Myanmar Country Programme
Country Programme Action Plan 2013 - 2017

Independent Midterm Evaluation

September 2015

Myanmar Country Programme – Country Programme Action Plan 2013-2017

Independent Midterm Evaluation

September 2015

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

When the UNDP Myanmar Country programme was designed in 2012, the country was embarking on multiple, simultaneous, complex reforms. Nation building was at the core of these reforms that include changes in the political and democratic and socio-economic situation; increased emphasis on decentralized and people-oriented governance and administration; as well as reforms to promote the inclusive development of the private sector.

Launched in 2011, these reforms had only just begun to deeply impact Myanmar's interactions with internal and external actors, including UNDP.

The midterm evaluation of UNDP's programme is focused on its relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability and the progress made since 2013 under the three outcome areas that underline UNDP's support for: effective local governance, improved environmental and natural resource management and the promotion of energy conservation and the promotion of democratic governance.

Findings

The evaluation findings have been identified following in-country consultations (23 June - 3 July 2015), that included (i) discussions with government officials and other national stakeholders, development partner representatives, UN representatives, UNDP Myanmar management and staff associated with the programme, advisers and consultants; as well as (ii) an analysis of available documentation and reports linked directly to the design and implementation of the country programme.

Key findings are as follows:

- The overall direction of programme design remains relevant. Given the broad range and complexity of the economic and social reforms facing the country, a number of the initial output descriptions and performance indicators had to be revised to reflect the pace of change and absorption capacity.

- Programme management was generally considered to be both efficient and effective. However, with the emergence of new development partner initiatives and uncertainty over continued funding support for UNDP, it is important to carefully consider what opportunities there might be for a greater integration of the work across the three outcome areas.

- Future sustainability of the governance work at both Union and regional levels is highly dependent on the continued commitment of the national stakeholders to the full range of governance changes that are underway across the country.

- There is enthusiasm for the support being provided by UNDP and the motivation this has given to counterparts to strengthen democratic decision-making at national, regional and township levels. The work at community level and with civil society and the media to address livelihoods, social cohesion and early recovery is also appreciated.

- Work is underway to develop an area-based approach in Rakhine, South East and Kachin providing an opportunity to integrate peace building into UNDP's support across the programme.

- There is limited evidence of systematic tracking or tracer studies to assess results, such as how training has contributed to changed behaviour or how a microfinance loan has changed the lives of a family, community or individual. Results are often being delivered through work across outputs and/or outcome level but these are not easily identified and are not necessarily being reported in terms of their contribution at programme level.

- There is a need to work with Myanmar counterparts to find mechanisms to deliver a more integrated set of activities that consistently draws together the national and local levels or the role of Union level institutions and communities. In the short term this could include a stronger reporting framework that draws out the common intentions of improved governance across outputs and helps demonstrate how through working at a number of levels or with different groups of stakeholders progress is being made towards the achievement of the programme goal.

- There is evidence that the mix of "soft" and "hard" support is appreciated and seen as an important element for building trust, commitment and capacity among stakeholders in many aspects of the programme both at Union and Region/State and township levels.

- It is important that the design and implementation of UNDP programme outputs consistently apply a rights-based approach to development as well as gender equality principles and that UNDP continues to pursue an increased commitment to them by the Government and other stakeholders.   In this regard, it is important that human rights standards, contained in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other international human rights instruments, guide all development cooperation and programming in all sectors and in all phases of the programming process.

- It is important to allow the reform process to emerge and grow while encouraging the introduction of new ideas or change, taking opportunities when and where they arise. This requires a less prescriptive approach to programming than is more often the case and the full involvement of all stakeholders from the beginning of the process.

- UNDP is encouraged to continue to ensure that comprehensive and meaningful consultations (involving all impacted parties) are undertaken prior to undertaking activities. This includes discussion on the TOR, especially for advisory inputs; increasing opportunities for the translation of key shorter documents to improve understanding and timeliness and information flow on the programme; and consideration of expected next steps and follow-up.

- UNDP has had success in strengthening local ownership of development planning and policy formulation that is based on sound statistical analysis and considers that there may be opportunities to demonstrate a commitment to support more directly the use of national systems in the implementation of the programme.

- There are opportunities to take advantage of improved availability of data and the potential for increased evidence-based policy, planning and implementation and in working with a number of UN agencies to ensure a fully integrated UN response to Myanmar's economic, social and environmental development challenges.

- The orientation training and the ongoing exposure visits and knowledge sharing are opportunities to underline the important role that civil society organisations and the media can play in drawing to the attention of the community the role of parliament as well as an avenue for community aspirations to be better understood by parliamentarians.

- There are a number of examples where a 'learning by doing' approach or where there is potential to "learn from each other" could be adopted. One specific example of how counterparts can learn from each other is to arrange an 'information sharing consultation/workshop' involving staff of the Union Parliament, Attorney General, Supreme Court and General Administration Department, given their similar experience in receiving similar support from UNDP since 2013.

- Internally in UNDP, it would be useful to reassess the structure of the teams to underline the importance of differentiating between programme/output management and quality assurance.

- A significant amount of time and resources is devoted to the three levels of programme governance and this structure appears to reduce opportunities for a more integrated programmatic monitoring and reporting process. Consultations with the programme partners and development partners suggest that there is an opportunity to reconsider the governance arrangements and to find a solution that not only meets the need to monitor at output level (where partners often have specific

involvement) and the importance of focusing attention on programme outcomes and their interrelationship with each other.

● With national elections in late 2015 and a new government in place in early 2016, it will be important to allow time for the new administration to be in place and functioning before work begins on the design of the new programme. Building a new programme where there still remains much to do to deepen the understanding of democracy and the accompanying commitments to widespread reform, requires UNDP to be realistic about what can be achieved.

● The further development and continued support from UNDP in the area of public administration reform and implementation of the draft national Framework may provide a platform for the design of a programme for implementation beyond 2017 that supports decentralization and focuses on: strengthening the capacity of the civil service at Union, State/Region and township levels, improved service delivery; and increased transparency and accountability – providing a nationally led chapeau with clear targets and indicators that are already owned nationally and which can be supported by UNDP.

● One suggestion made to the evaluation for future UN programming was the potential to develop a joint programme in the area of urban planning that could make use of the national census supported by UNFPA, address a range of environmental and community challenges such a water quality, sanitation, child and family health as well as urban planning and governance. Such an approach would give a focus to poverty in urban areas but may also provide a way to promote MDG/SDG achievement in a local (manageable) context.

● UNDP field offices currently provide very good liaison and support services but UNDP could get a greater returns on this investment if the capacity in these offices were to take on greater responsibility for implementation with performance monitoring the role of the Yangon-based staff. Under the present structure, Yangon based staff tend to be responsible for both the implementation and performance monitoring of outputs. A greater degree of decentralization would ensure that field staff are fully aware of all aspects of UNDP's work, are the 'local eyes and ears' and a facilitator for knowledge sharing.

● The field offices could also be strengthened through the adoption of a more systematic approach to supporting other Yangon based UN offices and a point of contact for other agencies working in the area on a full cost recovery basis.

Based on these findings, the midterm evaluation makes a number of recommendations that could be addressed immediately by the UNDP Myanmar

Office as well as others that may be considered in the lead-up to the design of the next country programme.

Recommendations

Recommendations to be addressed immediately:

1. Reinforce the importance of seeing the programme approach as the most effective way to design, deliver and report progress towards achievement.

2. Identify ways to more effectively tell the story of achievement.

3. Continue to build the capacity of stakeholders in the Myanmar institutions so that the support for reform can go to the next level while consistently demonstrating an understanding of the hierarchy and interconnections between the various levels of government and the administration.

4. Ensure a rights-based approach is consistently applied across the programme as well as how gender equality in all aspects of development can be maximized.

5. Explore the potential to involve key Myanmar officials more directly in the promotion of UNDP's comparative advantage to development partners and in doing so underline the importance of maintaining UNDP involvement in the post-election period and as a key partner to support Myanmar as it seeks to implement the SDGs.

6. Given the confidence shown in UNDP by the Myanmar counterparts, it is important that the organisation has the necessary resources and the support of development partners to stay engaged. This will help ensure continuity and coherence in the areas in which UNDP works.

7. In the delivery of the outcome areas continue to look for new partners, including increasing opportunities for broader UN engagement.

