

## TERMINAL EVALUATION TERMS OF REFERENCE

### STRENGTHENING THE SUSTAINABILITY OF PROTECTED AREA MANAGEMENT IN MYANMAR

#### BASIC INFORMATION

<b>Location:</b>	Myanmar with travel to Yangon, Kachin, Sagaing and Naypyitaw
<b>Application Deadline:</b>	_____
<b>Type of Contract:</b>	Individual Contract
<b>Post Level:</b>	<b>International Evaluation Consultant (Team Leader)</b>
<b>Languages Required:</b>	English
<b>Starting Date:</b> (date when the selected candidate is expected to start)	<b>1 December</b>
<b>Duration of Initial Contract:</b>	<b>1 December 2019-31 March 2020</b>
<b>Expected Duration of Assignment:</b>	<b>40 Days</b>

#### INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full -sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of Strengthening Sustainability of Protected Area Management in Myanmar.

The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows:

#### PROJECT SUMMARY TABLE

Project Title:	Strengthening Sustainability of Protected Areas Management in Myanmar			
GEF Project ID:	00083188		<i>at endorsement (Million US\$)</i>	<i>at completion (Million US\$) =</i>
UNDP Project ID:	00091797	GEF financing:	6,027,397	
Country:	Myanmar	IA/EA own:	4,646,300	TBC
Region:	Kachin State and Sagaing Region	Government:		
Focal Area:	Protected Area Management and Biodiversity Conservation	Other: UNDP WCS	12,000,000 1,250,000	TBC
FA Objectives, (OP/SP):	Strengthening the terrestrial system of national protected areas for biodiversity	Total co-financing:	13,250,000	TBC

	conservation through enhanced representation, management effectiveness, monitoring, enforcement and financing			
Executing Agency:	Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Conservation (MONREC)	Total Project Cost:	23,923,697	TBC
Other Partners involved:	Wildlife Conservation Society	ProDoc Signature (date project began):		1 July 2015
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: 30 June 2020	Actual: 30 Jun 2020

## OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

Myanmar is the largest country in mainland South-East Asia, with significant forest, freshwater, coastal and marine ecosystems. Because of its very wide variation in latitude, altitude and climate, and location at the convergence of four major floristic regions, Myanmar supports a high diversity of habitats, and is extremely rich in plant species. Available information on species diversity and endemism indicates that Myanmar supports extraordinary plant and vertebrate diversity. However, detailed baseline data are still lacking for many taxonomic groups, and new species for science are still being regularly discovered. Since the late 1990s, destruction and degradation of Myanmar's natural habitat has increased, primarily due to logging and agricultural conversion as the country increasingly engaged with the outside world for economic development.

These pressures are likely to increase dramatically following recent political changes that facilitate foreign investment and trade. The long-term vision of the project is for Myanmar to have a robust, representative and effectively managed terrestrial protected area system, which is effectively integrated into broader landscape-level land use planning. This project aims to secure important biodiversity areas to be included in the expanded Protected Area (PA) system and to strengthen the overall system while at the same time raising the profile of protected areas within the national and state level development planning context. Its objective is to strengthen the terrestrial system of national protected areas for biodiversity conservation through enhanced representation, management effectiveness, monitoring, enforcement and financing.

To achieve the project objective and based on a barrier analysis which identified: i) the problem being addressed by the project; ii) its root causes; and iii) the barriers that need to be overcome to address the problem and its root causes. These are to be secured through two project components:

- Component 1: Systemic, institutional and financial framework for PA expansion and management

This component addresses the first barrier: the weak systematic and institutional capacity to plan and manage the expanded national protected area system through a range of inputs aimed to: strengthen national and regional policy and planning frameworks in relation to PA; build central capacity for PA system management; expand the PA system coverage to 10% of the national land area; develop a systematic approach for sustainable financing of the expanded PA system; and integrate PA values into regional and local development for sub-national government units associated with demonstration PAs.

- Component 2: Strengthened management and threat reduction in the target PAs and buffer zones

Component 2 addresses the second barrier: the insufficient management capacity and motivation at the PA level to manage local threats and achieve conservation outcomes. This component focuses on strengthening management effectiveness, financial sustainability, community engagement, monitoring and planning to address external threats at the four selected demonstration PAs.

The two components are further specified to two main outcomes:

- **Outcome 1:** Enhanced systemic, institutional and financial frameworks for PA expansion and management
- **Outcome 2:** Strengthened management and threat reduction in the targets PAs and buffer zones

The project is expected to contribute to the following Sustainable Development Goal(s):

- Goal 15: Protect, restore and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss.

and to following country outcomes of UNDP Myanmar's Country Programme:

- UNDAF Outcome 2: By 2022, Myanmar becomes more resilient to climate and disaster risk with efficient environmental governance and sustainable use of natural resources.
  - Output 2.2: Solutions developed at the national and sub-national levels for sustainable management of natural resources and ecosystem services as a platform for inclusive economic development.