8. Identify ways to promote more consistently the idea of "learning by doing" and encouraging cross-fertilization between agencies to encourage 'learning from each other'.

9. Complement the higher-level promotion of development effectiveness by identifying potential sector level partners to pilot aid management and development cooperation principles, thereby demonstrating at sector level the real benefits of the government taking the lead in development partner coordination and aid effectiveness.

10. Continue to ensure a balance between provision of TA and workshops with provision of hardware or practical tools and on-going support.

11. Continue to build the capacity of parliamentarians through orientation and induction training following the forthcoming elections as well as the continuation of ongoing exposure visits and arrangements of conferences/workshops to strengthen and broaden the understanding of all aspects of democracy.

12. Address overall programme governance arrangements and in particular clarity around the role of various boards and committees as well as timeliness in terms of meeting notices and documentation.

Recommendations on issues to consider in the design of a future programme beyond 2017:

13. Analyse the current programme structure and outputs to ensure that the next programme cycle builds on its success and remains responsive to emerging challenges and needs.

14. Strengthen role of the field coordinator offices alongside the adoption of a stronger area-based approach where the UNDP programme outcomes are fully integrated and delivered in two or three clearly defined areas of the country.

15. Explore within the UN agencies, initially with those with offices in Myanmar, the opportunity to develop a joint programme that recognizes the comparative advantage of each agency and which builds on work already completed. One suggestion was a joint programme in the area of urban planning that could make use of the national census supported by UNFPA, address a range of environmental and community challenges such a water quality, sanitation, child and family health as well as urban planning and governance.

Lessons learned

Lessons learned during the implementation of the Myanmar programme include:

1. The importance of being <u>very realistic in setting outcome targets</u> when designing a programme in a situation where there is a need to build understanding and trust between UNDP and national stakeholders, while also embarking on significant organisational change in the UNDP office that involves staff re-profiling and changes in programme management processes and systems.

2. The necessity to ensure that there is <u>adequate flexibility in the programme design</u> when seeking to implement a governance based programme, given the need to be responsive and recognize that behaviour change of individuals as well as how institutions and Government agencies work together are often not easy to predict.

3. The importance of ensuring UNDP has and retains the <u>capacity to build and maintain trust and the technical background to support a range of Government led sector groups</u> as the country seeks to set new directions and implement extensive reforms.

4. The need to establish and maintain <u>effective partnerships</u> with as many development partners as feasible so they remain confident about the programme design. It is critical to ensure that the Government and other national stakeholders fully understand the role played by UNDP and are willing to advocate for the programme on behalf of UNDP.

5. The need at the time of programme design to <u>work closely with stakeholders and potential partners</u> rather than develop the programme outcomes and then seek their support. Gaining agreement after a design process reduces ownership and effective commitment.

6. The importance of outputs being <u>realistic and accompanied by indicators that can be measured and easily monitored</u>. Implementation plans should be flexible but remain focused on the achievement of the agreed outputs. Activities should also lead to progress towards the relevant output and be designed with the involvement of national stakeholders.

Acknowledgements

Acronyms

ASEAN	The Association of Southeast Asian Nations
AVAW	Anti-Violence Against Women
CEDAW	The Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women
CPAP	Country Programme Action Plan
CPD	Country Programme Document
CSO	Civil Society Organization
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
GAD	General Administration Department of the Ministry of Home Affairs
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GPEDC	Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation
HDI	Human Development Initiative
HFA	Hyogo Framework for Action
HIV	Human Immunodeficiency Virus
ICT	Information and Communication Technology
IPU	International Parliamentary Union
JICA	Japan International Cooperation Agency
LDC	Least Developed Country
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MNPED	Ministry for National Planning and Economic Development
MoF	Ministry of Finance
NGOs	Non-Government Organizations
NSPAW	National Strategic Plan for the Advancement of Women

OECD/DAC	Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development/Development Assistance Committee
RRF	Results Resources Framework
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
TA	Technical Assistance
TOR	Terms Of Reference
TSP	Township Plan
UCSB	Union Civil Service Board
UN	United Nations
UNCDF	United Nations Capital Development Fund
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
UN-Habitat	United Nations Human Settlements Programme
UNODC	United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
UNREDD	United Nations Collaborative Programme on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation in Developing Countries
UNSF	United Nations Strategic Framework
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WCS	Wildlife Conservation Society

A.   Introduction

1.   This report is the result of an Independent Midterm Evaluation of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Country Programme for Myanmar. The programme was initially designed to cover the period 2013 to 2015, but was subsequently extended by two-years so that it is now a five-year programme of support for the period 2013-2017.   The evaluation was undertaken by a two-person team (one international and one national consultant) and in accordance with the terms of reference and the agreed work plan, it involved:

- An analysis of available documentation and reports linked directly to the design and implementation to date of the country programme;
- A two-week in-country period of consultations (23 June - 3 July 2015) which included face-to-face discussions with Myanmar government and other stakeholders; UNDP Myanmar management and staff associated with the programme; programme appointed advisers and consultants; and development partner representatives;
- The presentation of a draft report and a review of its findings in Myanmar in early September; and
- Delivery of the final report by 30 September 2015.

2.   While it is a mid-term evaluation it is also an outcome-level evaluation. In this regard, the evaluation recognizes the UNDP Planning and Monitoring and Evaluating Handbook[1] definition of outcomes as:

"The intended changes in development conditions that result from the interventions of governments and other stakeholders, including international development agencies such as UNDP. They are medium-term development results created through the delivery of outputs and the contributions of various partners and non-partners. Outcomes provide a clear vision of what has changed or will change globally or in a particular region, country or community within a period of time. They normally relate to changes in institutional performance or behaviour among individuals or groups. Outcomes cannot normally be achieved by only one agency and are not under the direct control of a project manager."

3.   Adopting this definition, the primary purpose of the mid-term evaluation was to identify how UNDP is supporting processes and building capacities that are expected to help make a difference in Myanmar. In doing so, it was recognized that UNDP is only one of a number of partners supporting the Government and that the focus needed to be on what aspects of UNDP's programme in Myanmar have helped bring about changes in human development conditions. This included what changes had been experienced in the behaviour of people and/or institutions targeted through UNDP initiatives.   Moreover, the evaluation is an opportunity to identify why

---

[1]"UNDP, 'Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results'

particular initiatives have or have not succeeded in a given context. Such initiatives could comprise the whole programme, programme components, clusters of outputs/projects or individual outputs/projects, and activities such as advocacy or advisory services. They all, in one-way or another, aim to make a difference, i.e. to contribute to one or several outcomes.

4.   As a midterm report, the evaluators have assessed the performance of the programme and the likelihood of the three outcomes being achieved using the four established evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability. In adopting this approach the evaluators have endeavoured to make a number of recommendations to enhance performance for the remaining period of the programme or until 2017. The team has also identified a number of lessons already learned some of which are expected to provide guidance going forward in working in the Myanmar context as well to increase awareness of the complexity of delivering governance focused initiatives more generally.

5.   The evaluation aims to identify which UNDP approaches have worked well and which have faced challenges, and to use lessons learned in the first two and half years of the programme to improve future initiatives and generate knowledge for wider use. The evaluation also serves the purpose of holding UNDP accountable for the resources invested in its work.

B.   Background and Context

B.1   Myanmar Reforms

6.   The programme was designed when Myanmar was at an historic stage in its development, with the country embarking on multiple, simultaneous, complex reforms. The following background information draws heavily on UN produced documents and UNDP Annual Reports for 2013 and 2014.

7.   The reforms include: changes in the political and democratic and socio-economic situation; increased emphasis on decentralized and people-oriented governance and administration; as well as reforms that promote the inclusive development of the private sector. Launched in 2011, these reforms had only just begun to deeply impact Myanmar's interactions with internal and external actors, including the UN at the time of the UNDP design process.   A fundamental process of nation building is at the core of the reforms.

8.   At stake is the successful return of the country, after some 50 years of isolation, to the international fold and the wellbeing of more than 50 million people. The scope and pace of the reforms is triggering positive responses but also some resistance. In a number of areas the reforms have been quicker and more visible, including the release of political prisoners, media reform, legislative reforms, involvement of civil society, and open constitutional debates. At the same time, it is well understood that it is likely to take time for the reforms to take root.

9.   The transition from a formal, institutionalized and overt military rule to civilian rule, after the first national elections in twenty years, is a major break from the past, even though the 25% quota for the military in the parliament indicates the critical role the military continues to play in the political affairs of the country. While the 2010 General Elections had serious flaws, the electoral process had its credibility boosted when opposition parties participated and performed well in the 2012 by-elections. The Parliament is far more vibrant and influential than many expected, but there are some concerns that new laws are being enacted without sufficient preparation and consultation. Constitutional reform is a major challenge for supporting the continued transition to an inclusive democracy.

10.   The peace process is closely interlinked with the democratic transition, perhaps even inter-dependent, especially once a Nation-wide Ceasefire Agreement is signed and a framework for political dialogue is in place. After more than sixty years of conflict, the prospects for peace have never been so near. Actors are currently drafting a nation-wide cease-fire agreement. The decades-long ethnic struggle with the armed movements grew out of long-standing grievances over social, political and economic exclusions and differences, including important questions such as access to resources, power sharing, and political representation.

11.   In addition to political reforms, Myanmar has adopted broad social and economic reforms to ensure secure livelihoods and improved living standards. Myanmar is a low human development country, ranking lower than its neighbors and other ASEAN member countries. Addressing issues of poverty and stagnant growth is a priority for the country. Myanmar has made and is continuing to make significant progress. The incidence of poverty has fallen from 32 to 26 percent between 2005 and 2010. Gains have been made in literacy and basic education over the years. Almost 96% of 15-24 year olds are currently literate, although progress toward universal primary education is slow and wide gaps in enrolment and completion rates exist across states and regions. There are also challenges, not the least of which is the low level of women's participation at the highest level of politics, with only a few female ministers and only 4.6 % of women parliamentarians. Child mortality rates remain comparably high in Myanmar as do maternal mortality rates. Myanmar experiences a high burden of communicable diseases such as HIV, Malaria, and TB compared to other countries in the region. The economy is projected to expand further by 8.5% in FY2014/15, led by gas production and investment.

12.   Together the reform process and democratic transition has opened up opportunities for greater gender equality and women's empowerment. However, the reform agenda is generically framed and does not explicitly address gender equality and women's rights, although the National Strategic Plan for the Advancement of Women (NSPAW) 2013-22 provides opportunity to engender the reform agenda.

13.   Myanmar's geo-political reality has several overlaying elements. After a long history of considerable dependence on China, Myanmar reached out to the West, its neighbours and other countries when it started its reforms in 2011, launching a

democratization process that has propelled Myanmar back into the international limelight. At the regional level, Myanmar has long been a member of ASEAN and its relations with these countries is special. Myanmar's landmark chairmanship of ASEAN in 2014 has brought with it a level of recognition that extends beyond Southeast Asia. Myanmar has embraced its ASEAN identity and is measuring itself against ASEAN benchmarks.

14.   The geo-strategic context and the diverse interests of groups inside and outside the country have resulted in diverging narratives around the successes and/or failures of Myanmar's transitions. Some 'think-tanks' and other groups focus media attention on Myanmar's past and/or current ongoing human rights abuses and humanitarian crises. While these cannot be ignored, it is also true that the country is moving forward on an array of progressive reform agendas.

15.   Myanmar's reforms constitute a twenty-first century transition, not a twentieth century one. This brings with it a more interconnected world; modern technologies; a more vibrant and internationalized civil society. With this come tremendous opportunities for accelerated reforms. However, it also brings risks as changes can occur too quickly for the society to successfully absorb. Periods of great change and uncertainty such as Myanmar is currently experiencing open significant opportunities, but also potential for tensions and conflict. After a prolonged period of authoritarian rule, tensions continue to exist among and between different parts of society, based on ethnicity, religion and political affiliation, among other things, and a pervasive attitude of general distrust exists. Myanmar has faced internal conflict for almost the entirety of its existence and some of the root causes remain unaddressed. While tension is higher in parts of the country such as Rakhine and Kachin, a number of potential other flashpoints for conflict are emerging and 2013 saw communal clashes of various kinds in several parts of the country.

B.2   UNDP Response

16.   As a direct consequence of the reform agenda described in Section B.1, UNDP's mandate in Myanmar was fully restored and the Executive Board approved a country programme in 2013, the first one after a twenty-year gap.   In practice, this required UNDP in Myanmar to transform its way of working, away from Non- Government Organization (NGO)-like interventions, as was the case under the Human Development Initiative (HDI) from 1993 to 2012, to a more fully-fledged multilateral development partner model under which partnerships are forged with multiple State institutions as well as civil society, media and academia.

17.   The transformation required a programmatic shift from a geographically widespread project implementation model to an institutional capacity development model. This also meant that UNDP's operational footprint needed to be re-engineered to align with new programmatic requirements: reducing the number of offices from 51 to 16; facilitating previous staff transition to their new careers (from 900 field staff under the HDI to a staff complement of approximately 150); and repositioning the

field presence shifting from support to local communities' basic humanitarian needs to a substantive engagement with sub-national authorities on local governance priorities.

C.   Description of the Programme

C.1   Overview

18.   The UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD) and associated Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) support the Government of Myanmar in its objective to achieve democratic transformation and poverty reduction in the country. The programme design is consistent with the United Nations Strategic Framework (UNSF) for the period 2012 to 2015 (extended until 2017) and takes account of the rapidly changing context. As the institutional nature and pace of reforms and their implementation were unable to be accurately predicted, the programme reflected the need for flexibility and the importance of being responsive to risks and opportunities. The programme seeks to ensure alignment with the national ownership principle of development cooperation and as such the Government and other national stakeholders were expected to play a central role in guiding implementation and attainment of programme priorities.

19.   The programme aims to promote poverty reduction and sustainable development that are rights-based, gender-sensitive, inclusive and equitable by strengthening institutional capacity of national and local governments and non-state actors. Based on the comparative advantage and strengths of the UNDP, community-level actions are intended to show what works in achieving a reduction in poverty and sustainable development in the Myanmar context and at the same time engage in policy advocacy based on those experiences and lessons from other countries.

20.   The overall goal of the programme is described as *"**Inclusive economic growth and poverty reduction, while facilitating reduced vulnerability to natural disasters and climate change and the promotion of economic, social and political reform processes"*** and is expected to be delivered through the achievement of three outcomes which were described as the pillars of the programme. The three outcome areas[2] as described in 2013 are as follows.

21.   The first outcome area of *"**Effective local governance for sustainable inclusive community development"*** builds on the social mobilization experience of the Human Development Initiative and supports institutional strengthening of local governments and civil society to promote sustainable and inclusive local development models and contribute to poverty reduction in Myanmar. The support provided under this outcome area was designed to facilitate the transition of UNDP's previous community development activities into a more holistic support to local governance and development processes, with successful models to potentially be further scaled up by

---

[2] The three outcome areas have been described as pillars but for this report reference is only made to outcomes or outcome areas.

government and other partners. These models were to be promoted through capacity building of local governments (including in the self-administered zones) for area-based development planning and responsive public services; supporting development of a model of integrated township development; nurturing local civil society, community learning centres and media for increased legal and civic awareness and community services. At the same time, UNDP intended to support strengthening local institutions supporting livelihoods development through access to finance, vocational training and small enterprise development, and reposition its support for livelihoods towards strengthening of social inclusion and equity (including gender equality, persons with disabilities and addressing the needs of HIV-affected populations).

22. The programme included steps for UNDP to transition its microfinance retail work to focus more on policy support for institutionalizing national legal and oversight frameworks, including through strengthening regulatory oversight and promoting provision of diverse and affordable financial products and services. In doing so, the programme was tasked to find options for transferring the existing microfinance portfolio to a financial intermediary or other suitable mechanism under the new regulatory framework.

23. With respect to target groups and geographic spread under this outcome area, UNDP intended to focus interventions on areas with the greatest need (such as with high poverty incidence and ceasefire areas). It was also intended to be an integrated UN response, coordinated with government, and donor supported group efforts to increase potential impact and sustainability.