Further, the project is linked to the following outputs of the UNDP Strategic Plan:

- Output 1.3: Solutions developed at national and sub-nation levels for sustainable management of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste.
- Output 1.5: Legal and regulatory frameworks, policies and institutions enabled to ensure the conservation, sustainable use, and access and benefit sharing of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems, in line with international conventions and national legislation.

The Terminal Evaluation (TE) will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects.

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

## EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

---

An overall approach and method<sup>1</sup> for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact**, as defined and explained in the [UNDP Guidance](#)

---

<sup>1</sup> For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 7, pg. 163

for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR ([Annex C](#)) The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. **Focus Group Discussions** to be held whenever appropriate. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Kachin State/Sagaing Region, including the following project sites:

- Forest Department, Nay Pyi Taw
- Forest Department, Myitkyina, Kachin State
- Hkakaborazi National Park Headquarters, Putao, Kachin State
- Forest Department, Monwya, Sagaing Region
- Htamanthi Wildlife Sanctuary, Sagaing Region

**Interviews** with key stakeholders including key government counterparts, donor community members, representatives of key international and national civil society organizations, and implementing partners is required to gather diverse views from stakeholders engaged in project implementation. Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

- Forest Department, Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Conservation
- Wildlife Conservation Society
- Resident Representative, UNDP
- Chief of Unit, Sustainable Inclusive Growth Unit, UNDP
- Members of the Project Board, and
- Key stakeholders in the project sites in Kachin State and Sagaing Region

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as MSDP, CPD , the project document, Programme and project quality assurance reports; Annual workplans; project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, monitoring reports, minutes of Project board meetings, risk logs, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in [Annex B](#) of this Terms of Reference.

The final methodological approach including interview schedule, field visits and data to be used in the evaluation should be clearly outlined in the inception report and be fully discussed and agreed between Evaluation Steering Committee, UNDP and the evaluators.

## **EVALUATION CRITERIA & RATINGS**

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework (see [Annex A](#)), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact**. Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in [Annex D](#).

<b>Evaluation Ratings:</b>			
<b>1. Monitoring and Evaluation</b>	<i>rating</i>	<b>2. IA&amp; EA Execution</b>	<i>rating</i>
M&E design at entry		Quality of UNDP Implementation	
M&E Plan Implementation		Quality of Execution - Executing Agency	
Overall quality of M&E		Overall quality of Implementation / Execution	
<b>3. Assessment of Outcomes</b>	<b>Rating</b>	<b>4. Sustainability</b>	<b>rating</b>
Relevance		Financial resources:	
Effectiveness		Socio-political:	
Efficiency		Institutional framework and governance:	
Overall Project Outcome Rating		Environmental:	
		Overall likelihood of sustainability:	

## PROJECT FINANCE / COFINANCE

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report.

Co-financing (type/source)	UNDP own financing (mill. US\$)		Government (mill. US\$)		Partner Agency (mill. US\$)		Total (mill. US\$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Actual	Actual
Grants	12,000,000	TBC		TBC	1,250,000	TBC	13,250,000	TBC
Loans/Concessions								
• In-kind support								
• Other								
<b>Totals</b>	<b>12,000,000</b>				<b>1,250,000</b>		<b>13,250,000</b>	

## MAINSTREAMING

UNDP supported GEF financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender.

## IMPACT

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.<sup>2</sup>

## CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS & LESSONS

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions, recommendations** and **lessons**.

<sup>2</sup> A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office: [ROtI Handbook 2009](#)

## IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS

An indicative Evaluation Management Structure is provided in Annex H. The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP CO in Myanmar. The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

## EVALUATION TIMEFRAME

<b>Phase One: Desk review and inception report</b>				
Meeting briefing with Implementing Partner (WCS), and UNDP (programme managers and project staff as needed)	-	At the time of contract signing	UNDP or remote	Evaluation manager and commissioner
Sharing of the relevant documentation with the evaluation team	-	At the time of contract signing	Via email	Evaluation manager and commissioner
Desk review, Evaluation design, methodology and updated workplan including the list of stakeholders to be interviewed	5 days	Within two weeks of contract signing	Home- based	Evaluation Team
Submission of the inception report (15 pages maximum)	-	Within two weeks of contract signing		Evaluation team
Comments and approval of inception report	-	Within one week of submission of the inception report	UNDP	Evaluation manager
<b>Phase Two: Evaluation mission</b>				
Consultations and field visits, in-depth interviews and focus groups	15 days	Within four weeks of contract signing	In country  With field visits	IP (WCS) and UNDP to organize with local project partners, project staff, local authorities, NGOs, etc.
Debriefing to Government, IP (WCS), UNDP and key stakeholders, if possible Project Board Members	1 day	....	In country	Evaluation team
<b>Phase Three: Evaluation report writing</b>				
Preparation of draft evaluation report (50 pages maximum)	10 days	Within three weeks of the completion of the field mission	Home- based	Evaluation team

excluding annexes), executive summary (5 pages)				
Draft report submission	-	...		Evaluation team
Consolidated FD, IP (WCS), UNDP and key stakeholder comments to the draft report	-	Within two weeks of submission of the draft evaluation report	UNDP	Evaluation manager and evaluation reference group
Debriefing with IP (WCS) and UNDP	1 day	Within one week of receipt of comments	Remotely UNDP	UNDP, evaluation reference group, stakeholder and evaluation team
Finalization of the evaluation report incorporating additions and comments provided by project staff (IP), and UNDP country office including audit trail	8 days	Within one week of final debriefing	Home- based	Evaluation team
Submission of the final evaluation report to UNDP country office (50 pages maximum excluding executive summary and annexes)	-	Within one week of final debriefing	Home- based	Evaluation team
<b>Estimated total days for the evaluation</b>	<b>40</b>			

## EVALUATION DELIVERABLES

---

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the following:

Deliverable	Content	Timing	Responsibilities
<b>Inception Report</b>	Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method	No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation mission.	Evaluator submits to UNDP CO
<b>Presentation</b>	Initial Findings	End of evaluation mission	To project management, UNDP CO
<b>Draft Final Report</b>	Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the evaluation mission	Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs
<b>Final Report*</b>	Revised report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft	Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC.

\*When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report.

## TEAM COMPOSITION

---

The evaluation team will be composed of *(1 international and 1 national evaluator)*. The consultants shall have prior experience in evaluating similar projects. The international consultant will be the team leader *responsible for finalizing the report*. The evaluators selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities.

The **International Evaluation Consultant (Team Leader)** will be responsible for:

- Providing overall leadership on the independent evaluation based on inputs and insights from the national consultant
- Conducting desk reviews of relevant documents and interview with implementing partner, government partners, UN/UNDP staff, donors and other partners
- Reviewing the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, value-added and impact of the Project;
- Identifying whether project has achieved its intended results (based on the strategic outcomes and work plans)
- Ensuring completion of all the deliverables outlined above: evaluation inception report, draft evaluation report, and final evaluation report

### **Required qualification and experience:**

#### **Educational Background (10 points)**

- A Master's Degree or higher in biodiversity conservation, environmental finance, economics, environmental or natural resource economics, environmental planning/management, public finance, or other closely related field

#### **Relevant Experiences (10 points)**

- At least 10 years of professional experience in environment and/or conservation finance or 8 years' experience in areas such as protected area management, sustainable development management, natural resource management, ecology, or conservation related areas
- Experience working with protected area management projects is strongly preferred

- Track record of previous research and impact evaluation assessments
- Knowledge of UNDP and GEF will be considered an asset
- Prior experience working in Myanmar is desirable
- Experience with the IUCN Red List and plant and animal taxonomy in Myanmar desired

**English Language Skill (5 points)**

- Excellent command of the English language (oral and written)

**EVALUATOR ETHICS**

The evaluation is expected to adhere to a framework supporting human rights-based (HRBA), results-oriented and gender responsive monitoring and evaluation. Towards this purpose, the project evaluation will encompass the principles of gender equality and human rights, ensuring that the evaluation process respects these normative standards, and aims for the progressive realization of same by respecting, protecting and fulfilling obligations of non-discrimination, access to information, and ensuring participation through a combination of consultative and participatory evaluation approaches.

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex E) upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the [UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'](#)

**PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS**

%	Milestone
10%	At contract signing
40%	Following submission and approval of the 1ST draft terminal evaluation report
50%	Following submission and approval (UNDP-CO and UNDP RTA) of the final terminal evaluation report

**APPLICATION PROCESS**

Applicants are requested to apply online <http://jobs.undp.org> or email to [bids.mm@undp.org](mailto:bids.mm@undp.org). Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions. The application should contain a current and complete C.V. in English with indication of the e-mail and phone contact. Shortlisted candidates will be requested to submit a price offer indicating the total cost of the assignment (including daily fee, per diem and travel costs).

UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

<b>Signature – Post Description Certification</b>		
<b>BIPLOVE CHOUDHARY</b> Chief, Sustainable and Inclusive Growth Unit, UNDP CO	Signature	Date
<b>DAWN DEL RIO</b> Deputy Resident Representative, UNDP CO	Signature	Date

## ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK (REVISED IN MARCH 2019)

	Objective and Outcome Indicators (no more than a total of 15 -16 indicators)	Baseline <sup>3</sup>	Mid-term Target <sup>4</sup>	End of Project Target	Data Collection Methods and Risks/Assumption <sup>5</sup>																						
<b>Project Objective:</b> Strengthen the terrestrial system of national protected areas for biodiversity conservation through enhanced representation, management effectiveness, monitoring, enforcement and financing	<b>Indicator 1:</b> coverage of Myanmar's terrestrial and aquatic PA network managed by the Forest Department as indicated by increased coverage of under-represented ecoregions (see inset table)	5.6% coverage (3,788,697 ha) of Myanmar's terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems.	Midterm PA Coverage: 5.6% (3,818,749 ha) through the addition of Inkhinebum National Park (30,052 ha) in 2017	6% coverage (4,059,462 ha) of total country land area	Official Forest Department information; Project GIS/RS analysis																						
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Ecoregion</th> <th>Baseline (2014)</th> <th>EoP Target</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Irrawaddy dry Forest</td> <td>0.45%</td> <td>3.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Irrawaddy moist deciduous forest</td> <td>1.82%</td> <td>3.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Kayah-Karen montane rain forest</td> <td>0.60%</td> <td>1.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Myanmar Coast mangrove</td> <td>0.92%</td> <td>3.0%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Nujiang Langcang Gorge alpine conifer and mixed forest</td> <td>0.00%</td> <td>3.0%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>					Ecoregion	Baseline (2014)	EoP Target	Irrawaddy dry Forest	0.45%	3.0%	Irrawaddy moist deciduous forest	1.82%	3.0%	Kayah-Karen montane rain forest	0.60%	1.5%	Myanmar Coast mangrove	0.92%	3.0%	Nujiang Langcang Gorge alpine conifer and mixed forest	0.00%	3.0%				Risks: -Exploitation of wildlife and forest products driven by increased international trade and demand for land may severely impact conservation
	Ecoregion					Baseline (2014)	EoP Target																				
	Irrawaddy dry Forest					0.45%	3.0%																				
	Irrawaddy moist deciduous forest					1.82%	3.0%																				
	Kayah-Karen montane rain forest				0.60%	1.5%																					
Myanmar Coast mangrove	0.92%	3.0%																									
Nujiang Langcang Gorge alpine conifer and mixed forest	0.00%	3.0%																									

<sup>3</sup> Baseline, mid-term and end of project target levels must be expressed in the same neutral unit of analysis as the corresponding indicator. Baseline is the current/original status or condition and need to be quantified. The baseline must be established before the project document is submitted to the GEF for final approval. The baseline values will be used to measure the success of the project through implementation monitoring and evaluation.

<sup>4</sup> Target is the change in the baseline value that will be achieved by the mid-term review and then again by the terminal evaluation.

<sup>5</sup> Data collection methods should outline specific tools used to collect data and additional information as necessary to support monitoring. The PIR cannot be used as a source of verification.

	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Tenasserim-south Thailand semi-evergreen rain forest</td> <td>5.16%</td> <td>25.0%</td> </tr> </table>	Tenasserim-south Thailand semi-evergreen rain forest	5.16%	25.0%				<p>-Political tension between ethnic groups and central govt may limit ability to implement activities</p> <p>- Increased local conflict against PA expansion, including threat of violence and destruction of property of government and project personnel</p> <p>-Climate change may undermine conservation objectives of the project</p>
	Tenasserim-south Thailand semi-evergreen rain forest	5.16%	25.0%					
	<p><b>Indicator 2:</b> habitat conditions at the target sites indicated by percentage change in forest cover measured through remote sensing during the project.</p>	See inset table for baseline annual rate of change in forest cover by PA	Hukaung Valley WS 0.69% Hkakaborazi NP 0.02% Hponkanrazi WS 0.15% Htamanthi WS 0.05%	See inset table for target annual rate of change in forest cover by PA	Assumptions: The Myanmar Government continues to be committed to the extension and improved management of the PA system in the face of other			
<p><b>Indicator 3:</b> Financial Sustainability of PA System (measured through Financial Sustainability Scorecard)</p>	Baseline Financial Sustainability Scorecard score (October 2013) 15%	Mid-term Evaluation Sustainability Scorecard score (March 2018) 24%	Baseline Financial Sustainability Scorecard score 25%					

	<b>Mandatory indicator 4:</b> Number of direct project beneficiaries of which 50% are women.	None	Number of government staff who improved their knowledge and skills on management and threat reduction due to the project (162M, 35F 18%)  Number of local people in project areas benefiting from engagement in conservation activities and improved livelihoods (1779M, 1679F 49%)	Number of government staff who improved their knowledge and skills on management and threat reduction due to the project (160M, 160F 50%)  Number of local people in project areas benefiting from engagement in conservation activities and improved livelihoods (5600M, 5600F 50%)	demands for land and resources.
<b>Component/Outcome<sup>6</sup> 1</b>  Enhanced systemic, institutional and financial frameworks for PA expansion and management	<b>Indicator 5:</b> Legal status enabling local people to use and benefit from sites within Protected Areas put in place and implemented.	Local people have no legal use rights and in PAs, PA buffer zones vary in location and legal status;	New Conservation of Biodiversity and Protected Area Law in May 2018, revision of bylaws ongoing	Legislation passed and zones developed to enable local use of land within PAs with appropriate safeguards.	Report on development of Conservation of Biodiversity and Protected Area Rules

<sup>6</sup>Outcomes are short to medium term results that the project makes a contribution towards, and that are designed to help achieve the longer-term objective. Achievement of outcomes will be influenced both by project outputs and additional factors that may be outside the direct control of the project.