24. The second outcome area of *"Climate change, environment, energy and disaster risk reduction"* is focused on building mitigation, preparedness and adaptation capacities of communities to manage the impact of climate change and natural disasters. This outcome area also included support for the sustainable use of natural resources and appropriate technologies (such as rural electrification and renewable energy). UNDP intended to promote the equal participation of women and men in adaptation, preparedness and mitigation responses. Support was also to be provided for policy advice on climate change, disaster risks, energy- and environment-related issues that need to be addressed at the region as well as central levels, such as environmental impact analysis, environmental standards and procedures, and multi-hazard risk information. Furthermore, this outcome area was also expected to help improve life skills and capacities of communities, civil society and local and national institutions to establish systems and networks for disaster risk management. If and when they occur, UNDP undertook to help communities to recover from the effects of natural disasters.

25. The third outcome area of *"Democratic governance"* supports policy and governance changes through analysis of data (both existing and newly gathered) and lessons learned from grass-roots level experience, to strengthen poverty reduction strategies and democratic governance in Myanmar. Analysis and policy advocacy was to focus on poverty and specific thematic issues including gender, HIV, inclusive development and access to justice. The outcome area was designed to support the

formulation and implementation of national development and governance reform strategies, and provide policy advice for advancing regional development, decentralization, and economic governance. UNDP also intended to help improve gender-sensitive data and statistics that strengthen national monitoring and evaluation systems pertinent to a human rights based approach to poverty reduction and MDG achievement.

26.   Achievement of the outcome was expected, through a prioritization and sequencing approach dependent upon legislative and institutional development to support efforts to ensure accountability of emerging democratic institutions, including Parliament, the judiciary and public administration, media and civil society. This was expected to help promote inclusive legislative processes, the rule of law and access to justice, including enhancing awareness of these concepts and empowering people. Support was to be provided to the Union Parliament and sub-national parliaments to provide consultative, inclusive and transparent law-making processes, oversight as well as strengthen capacity to support dialogues as part of the peace processes.

27.   Democratic space was to be expanded by strengthening capacities for, and dialogue among, national stakeholders (e.g., communities in rural areas where efforts are focused, research institutions, advocacy groups and government). Capacity-building activities were to be targeted at systems and institutions with the greatest impact on legal empowerment, access to justice and public administration, with a particular focus on promoting gender equality in decision-making and the fulfillment of human rights. As it was recognized that the reform process was at an early stage, this support would be provided on an incremental basis, taking into account progress on broader democratic reforms and the inclusiveness of government systems. The original design also included an indication that UNDP was ready to assist the institutional and enabling framework for democratic elections in 2015.

28.   Working together with the organizations of the United Nations system and development partners the programme was designed to support implementation of the Busan Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation, particularly by contributing to harmonization and coordination of development assistance in support of national priorities. Support in helping Myanmar meet its aspiration to graduate from the Least Developed Country status was also included as part of this outcome.

C.2   Partnership Strategy

29.   Under the programme the intention is for UNDP to establish a broad range of partnerships with the Government (at Union and sub-national levels), development partners, non-state actors and UN agencies in order to strengthen relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of development results.   Strong partnerships with the Union government are considered most crucial across the entire range of programme activities. To strengthen national ownership of programme results, UNDP seeks to support Myanmar's priorities and policy frameworks such as the National Strategy on Rural Development and Poverty Alleviation, Myanmar Action Plan on Disaster Risk Reduction and the Standing Order on Disaster Management, National Framework for Socio-Economic Reforms and others.   UNDP closely cooperates with Union ministries, such as Ministries of Planning and National Economic Development, Border Affairs and Social Welfare to ensure its activities are aligned with ministerial work plans and in an effort to ensure UNDP's work is sustainable and can be carried forward by national counterparts.

30.   Beyond the executive branch, close partnerships with the parliament and the judiciary are considered important not only for their effective capacity building, but also to enhance the enabling policy and regulatory environment for all UNDP's activities. Strong partnerships with state and regional governments are also expected to inform priorities of local governance initiatives, ensure their alignment with state and regional development plans and facilitate longer-term sustainability of local governance institutions.

31.   Strong partnerships with development partners are seen as important for ensuring the success of the programme. Agreement by development partners to provide "un-earmarked" resources to complement UNDP's own core support is considered important to allow for the smooth implementation of activities and to help bring programme results to scale. It also ensured that UNDP was in a position to draw on global, regional and national technical expertise. At all times UNDP endeavours to coordinate programme activities with the full range of development partners operating in Myanmar in order to ensure synergies at the local level and avoid overlaps in provision of technical assistance to the Union and sub-national governments.

32.   Partnerships with civil society, private sector and academia and research institutions are considered indispensable for the delivery of results in an effective, efficient and sustainable manner. The partnerships with civil society organizations and national and local media are helping to underline the importance of considering citizens' concerns while at the same time advocating for the most relevant policy priorities. UNDP has also sought to strengthen partnerships with national research institutions and policy think tanks. Finally, UNDP programme activities in ceasefire areas will be guided by national priorities and embedded in the overall UN system's response to special development situations.

33.   Where possible UNDP will always consider leveraging and strengthening existing networks and interagency thematic groups as communities of practice in respective technical and policy fields. This applies, but is not limited to, various national and inter-agency fora such as the Social and Economic Advisory Council, the Development Effectiveness Working Group, Gender Equality Network, Women's Organization Network, Governance Working Group, DRR Working Group and the Environment Working Group.

C.3   Programme Management

34.   The programme is directly implemented by UNDP, which is responsible for ensuring efficient delivery of programme outputs, and coherence and coordination with other programmes. The CPAP indicated that "in consultation with government and donor partners, and based on institutional capacity assessments of prospective implementing partners, UNDP may consider modalities such as national implementation, non-governmental organization and United Nations agency implementation".

35.   The programme is under the overall coordination of the Government's coordinating agency (Ministry of National Planning and Economic Development) which is responsible for nominating the Government Co-operating Agency (ies) directly responsible for the Government's participation in each aspect of the country programme.

36.   The strategic direction and overall implementation of the programme is expected to be in accordance with the Results and Resources Framework that is to be reviewed in the Steering Committee. This committee includes concerned government ministries and departments, development partners, non-state actors and UN agencies and were to be co-chaired by UNDP and the Ministry of National Planning and Economic Development. The Steering Committee is convened twice each year to review the previous year's results and the current year's priorities and, if necessary, mid-year to review interim progress reports and provide guidance to programme implementation.   In order to leverage strategic synergies with existing national coordination mechanisms, UNDP aims for coherence and convergence in the work of the steering committee with existing national and inter-agency fora.

37.   A monitoring and evaluation (M&E) work plan has been developed and is focused on monitoring the results that are being supported directly by UNDP. M&E mechanisms and tools ensure continuous monitoring and evaluation of the CPAP and related documents with the view to ensuring efficient utilization of programme resources, accountability, transparency and integrity.

C.4   Financial Position

38.   In the first three years of the programme, UNDP has committed resources alongside those provided by a range of development partners. The following provides a breakdown of the resources received to date. It should also be noted that at this stage there are only limited resources secured for the remaining two years (2016-2017), particularly for the first and third outcome areas.

Funds Received By Source (2013-2015)

Funding Source	USD$'000
Australia	1,927
Denmark	4.189
DFID	5,587
Finland	2,270
Japan	14,165
Norway	1,387
Sweden	4,211
Global Environment Facility	13,466[3]
Sub-total	**47,202**
UNDP Regular Resources	25,345
UNDP Trust Funds	3,050
UNDP – JPAA	407
Sub-total	**28,802**
TOTAL	**76,004**

39.   Delivery for the first two years of the programme is shown below. Although total delivery in 2013 was USD4m more than 2014, it included the last transfer of funds (USD7.7m) under the HDI microfinance project to partners – Save the Children, GRET, PACT.

Delivery by Outcome Area (US$000)

Outcome Area	2013	2014
Local Governance	17,106	11,060
Environmental Governance and Disaster Resilience	1,277	1,631
Democratic Governance	3,240	5,446
TOTAL	**21,624**	**18,137**

---

[3] This includes USD6m for a GEF project that is for the period July2015-June2020

D.   Evaluation Scope and Objectives

40.   The CPAP is derived from the Country Programme Document that was approved by the UNDP Executive Board. The results chain links the CPAP outputs to the UNSF outcomes. The CPAP defines 3 broad outcomes and 12 outputs (reduced to 10 after the 2013 Steering Committee Meeting), with multi-year annual targets, demarcating progress towards the achievements for the duration of the Country Programme. The midterm evaluation assesses the strength of the results chain by reviewing achievements at the output level and their corresponding contribution to meeting CPAP outcome targets.