	<p><b>Indicator 6:</b> 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 Training and Research Development Division and the Planning and Statistics Division)</p>	<p>Baseline average of 56% (range: 48% to 65%)</p> <p>No formal training courses on PA management are available in Myanmar</p>	<p>Mid-term average score of 63% (range 50-71%)</p> <p>Total numbers of trainees trained in 2016-17 were 368 - 115 Forest Department Staff, 63 WCS staff, 183 local communities and 7 INGOs and CSOs</p>	<p>67%</p> <p>Certificate-level Wildlife Conservation and PA management modules are incorporated into regular curricula for these groups: 1. Nature and Wildlife Conservation Division (NWCD), 2. University of Forestry and Environmental Science (UoFES), 3. Myanmar Forest School (MFS) and 4. Central Forestry Development Training Centre (CFDTC)</p>	<p>Capacity Development Scorecard</p> <p>Certificate level PA management modules developed and incorporated into: (i) NWCD; (ii) UoFS; (iii) MFS and (iv) CFDTC</p> <p>Official Forest Dept. and Yezin University reports</p>
	<p><b>Indicator 7:</b> Piloted a feasible sustainable financing mechanism.</p> <p>50% increase in total budget allocated to the protected areas in real terms compared to the baseline as indicated by the financial sustainability scorecard</p>	<p>No PA sustainable financing system is piloted</p> <p>US\$1,012,642 per year in Financial Scorecard for 2013-14</p>	<p>Legal establishment investigated</p> <p>Increased by 25% by Min-term review</p>	<p>A Conservation Trust Fund is established</p> <p>50% increase in budget allocated to the protected areas in real terms compared to baseline</p>	<p>Project report on conservation trust fund drafted</p> <p>Governmental budgetary information</p>

	<b>Indicator 8:</b> Developed Redlisted Ecosystem for PA expansion and network review	No national ecosystem information for comprehensive and representative PA gap analysis	Draft National Ecosystem Typology	Improved PA representation through gap analysis using national ecosystem information	Project report on ecosystem development  National Ecosystem Typology  National IUCN red list of Ecosystems for Myanmar assessed for PA expansion and network review.											
<b>Component/ Outcome 2</b>  Strengthened management and threat reduction in the target PAs and buffer zones	<b>Indicator 9:</b> No. of business plan for PA developed and under implementation	No business plan of PA	Business plan of a model PA drafted	Business plan of at least one model PA developed	A business plan of a model PA											
	<b>Indicator 10:</b> Reduction of threats at the target sites as indicated by increase of patrol distance (km) and decrease of evidences of illegal activity (people, camps and hunting weapons)  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.  <table border="1" data-bbox="450 1150 1077 1305"> <thead> <tr> <th>PA</th> <th>Indicators</th> <th>Baseline 2015</th> <th>Baseline / PIR 2016</th> <th>PIR 2017</th> <th>EOP Target</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	PA	Indicators	Baseline 2015	Baseline / PIR 2016	PIR 2017	EOP Target							See inset table for baseline patrol distance (km) and, encounters of people, camps and hunting weapons in 2015 and 2016  - Encounter rate of 2 Hoolock Gibbon groups/ km <sup>2</sup> in Htamanthi WS.	<i>As above</i>	See inset table for predicted annual target for patrol distance (km) and, encounters of people, camps and hunting weapons  - Encounter rate of 2 Hoolock Gibbon groups/ km <sup>2</sup> in Htamanthi WS.
PA	Indicators	Baseline 2015	Baseline / PIR 2016	PIR 2017	EOP Target											

	Htamanthi Wildlife Sanctuary	Patrol Distance (km)	4,196	6,133	116,193	130,000		- 0.2 to 2.5 ungulate sign observations/ 100 km patrolled for all demonstration site.		- 0.2 to 2.5 ungulate sign observations/ 100 km patrolled for all three demonstration sites.	
		Total People encountered	3,274	1,806	948	500					
		Total Camps encountered	33	29	31	20					
		Total Hunting weapons encountered	993	152	38	20					
	<b>Indicator 11:</b> Management effectiveness of individual PAs covering 2,604,000 ha, indicated by the % increase in the METT assessment						Hkakaborazi National Park 51%	Hkakaborazi National Park 58%	Hkakaborazi National Park 83%	Assumptions: Subnational government agencies are committed to the extension and improved management of the PA system in the face of other demands for land and resources.	
					Hponkanrazi Wildlife Sanctuary 12%	Hponkanrazi Wildlife Sanctuary 39%	Hponkanrazi Wildlife Sanctuary 69%				
					Htamanthi Wildlife Sanctuary 49%	Htamanthi Wildlife Sanctuary 61%	Htamanthi Wildlife Sanctuary 82%				
	<b>Indicator 12:</b> Community and stakeholder's participation systems piloted at demonstration PAs and landscapes, and incorporated into management plans						No existing systematic measures for community participation at demonstration PAs		Community and stakeholder's participation systems piloted at demonstration PAs and landscapes, and incorporated into management plans	Number of communities engaged in resource management/ community forestry/community training, etc. for	

					<p>effective co-management.</p> <p>Community and stakeholder participation measures/ systems incorporated into PA management plan</p>
<p><b>Component/ Outcome 2</b></p> <p>Knowledge Management and M&amp;E</p>	<p><b>Indicator 13 (M&amp;E): Knowledge Products</b></p> <p>Number of knowledge products reflecting best practices and lessons learned documented and disseminated for scaling-up.</p>	<i>As above</i>	<i>As above</i>	<p>Reptile, Bird and Mammal National Redlists</p> <p>Ecosystem Redlist</p> <p>Protected Area Representation Document</p> <p>NWCD Curricula for Biodiversity and Protected Area management</p> <p>UEAFS Curricula for Biodiversity and Protected Area management</p> <p>MFS Curricula for Biodiversity and Protected Area management</p> <p>CFDTC Curricula for Biodiversity and</p>	

				Protected Area management  Draft Conservation Biodiversity and Protected Area Rules	
	<b>Indicator 14 (M&amp;E): Strategies</b>	Limited Strategy Documents	Draft Capacity Development Strategy	Government develops strategies for protected area related capacity development and sustainable financing.  The Project develops an exit strategy	Sustainable Finance Strategy  Capacity Development Strategy  Exit Strategy

## **ANNEX B: LIST OF DOCUMENTS TO BE REVIEWED BY THE EVALUATORS**

---

- Project Document
- Annual Work Plans and Budgets
- Procurement and HR Documents
- Maps
- Monitoring and Evaluation Framework
- List and contact details of project staff, key project stake- holders, including Project Board, and other partners to be consulted
- Project sites, highlighting suggested visits
- Midterm Review (MTR) report and other relevant evaluations and assessments
- Project Inception Report
- Project Implementation Reports (PIRs)
- Finalized Tracking Tools/Scorecards
- Quarterly Progress Reports
- All monitoring reports prepared by the project
- Financial Data
- Sample of project communications materials, i.e. press releases, brochures, documentaries, etc.
- Minutes of the Project Board Meetings and other meetings (i.e. Local Project Appraisal Committee meetings)
- Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)
- Country Programme Document (CPD)
- Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP)
- Kachin Landscape Documents
- Sagaing Landscape Documents
- National Landscape Documents
- Forest Cover Monitoring
- SMART Patrol Reports
- UNDP GEF Project Management Training
- UNDP GEF Monthly Meeting Minutes

## ANNEX C: EVALUATION QUESTIONS

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
<b>Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels?</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the project relevant to the Myanmar’s protected area management system?</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the project aligned with sub-national and national development priorities (MSDP), UNDP’s Strategic Framework and the objectives of the Country Programme Document?</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the project address the needs of the target beneficiaries?</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How is the project complementary to the actions and portfolios of other stakeholders in Myanmar?</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Is the project consistent in its design? Are the project’s objectives and outputs clear, practical and feasible within its frame? If not, does it provide space for flexibility to be responsive to policy changes that would directly affect the achievement of project objectives?</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent were lessons learned from other relevant projects considered in the project’s design and implementation?</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<b>Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved?</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the activities and outputs of the project consistent with the project’s goals and objectives?</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent have the delivered outputs contributed to the achievement of the project’s expected outcomes? Which of these outputs and objectives are being achieved, and where is the project facing challenges and which ones?</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the risks of the project clearly assessed – and accurate? Does the project have sufficient ability to adapt to changing context and mitigating risk? What have</li> </ul>	•	•	•

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
been the main limiting factors constraining the project's effectiveness? How were they mitigated by the project?			
• Which are the lessons learnt from the project in terms of effectiveness?	•	•	•
• How could the project have been more effective in achieving results?	•	•	•
• Is the objective of the project clearly articulated in relevant documents and translated into operational practices?	•	•	•
• How are different stakeholder views considered in project implementation?		•	•
<b>Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?</b>			
• Was adaptive management needed and used in order to ensure efficient use of resources? What are the key areas of learning in the previous years, are there robust learning/feedback loops, and how has the project adapted in response?	•	•	•
• To what extent was the project management structure (e.g. project boards) as outlined in the project document efficient in generating the expected results?	•	•	•
• Were the accounting and financial systems in place adequate? Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically and at the right time to achieve outcomes? To what extent have resources been used efficiently?	•	•	•
• Were progress reports produced timely and in compliance to project reporting requirements? To what extent do the M&E systems utilized by UNDP ensure effective and efficient project management?	•	•	•
• Was project implementation as cost-effective as originally envisaged?	•	•	•
• Was the expected co-financing leveraged as initially expected?	•	•	•
• Were the reported lessons learnt shared among project stakeholders for subsequent improvement of project implementation?	•	•	•
• Which partnerships and networking were facilitated among stakeholders?	•	•	•
• Was local capacity and know-how adequately monitored?	•	•	•
<b>Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?</b>			