41.   The midterm evaluation considers the quality, quantity and timeliness of progress towards delivering intended results. It includes an assessment of the performance of on-going and recently completed projects and considers lessons learned from annual project reviews, project evaluations (one to be conducted in 2015 on Social Cohesion and livelihood interventions) and the results of previous annual CPAP review exercises as conducted by the Steering Committee in order to define progress achieved in meeting stated outcomes. The mid-term evaluation has the following six objectives to:

I.   Review the progress and achievement;

II.   Review of factors influencing the achievement;

III.   Assess the continual relevance of the programme including its strategies and progress towards the delivery of the expected outcomes taking into account the emerging development challenges;

IV.   Identify gaps/risks to be addressed, lessons learnt to be applied, and any modifications to be made in the programme to support the achievement of national development priorities;

V.   Revisit program approach, in order to be consistent with the development framework and propose a roadmap/ action plan for the UNDP Country Office on how to support the achievement of national development priorities over the remaining CPAP period; and

VI.   Provide key recommendations/directions (both substantively in terms of focus and allocation of resources) for the second half of the extended CPD implementation, as well as for the next Country Programme cycle.

42.   The evaluation team used the standard OECD/DAC Evaluation Criteria for Evaluation of Development Assistance namely: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability that are defined as follows:

- **Relevance** that is concerned with the extent to which the programme and its intended outputs and outcomes are consistent with national and local policies and priorities and the needs of intended beneficiaries. In this regard specific

emphasis has been put on how UNDP has ensured that the programme was kept "on track" to support achievement of the "right" development results in Myanmar regardless of any political agenda. This was considered of particular importance given that it was the first UNDP country programme in Myanmar, without mandate restrictions in 25 years; and the evaluation was taking place in an election year.

- **Effectiveness:** The extent to which the programme's intended outcome has been achieved or the extent to which progress has been made towards the achievement of the associated outputs.

- **Efficiency:** A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, equipment, time, etc.) are converted to results.

- **Sustainability:** The extent to which aspects of the programme are likely to continue after external development assistancehas come to an end. Also, as it is a mid-term evaluation, what steps have been taken to develop an appropriate exit strategy?

43. The evaluation has also paid specific attention to the significant changes in Myanmar which led to the lifting of mandate restrictions and the development of the first UNDP country programme in over 20 years; the restructuring of the UNDP Office to ensure it possessed the required skills to implement the programme; and a capacity in UNDP to help build a relationship of mutual trust and respect with government counterparts. In this regard, the evaluation considered how successful UNDP is seen as a trusted partner to the Myanmar Government vis-à-vis other development partners and whether the expertise provided by UNDP in the various thematic areas (including RBM, M&E and risk analysis) is adequate.

E. Evaluation Approach and Methodology

44. The Terms of Reference (included as Annex 1) for the evaluation describes the scope of work for the assignment and the need for it to assess the quality, quantity and timeliness of progress towards delivering the intended results as described in the CPD and reflected in other documents developed during its implementation to date. A list of documents provided to the team at the beginning of the assignment is attached as Annex 2. As noted already, there was a range of face-to-face discussions with Government and other stakeholders the project management team, steering committee members as well as the full range of project stakeholders. In all of this work the emphasis will be on trying to identify the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the programme elements, both individually as well as for the programme as a whole.

45.   The CPD cites a 2011 Independent Assessment Mission report that emphasized the need for UNDP to ensure its future programme included robust baseline data, a consistently applied gender strategy and for stronger links to be made between grass-roots level and policy-level work.   The CPD also noted in part the need to:

a) Identify cost-effective ways of implementing its community-level actions by building local capacity for the delivery of intended results;
b) Prioritize joint programming with other United Nations agencies in the design of new programmes in ceasefire areas that will be guided by the UN Strategic Framework's monitoring and evaluation system; and
c) Work closely with development partners and sector coordination groups to optimize development effectiveness.

It will be important that the evaluation considers all of these aspects in some detail and seeks to identify how these aspects have been addressed in the design and implementation of the programme to date.

46.   UNDP support is only a small contributor to the development agenda of the country and in supporting efforts to promote improved governance its work is often linked either directly or indirectly to the work of other stakeholders. Given this, it is important that the evaluation also considers this aspect carefully. The timeliness and effectiveness of UNDP support is normally very dependent on the inputs of others as well the decision-making processes of Government, so understanding this and identifying gaps and lessons learned will be important in the midterm evaluation.

47.   The approach in the midterm review has been to use the CPD and associated written material together with the results framework to guide the development of a range of questions for the face-to-face interviews.   These questions test the assumptions made in the original design; the impact of any changes in the situation since 2013; the progress made against the targets set and baselines used; and the expectations of achievement by 2017.

F.   Data Analysis

F.1   Country Programme Structure

F.1.1   Rationale
48.   The country programme was developed in 2012 and approved in 2013 for an initial three-year period that was extended until 2017 to be more aligned with Government planning processes and the UN programming cycle. The design and intent of the programme coincided with and sought to respond to a continued commitment in the country and expansion beyond the four-wave reform agenda of political and democratic reforms; socio-economic reforms; governance and administration reforms; and reforms for the inclusive development of the private sector. The reform momentum, outlined in more detail in Section B, was the rationale for a change in direction of UNDP's programme away from a wide array of programming options towards more focused interventions based on a better

understanding of UNDP counterparts; the programmes offered by other development partners; and the organization's comparative advantage in working closely with counterparts to improve governance for more effective and inclusive service delivery and which leads to enhanced social and economic development for the most disadvantaged in the community.

49.   The programme was also built on a need to strengthen strategic possibilities to achieve results so the initial design combined capacity building of basic governance structures, systems and processes with practical support for renewable energy and micro-entrepreneurship development. After further analysis a decision was made to not proceed immediately with an intervention on renewable energy because of the large number of other players working in this area. While the basis for the decision is well understood it has unfortunately diluted significantly the opportunity to demonstrate the important link that must continuously be underlined between governance reform and better development outcomes. Improved governance alone will not ensure poverty alleviation or better social and economic development outcomes, while improved and equitable social and economic development is unlikely without effective decision-making and good governance processes and systems.

50.   As noted in Section E, the programme rationale was also centred on the need to design initiatives that (i) build local capacity; (ii) either use or help build robust baseline data; (iii) consistently apply a gender lens in the design and implementation; (iv) make every effort to build stronger links between grass-roots level and policy-level work; (v) prioritize joint programming with other United Nations agencies; and (vi) work closely with development partners and sector coordination groups to optimize development effectiveness. All of these issues will be considered in more detail in the following analysis but it is clear from the evidence available that, at the mid-point in the delivery of the programme, achievement of real and sustained progress in a number of these areas by the end of 2017 is likely to be a challenge.

F.1.2   Outputs
51.   The results and resources framework for the country programme that was approved at the beginning of the programme period 2013-2015 was structured around the three outcome areas described in Section C, with a total of twelve (12) outputs that together were expected to support the achievement of the three outcomes as described under the three outcome areas. Indicators were developed for each output and where possible a baseline was established with targets. In the 2014/15 reports produced by the team it is clear that while the number of outputs was reduced from twelve (12) to ten (10) there were also a number of refinements made to both the wording and intent for almost all of the remaining output descriptions. These refinements have led to an enhanced set of indicators that it is understood continue to be developed and were not finalized for all three outcome areas at the time of the midterm evaluation.

Table 1: Evolvement of Output Descriptions in Myanmar Country Programme (2013-2015)

CPD/CPAP - Original	Situation (as reflected in 2014 Reports)	Current Situation (2015 RRF)
CPD Outcome: Community driven development institutions that support local governance in service delivery; inclusive growth, including agricultural development and enhancement of employment opportunities		
1. Strengthened institutional capacity of local governments.	1. Strengthened institutional capacity of local governments and township administrations for area-related development planning, responsive and effective public service delivery, organizational management and conflict prevention.	1. Strengthened institutional capacity of State/Region and township administrations for participatory local development planning, and inclusive public service delivery.
2. Strengthened institutional capacity of civil society organizations to provide community services.	2. Citizens and communities engaged in local development and monitoring of service delivery (combined civil society and media support).	2. Citizens, communities and CSOs role in local governance and for monitoring of service delivery strengthened.
3. Strengthened capacity of local media institutions in support of local development and civic awareness.	*Deleted – Original Outputs 2 and 3 are combined.*	*Deleted – Original Outputs 2 and 3 are combined.*
4. Strengthened capacity of institutions to support sustainable livelihoods, including development of model of integrated village development.	3. Strengthened capacity of institutions required to support livelihoods at the local level (microfinance, vocational training, technical extension centres).	4. Improved financial inclusion and entrepreneurship development through support for national coordination and sustainable market development.
5. Support to social cohesion and livelihoods in districts	4.Livelihood (LH) support for social cohesion	5. Target communities and institutions have increased capacities for social cohesion, sustainable livelihoods, and improved opportunities for peace
CPD Outcome: Reduced vulnerability to natural disasters and climate change, improved environmental and natural resource management and promotion of energy conservation through access to affordable and renewable energy, particularly in off-grid local communities		
6. Rural communities and institutions have climate and disaster resilient plans.	6. Capacities to adapt to climate change and reduce disaster risk.	No change

7. Enhanced institutional and people's capacity for environmental conservation and use of natural resources.	7. Enhanced capacities to sustainably manage natural resources at local, regional and national levels.	No change
8. Rural households have increased access to renewable energies.	On hold	No change
CPD Outcome: Promote democratic governance and the rule of law to strengthen democratic institutions and the advancement of human rights		
9. Development Effectiveness	*9.* **Strengthened capacity of national institutions for socio-economic policy-making, planning and development effectiveness with broad stakeholder participation (including women, people with disabilities and HIV/AIDS)**	**9. National and state/regional development planning informed by robust data and broad consultations; capacities of stakeholders strengthened to manage development cooperation in line with GPEDC principles.**
9a. Strengthened capacity of institutions at the Union and State/region level to collect and analyse poverty data and use it to monitor progress in the implementation of development plans and revise their implementation.	9a. Key government institutions develop national and regional plans using up to date, accurate and gender disaggregated poverty data.	
9. b. Strengthened capacity of national and state/regional institutions to formulate poverty focused plans with clear links to the national budget, and based on sector as well as state/regional priorities.	9b. MNPED manages international aid cooperation and aligns it with national priorities and budgets.	
9. c. Strengthened capacity of government agencies, parliament, civil society and others for transparency and accountability in implementing national and regional / state level plans.		
9. d. Strengthened capacity of MNPED, MoF and other key governmental and non-		

governmental stakeholders at Union, state/regional and sectoral levels, to align development cooperation with national plans, budgets and monitoring and evaluation.		
10. Parliamentary Support	**10. Parliament at Union levels and selected state/ region levels perform their functions**	**10. Legislative, oversight and representation functions performed by Hluttaws at Union and selected state and regional levels institutionalized.**
10. a. Improved capacity of MPs, with special focus on women, at the Union and State/Region levels to perform their functions in an effective, transparent and inclusive way.	10a. Strategic Development plan in place for supporting the strengthening of the parliamentary structure, services, processes and procedures.	
10. b. Enhanced institutional capacity of key parliamentary committees at the Union and State/Region levels to ensure the parliament is able to pass quality legislation and oversee government activities.	10b. ICT, research and training services set up and services provided to MPs and committees.	
10. c. Improved capacity of parliaments to effectively communicate for internal and external purposes.	10c. Improved understanding of the legislative process of parliamentary committees and their support staff.	
10. d. Enhanced capacity of the Union parliamentary secretariats at the Union and State/Region levels to provide effective support to MPs, committees and the respective parliaments.	10d. Selected state and regional parliaments perform their legislative, oversight and outreach functions better.	
10. e. Civil society and media more aware and empowered to participate in democratic political processes.		
11. Rule of law & Access to Justice	**11. Justice institutions and legal framework improved to**	**11. Justice institutions equipped to develop and**

	ensure Rule of Law and Access to Justice for all with a specific focus on marginalized groups	implement frameworks for justice sector reform that reflects the needs of diverse groups, especially women and vulnerable groups.[4]
11. a. Strengthened institutional capacity to coordinate, formulate and implement a comprehensive (nationally owned and multi-stakeholder-driven) gender responsive policy and strategy for the justice sector.	11a. Strengthened institutional capacity of justice sector institutions for coordinated planning and policy making in justice sector reform.	
11. b. Enhanced capacity of justice actors for the development of a justice system that upholds the rule of law, protects human rights, promotes gender equality and improves access to justice, including through laws and regulations that are in conformity with the Constitution and international human rights standards, in conformity with the Conventions ratified by Myanmar.	11b. Capacity of justice sector actors strengthened to better perform their functions.	
11.c. Increased service delivery at the local level focusing on the rights of women and the rights of the most vulnerable, in target states/regions and in selected townships.	11c. Justice sector actors at local level in the pilot states/regions better equipped to perform their functions.	
11. d. Empowerment of women and vulnerable groups in selected pilot states/regions to claim and have their rights adjudicated and grievances remedied.	11d. Legal awareness of vulnerable groups including women enhanced in selected townships/villages in each of the pilot states/ regions.	
11. e. Ethnic groups in ceasefire and border areas have increased knowledge of		

---

[4] Vulnerable groups identified by the mapping as – women, children, poor people with little or no land

their rights and are better able to access and benefit from expanded justice remedies.		
12. Public Administration	**12. Strengthened capacity for service delivery and improved responsiveness of the public administration reforms**	**12. Capacity of government institutions enhanced to develop and implement administrative and civil service reforms that promote responsiveness and efficiency.**
12. a. Long-term modernization agenda for an ethical civil service in support of the decentralisation and democratic reforms. 12. b. Strengthened institutional capacity of the Union Civil Service Board (UCSB) for the development of a professional, transparent and representative civil service. 12. c. Strengthened capacity of the Civil Service Training Institutes. 12. d. Strengthened capacity for the public sector through leadership and management competencies. 12. e. Targeted innovations in public service delivery adapted to the local context.	12a. Capacities developed at the Union level to advance, coordinate and implement incremental public administration reforms. 12b. Strengthened capacities of the Union Civil Service Board (UCSB) and other ministry training institutes to train and establish a professional, transparent and representative civil service.	

52. While there is internal consistency between the outputs and outcome areas, it is already apparent at this point in the programme that a significant part of the second outcome cannot be achieved or will not be able to be attributed directly to the work of UNDP. This follows from a decision to put on hold support for the output that was designed to increase the access of rural households to renewable energies. It may be possible to more effectively meet the second outcome area if a stronger link can be forged with the work of other development partners supporting renewable energy initiatives as well as the work of UNDP under the second outcome area output focused on environmental conservation and use of natural resources and/or the outputs under

the first outcome area that either address the need to strengthen the capacity of institutions to support livelihoods at local level or the output focused on livelihood support for social cohesion.

53.   A number of those consulted, while endorsing the work done to rationalise the number of outputs to reduce an impression of too broad a coverage, felt that some further rationalization might be helpful during the remaining period of the programme. The midterm evaluation will provide some suggestions on this aspect later in this report.

54.   The importance of promoting cross linkages between the outcome areas will be important for the success of the overall programme and was a point underlined by a number of stakeholders during the consultations.   Although, the follow-up discussions with the outcome area teams revealed some good examples of how teams are working and reporting progress across outcome areas. The evaluation considers that more can be done to ensure the approach is more systematically applied to the design and delivery of the outputs.

F.1.3   Outcome Indicators

55.   The evaluation team was provided with revised outcome indicators for each of the outcome areas, with accompanying revised data sources, baseline information for 2012 and targets for 2017. While these have changed from those presented in the CPAP, for the purposes of this evaluation the revised indicators will be used for commenting on their suitability for measuring the performance of the programme.

56.   For outcome area 1 there are three outcome indicators as follows:

Outcome Indicator 1: A participatory methodology for area-based township planning developed and demonstrated jointly with national partners ready for replication.

This indicator will be **measured using data** collected from:
- TSP level plans from two pilot states available
- UNDP internal reports on TA and facilitation Government of Myanmar reports
- Media coverage
- Methodology in the form guidelines available
- Sharing of guidelines via training and training of trainers (2015)

The **baseline in 2012** is described as "No participatory methodology for area-based township planning exists" and the **target for 2017** is described as "Methodology developed replicated in at least two more states/regions".

Outcome Indicator 2: Nationwide baseline on the quality of local governance established and disseminated (as state of governance reports).