Evaluative Criteria Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Were sustainability issues adequately addressed as project design?</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is there evidence that some partners and stakeholders will continue their activities beyond project termination? Which ones?</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Which are the main risks to the continuation of policies and actions initiated by the project? (financial, institutional, socio-economic, environmental)</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are project actions and results being scaled up or replicated elsewhere in the country?</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Did the project adequately address institutional and financial sustainability issues?</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How is the beneficiary planning to mainstream the lessons learnt within protected area management and biodiversity conservation?</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<b>Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How likely is the for the project to achieve its long-term goal?</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are stakeholders more aware about challenges and policies on the protected area management and biodiversity conservation in Myanmar? Which ones?</li> </ul>	•	•	•
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the impact of the project in the</li> </ul>	•	•	•

## ANNEX D: RATING SCALES

---

<p><b>Ratings for Outcomes, Effectiveness, Efficiency, M&amp;E, I&amp;E Execution</b></p> <p>6: Highly Satisfactory (HS): no shortcomings          5: Satisfactory (S): minor shortcomings          4: Moderately Satisfactory (MS)          3. Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): significant shortcomings          2. Unsatisfactory (U): major problems          1. Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): severe problems</p>	<p><b>Sustainability ratings:</b></p> <p>4. Likely (L): negligible risks to sustainability          3. Moderately Likely (ML): moderate risks            2. Moderately Unlikely (MU): significant risks          1. Unlikely (U): severe risks</p>	<p><b>Relevance ratings</b></p> <p>2. Relevant (R)          1.. Not relevant (NR)</p> <p><b>Impact Ratings:</b></p> <p>3. Significant (S)          2. Minimal (M)          1. Negligible (N)</p>
<p><i>Additional ratings where relevant:</i>          Not Applicable (N/A)          Unable to Assess (U/A)</p>		

## ANNEX E: EVALUATION CONSULTANT CODE OF CONDUCT AND AGREEMENT FORM

---

### Evaluators:

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

### Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form<sup>7</sup>

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

Name of Consultant: \_\_\_\_\_

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): \_\_\_\_\_

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

Signed at *place* on *date*

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

---

<sup>7</sup>[www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.unevaluation.org/unegcodeofconduct)

## ANNEX F: EVALUATION REPORT OUTLINE<sup>8</sup>

---

- i. Opening page:
  - Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project
  - UNDP and GEF project ID#s.
  - Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
  - Region and countries included in the project
  - GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program
  - Implementing Partner and other project partners
  - Evaluation team members
  - Acknowledgements
- ii. Executive Summary
  - Project Summary Table
  - Project Description (brief)
  - Evaluation Rating Table
  - Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons
- iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations  
(See: UNDP Editorial Manual<sup>9</sup>)
  1. Introduction
    - Purpose of the evaluation
    - Scope & Methodology
    - Structure of the evaluation report
  2. Project description and development context
    - Project start and duration
    - Problems that the project sought to address
    - Immediate and development objectives of the project
    - Baseline Indicators established
    - Main stakeholders
    - Expected Results
  3. Findings  
(In addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with (\*) must be rated<sup>10</sup>)
    - 3.1 Project Design / Formulation
      - Analysis of LFA/Results Framework (Project logic /strategy; Indicators)
      - Assumptions and Risks
      - Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project design
      - Planned stakeholder participation
      - Replication approach
      - UNDP comparative advantage
      - Linkages between project and other interventions within the sector
      - Management arrangements
    - 3.2 Project Implementation
      - Adaptive management (changes to the project design and project outputs during implementation)
      - Partnership arrangements (with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region)

---

<sup>8</sup>The Report length should not exceed 40 pages in total (not including annexes).

<sup>9</sup> UNDP Style Manual, Office of Communications, Partnerships Bureau, updated November 2008

<sup>10</sup> Using a six-point rating scale: 6: Highly Satisfactory, 5: Satisfactory, 4: Marginally Satisfactory, 3: Marginally Unsatisfactory, 2: Unsatisfactory and 1: Highly Unsatisfactory, see section 3.5, page 37 for ratings explanations.

- Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management
- Project Finance:
- Monitoring and evaluation: design at entry and implementation (\*)
- UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (\*) coordination, and operational issues

### 3.3 Project Results

- Overall results (attainment of objectives) (\*)
- Relevance (\*)
- Effectiveness & Efficiency (\*)
- Country ownership
- Mainstreaming
- Sustainability (\*)
- Impact

### 4. Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

- Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
- Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
- Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives
- Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success

### 5. Annexes

- ToR
- Itinerary
- List of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits
- List of documents reviewed
- Evaluation Question Matrix
- Questionnaire used and summary of results
- Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form

**ANNEX G: EVALUATION REPORT CLEARANCE FORM**

---

*(to be completed by CO and UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and included in the final document)*

Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared by	
UNDP Country Office	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____	Date: _____
UNDP GEF RTA	
Name: _____	
Signature: _____	Date: _____

## ANNEX H: EVALUATION MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE

---

Evaluation management structure: five level structure

1. **Evaluation Commissioners (EC):** Senior management who owns the evaluation
2. **Evaluation Steering Committee (ESC):** Key project stakeholders as advisory
3. **Evaluation Management Group (EMG):** Selected members for day to day management
4. **Evaluation Manager (EM):** Programme specialist as Lead for evaluation management
5. **Evaluators:** Third party

Detail of roles and responsibility of evaluation management structure is mentioned below:

1. **Evaluation Commissioners (EC):** Country office senior management, who “own” the evaluation plan for their programme/project. The key role of the EC will be the following:
  - Lead and ensure the development of a comprehensive, representative, strategic and costed evaluation plan
  - Responsible for the timely implementation of the evaluation plan
  - Ensure evaluability of UNDP initiatives: clear and comprehensive results frameworks are in place and effective monitoring is implemented
  - Establish appropriate institutional arrangement to manage evaluation- appoint evaluation manager;
  - Safeguard the independence of the exercise and ensure quality of evaluation;
  - Ensure management response are prepared and implemented
  - Accountable for quality and approval of final TOR, Final evaluation report and mgt responses
2. **Evaluation Steering Committee (ESC):** Key project stakeholders, government partners, donors including representatives from project management boards, and/ or UNDP GEF RTA. The key role of the Evaluation Steering Committee will be the following:
  - This is the primary decision-making entity for the evaluation as it consists of members of the evaluation commissioners and other key stakeholders
  - Perform advisory role throughout the evaluation process
  - Composition and level of engagement of ESC can be discussed and finalized with consensus during finalization of ToR
  - Endorse the ToR for the evaluation
  - Oversee progress and conduct of the evaluation
  - Ensure that evaluation standards, as provided by UNEG, are adhered to, including safeguarding of transparency and independence
  - Provide advice on the evaluation’s relevance, on the appropriateness of evaluation questions and methodology and on the extent to which conclusions and recommendations are both credible considering the evidence that is presented and are action-oriented
  - Review the evaluation products, provide feedback and ensure final draft meets quality standards. Endorse the final evaluation report
  - Endorse the communication plan for the dissemination of evaluation findings. Communication plan to be prepared by evaluation task manager
  - Review and endorse management response to the evaluation
3. **Evaluation Management Group (EMG):** Programme unit head/Programme Specialist, M&E focal point of the project; Project Manager, QA and Reporting Specialist of Country offices. This group will support the Evaluation Manager for the day-to-day management of the evaluation process. More specifically, it will:
  - Prepare the terms of reference for the evaluation in consultation with the Evaluation Steering Committee (ESC);
  - Ensure the quality and independence of the evaluation in alignment with UNEG Norms and Standards and Ethical Guidelines;

- Support the Evaluation Manager for the day-to-day implementation of the evaluation activities and management of the evaluation budget;
  - Hire the team of external consultants
  - Ensure participation of relevant stakeholders;
  - Review and provide substantive comments to the inception report, including the work plan, analytical framework, methodology, and evaluation matrix;
  - Substantive feedback on the draft and final evaluation reports, for quality assurance purposes, and to ensure that the evaluation findings and conclusions are relevant and recommendations are implementable;
  - Inform the Evaluation Steering Committee on progress;
  - Prepare management response to the evaluation for ESC's review
  - Contribute to the dissemination of the evaluation findings and follow-up on the management response.
- 4. Evaluation Manager (EM):** Program Officer from the country office. Evaluation manager will work as the Secretariat of the EMG.
- Participate in all stages of the evaluation process: (a) evaluability assessment;
  - (b) preparation; (c) implementation and management; and (d) use of the evaluation
  - Lead the development of the evaluation terms of reference
  - Participate in the selection/ recruitment of external evaluators
  - Safeguard the independence of evaluations
  - Provide the evaluators with administrative support and required data and documentation
  - Liaise with the programme/project manager(s) throughout the evaluation process Connect the evaluators with the wider programme unit, senior management and key evaluation stakeholders, and ensure a fully inclusive and transparent approach to the evaluation
  - Review and approve inception reports including evaluation questions and methodologies
  - Review and comment on draft evaluation reports, circulate draft and final evaluation reports Collect and consolidate comments on draft evaluation reports and share with the evaluation team for finalization of the evaluation report
  - Contribute to the development of management responses and key actions to all recommendations addressed to UNDP
  - Ensure evaluation terms of reference, final evaluation reports, management responses, lessons learned, and other relevant information are publicly available through the ERC within the specified time frame
  - Facilitate, monitor and report on a quarterly basis implementation of management responses and key actions
  - Facilitate knowledge-sharing and use of findings in programming and decision-making
- 5. Evaluation team:** This team has to be a third-party firm/group/individuals who have never been involved directly or as implementing partners in any part of the project/program design, advisory role and/or implementation of any component of the project. Their tasks will be as per the ToR and contractual agreement:
- Fulfil the contractual arrangements under the terms of reference as appropriate
  - Develop the evaluation inception report, including an evaluation matrix, in line with the terms of reference
  - Keep to standards and ethical principles in line with UNEG Norms and Standards and Ethical Guidelines;
  - Draft reports and brief the evaluation manager, programme/project managers and stakeholders on the progress and key findings and recommendations
  - Finalize the evaluation, taking into consideration comments and questions on the evaluation report. Evaluators' feedback should be recorded in the audit trail
  - Deliver the products agreed to the right standard and quality;
  - Account for what the team has done (and spent).