This indicator will be **measured using data** collected from:

- UNDP internal progress reports (by staff and consultants)
- State of governance reports available in print and electronic format
- Feedback from Government of Myanmar through meeting (reports) and other communication
- Feedback from other stakeholders through workshops, reports and other communication

The **baseline in 2012** is described as "No data on sub-national governance capacity available" and the **target in 2017** is "Data collection replicated and used for institutional performance assessment".

Outcome Indicator 3: Number of times a UNDP approach to community social cohesion building has been replicated by partners.

This indicator will be **measured by an independent evaluation**

The **baseline in 2012** is zero and the **target in 2017** is "At least 15 community driven socio-economic recovery initiatives undertaken".

57.   For outcome area 2 there are two outcome indicators:

Outcome Indicator 1: Disaster risk reduction, climate change adaptation policies and practices incorporated into development plans of national sectoral ministries and at sub-national levels.

This indicator will be **measured by** (i) sector development plans of the ministries and (ii) budget allocation for DRR at sub-national level.

With **baseline in 2012** of "(i) One sectoral ministry plan (HFA progress monitoring report 2009-2011 and 2011-2013); and (ii) No specific budget allocation on DRR at sub-national level" and a **target in 2017** of "Disaster risk reduction, climate change adaptation policies and practices incorporated into development plans of at least 4 (additional) national sectoral ministry and specific budget allocations at sub-national levels.

Outcome Indicator 2: A comprehensive national framework on environmental conservation developed.

This indicator will be **measured by** documentation on "The National Environmental Policy Framework"

With a **baseline in 2012** of:
- The Environment Policy (1994)
- National Environment Policy of Myanmar (1994)
- Myanmar Agenda 21 (1997)
- The National Sustainable Development Strategy (2009)
- National Biodiversity Strategic Action Plan (2012)

- Environmental Conservation Maw (2012); and

The **target in 2017** is to have a fully developed action plan for ensuring implementation of the National Environmental Policy Framework**.**

58.   For outcome area 3 there are three outcome indicators

Outcome Indicator1: Level of Government Effectiveness

This indicator will be **measured by** using the Worldwide Governance Indicators that are produced by the World Bank Institute.

With a **baseline in 2012** of a score on the Worldwide Governance indicators of -1.53 (out of 2.5) and percentile ranking of 4.

The **2015 Target** is for a score of -1.35 (out of 2.5) and percentile ranking of 11.

Outcome Indicator 2: Level of Rule of Law

This indicator will be **measured b**y using the Worldwide Governance Indicators that are produced by the World Bank Institute

With a **baseline in 2012** of a score of -1.35 (out of 2.5) and percentile ranking of 6

The 2015 Target is for a score of -1.2 (out of 2.5) and percentile ranking of 15

Outcome Indicator 3: Access to Justice Services - Accessibility and affordability of the civil justice system.

This indicator will be **measured using** the World Justice Project's Rule of Law Index

The **baseline in 2012** is 0.40 and the **2015 target** is 0.43.

Outcome Indicator 4: Proportion of women to men in Parliaments (lower or single house)

This indicator will be **measured by** using the Inter-Parliamentary Union database on statistics on women in parliament.

With a **baseline in 2012** of 6 and a **target for 2015** of 50.

59.   The decision to revise the outcome indicators at the mid-point in the programme is considered appropriate given the extension of the programme from 2015 to 2017.   It also makes good sense to limit the number of indicators and focus on those where a baseline can be assured. This is in line with the need to be flexible

and responsive to changing circumstances. The first couple of years of the programme have provided an opportunity to firm up 2012 baseline information and address what appeared to be some over ambitious target setting that was included in the 2012 Country Programme Action plan. The current set of indicators appears to be more realistic and based on experience and knowledge gathered during the implementation of the programme in 2013-2015.

60.   As indicated at the time of the mid-term evaluation it was understood that at least some of the programme indicators are still being revised in the light of the program extension to 2017.

F.2   Governance Structure

61.   As a result of feedback from a UNDP Country Programme Steering Committee meeting of 7 October 2013 and in an attempt to ensure effective and mutually complementary engagement of stakeholders to guide the programme direction, UNDP established a 3-tier governance structure at programme, outcome area and output levels. These 3 tiers are described as follows:

Tier 1 - Output Boards

<u>Core task:</u> results management.

<u>Decision prerogatives:</u> approve Output Annual Work Plans; endorse Output Annual Progress Reports; review Output Results and Resources Frameworks (RRFs) and, if necessary, recommend changes to Outcome Area Boards; other decisions as delegated by Outcome Area Boards and as per UNDP rules and regulations.

<u>Membership:</u> 1-2 main government counterparts per output; 1 donor per output; UNDP; other partners as agreed upon between UNDP, government and donors; all participants at <u>technical</u> level (e.g. Output lead for UNDP; Director-level for government).

<u>Frequency of meetings:</u> twice a year.

Tier 2 – Pillar Boards

<u>Core task:</u> quality assurance of results; programme coherence and strategic focus.

<u>Decision prerogatives:</u> approve Output RRFs and, on this basis, Outcome Area RRF; consider recommendations and approve changes to RRFs (except substantial changes to be reviewed by the Steering Committee, ref below); provides overall guidance to Output Boards on Annual Work Plans; where appropriate, recommend alignment with Sector Working Groups; endorse Annual Outcome Area Progress Reports; other decisions as delegated by the Steering Committee and as per UNDP rules and regulations.

<u>Membership:</u> 1-2 main government counterparts per each output; 1-2 donor per pillar; UNDP; other partners as agreed upon between UNDP, government and donors; all participants at <u>management</u> level (e.g. Outcome Area team leader for UNDP; Director-General-level for government).

Frequency of meetings: twice a year.

Tier 3 – Steering Committee

Core task: strategic direction and overall alignment with national priorities.

Decision prerogatives: conducts annual country programme review; provides overall guidance to Outcome Area Boards on their respective RRFs; approves substantial changes in the RRF, such as concerning deletion, addition or amalgamation of entire outputs; commissions independent evaluations and approves UNDP management responses; considers overall duration of the programme cycle in line with evolving national priorities and timelines and makes appropriate recommendations to Government and UNDP.

Membership: all government counterparts and all donors; UNDP; UN agencies; other partners as agreed upon between UNDP, government and donors; all participants at executive level (e.g. Country Director for UNDP; Deputy Minister for government).

Frequency of meetings: once every year.

62.   While these oversight mechanisms appear to be working relatively well there were some concerns expressed in the consultations about the late distribution of papers ahead of the meetings and inadequate notice of meeting schedules. There would also appear to be some potential to actually rationalize the number of meetings and their content to address the concerns by some stakeholders that there was often repetition in the information discussed at Output and Outcome levels and perhaps a need for more concrete discussions at steering committee level of how the three outcome areas work together to meet the overall objectives of the programme.

63.   Against this background the evaluation considers it may be helpful to review once more the structure and consider options that reduce the workload on programme team members and other stakeholders while still ensuring effective oversight at outcome level. The undue focus at output level may have reduced the initial intention to focus more at programme rather than project level.

F.3   Achievement at Outcome level

F.3.1   Relevance

64.   The documentation available to the evaluation does not describe in detail the actual processes for developing the programme. However, anecdotal evidence and discussions with some team members who have been working with UNDP Myanmar for some time, suggests that the design grew out of analysis that began in 2010 and which involved input from a number of regional and global experts from within UNDP. This analysis led to a decision by UNDP to focus attention, as part of a broader UN response to the changing environment in Myanmar, on the three outcomes of effective local governance for sustainable inclusive community development; climate

change, environment, energy and disaster risk reduction; and democratic governance and development effectiveness.

65.   It is understood, that many of these experts had only limited first-hand knowledge and understanding of the context of Myanmar, which appears to have led to a design that drew on global experience without fully reflecting the need and complexity of building trust and commitment to a range of governance concepts before the national stakeholders could become engaged and committed partners in the implementation of the country programme.   In most jurisdictions there is generally less of a need to build this initial platform of trust and understanding before initiating the changes required for ensuring an effective governance reform process.

66.   Programme team members, while noting that the three outcomes were largely relevant, suggested that they were probably overly optimistic with the outputs and performance indicators presented in the results framework unfamiliar or only partly understood by the stakeholders as first presented. This leads to questions about the level of buy-in at time of the programme approval and as a consequence the level of absorption and sustainability of the outcomes.

67.   Despite these reservations, the main focus areas for UNDP work is considered to be relevant and largely in line with the comparative advantage of the organisation and most importantly appears to have responded or coincided with the reform announcements by the Government of Myanmar. The decision to adopt a flexible approach to programme implementation has allowed for adjustments in actual outputs and the design of inputs. In this regard, the willingness of development partners to provide largely un-earmarked support to UNDP has facilitated this and was highly appreciated by UNDP management. While it has increased capacity to respond to new demands, it remains important that increased flexibility does not divert resources from "core" level work.

68.   During the consultations, a number of senior government officials expressed support for the flexible approach and this was also reflected in reports from the Steering Committee, Pillar and Output Boards.   Many of the stakeholders also appreciated the opportunity to guide the design and implementation of inputs as this helped ensure a full understanding of the local context and maximized the benefit accruing from the outputs.

69.   The programme is aligned to UNDP's global mandate and its principles of mainstreaming gender equality, inclusiveness, and human rights based approaches and more generally human development across all elements of the programme. However, as pointed out by some of those consulted, it is often difficult to see how the work of UNDP is leading to inclusive policy making that recognizes the rights of all in the community, ensuring that development decisions address the three elements of sustainable development (social, economic and environment) and focusing on measures to reduce poverty in the country.

70.   UNDP is providing coordination and technical advice to an inter-agency team that is supporting early recovery efforts in Kachin and Rakhine. This work is of critical importance with UNDP heading the coordination across seven areas that are being led by a range of UN agencies. UNDP is responding at both national and in targeted areas by ensuring that early recovery is integrated and seen as a cross-cutting element of the work being implemented across all three outcome areas of the programme.

71.   The design of the outputs under the second outcome area of environmental sustainability, climate change and disaster risk management, has benefited from the opportunity to access additional resources available globally through the Global Environment Fund and specific funding windows for climate change. While not yet fully operational the achievement of this outcome by 2017 could see a significant enhancement of work nationally in these important areas. Ensuring that these issues are captured fully in the support provided to national and regional parliaments and decision-makers is vital.

72.   In the period under review, UNDP has demonstrated a capacity to adapt and respond to the evolving situation in Myanmar. However, in doing so it would appear that this has not always ensured a consistent approach to ensuring that the principles, of mainstreaming gender equality, inclusiveness, and human rights based approaches and more generally human development across all elements of the programme, have been adequately addressed. It will be important in the remaining period of the programme that these aspects remain in focus, particularly in the context of the November national elections that may result in Government policy changes and the roles and expectations of key counterparts.

73.   Also linked to the issue of relevance of the programme, has been the request made for the UNDP Myanmar office to provide support to the Government as it responded to the significant emergency created by the flood and the more recent request for UNDP to provide support to the holding of the elections later this year. In relation to the severe flooding that occurred in the country from mid-July this year, UNDP has provided both assistance with immediate relief actions and coordination and is now considering support for the recovery plan. UNDP assistance for the electoral process will see the delivery of over USD3.8m to strengthen the role of key institutions; to increase the integrity and credibility of elections among voters; and increase the understanding of the roles and responsibilities of electoral stakeholders to contribute to peaceful and tranquil elections.

F.3.2   Efficiency

74.   The relatively short period of actual programme delivery makes it difficult to make any substantive observations about the efficiency of output delivery and their contribution towards the potential achievement of the three outcomes. However, from a review of the reports and comments by a range of stakeholders, the following observations can be made:

- Under the local governance outcome area, the steps taken to outsource the microfinance component has worked well and led to what would appear to be a relatively sustainable solution with minimal UNDP, UNCDF follow-up required in terms of management. As part of the transition agreement, a revenue sharing arrangement was agreed with the international service

provider who took over all the assets. This resulted in a fund flow back to the microfinance sector in the amount of USD12m over 5 years. Fifty per cent of these funds will come to UNCDF to establish a market development facility and implement the financial inclusion roadmap. The Financial Regulation Department highlighted that a part of this facility should be to support local microfinance institutions and ensure that these institutions have the capacity to borrow internationally.

● Under the local governance outcome area the livelihoods and social cohesion activities as well as the role of UNDP in strengthening local governance arrangements for better service delivery are considered to be working well and are appreciated by stakeholders. A close alignment with activities implemented under the democratic governance outcome area when supporting regional parliaments could ensure maximum benefit is assured.

● Much of the work under the second outcome area is in the very early stages of implementation but stakeholders considered that work of UNDP and UNESCO on the implementation of the Inle lake Conservation project was efficiently delivered. Inle Lake became the first Biosphere Reserve of Myanmar inscribed by UNESCO in June 2015 in collaboration with the Ministry of Environmental Conservation and Forestry and UNDP. There were also positive comments received from stakeholders on UNDP's leadership in the disaster risk reduction network.

● Activities implemented under the democratic governance outcome area across the parliament, rule of law and access to justice and public administration were in the main described as efficiently provided. The presence of CTAs and/or the close working relationships developed between UNDP technical staff and national counterparts has resulted in an increasing adoption of national processes and a building of capacity that has ensured efficiency of decision-making on terms of reference for advisory inputs, arrangements for study tours, etc.

75.   While the feedback to the evaluation team has generally been positive, there were some counterparts who commented on specific issues relating to a particular event or initiative. Most of the issues are commonly heard in evaluations of this type and while individually may be considered of minor concern they can impact on the overall relationship with partners and the trust that is so important in ensuring the successful implementation of the programme. Key issues raised included the following:

● The complexity of some of UNDP procurement and recruitment systems;
● Problems with an inadequate provision in the supply documentation for IT equipment that appeared to miss basic requirements for installing a system in Myanmar where power surges are a major concern;
● The lack of adequate prior and complete consultations on terms of reference for advisory inputs or workshops and training programmes; and
● In at least one instance a suggestion that a UNDP programme adviser had not followed the Government processes of consultation, preferring instead to "short circuit" the process that had been established.

76.   In all cases, the comments were offered without great malice and were usually followed by a rationalization that there was fault on both sides.

77.   While the evaluation team did not do a full review of staff numbers and the structure of teams it gained the impression that the development of projects to mirror outputs has led to what would appear to be a relatively complex team structure with outcome area team leaders, output heads or project managers or technical advisers in Yangon as well as some chief technical advisers for a number of the projects/outputs located outside of Yangon. The current team structure has led to some technical advisers also acting as project managers. A review of this situation may be required to increase the efficiency of programme delivery.

78.   As noted above, in 2015 UNDP Myanmar has been required to respond to the severe flooding by mobilizing support across a range of areas to assist the country and to implement a nationwide election support project. The capacity of the office to do this while maintaining a focus on the delivery of the programme is only possible through the combined efforts of the programme and operations teams.

F.3.3   Effectiveness

79.   At the mid-point in the delivery of the programme it is only possible to consider the effectiveness of output delivery and the contribution they have made towards the achievement of the outcome in the future, rather than the effectiveness of achievement at outcome level. The delivery of the outputs under the local governance outcome area has benefited from the established contacts from the HDI implementation. This has allowed implementation of the outputs to be designed and implemented with local counterparts and their active participation in delivery.

80.   The outcome area of effective local governance for sustainable inclusive community development involves capacity development of local governance institutions; strengthening civil society and media roles in local development; fostering access to inclusive finance and livelihood support for social cohesion. As such, it is a rather complex group of initiatives that are also expected to lead to poverty reduction, build social cohesion and demonstrate the important link between improved governance, the role of civil society and the media and the promotion of livelihood development.

81.   The successes so far include a model to show how livelihoods support can be used as a tool to build social inclusion, building capacity of regional CSOs and media networks, development and testing of a Myanmar poverty scorecard as a tool for poverty targeting. The establishment of the CSO Network has helped strengthen the engagement and coordination of civil society organisations with the Government's implementation of development programmes but is also aiming to increase dialogue and trust.   However, it will also be important to carefully consider the actual impact of the network and ensure it can be sustained in the future. In this regard, UNDP has

also been spearheading a joint effort with the General Administration Department of the Ministry of Home Affairs, a nationwide governance mapping completed in a period of 14 months, producing 14 State/Regional reports and 2 synthesis reports which are providing a national baseline, and being used to identify future program entry points. The reports are being used widely as well as contribute to an informed discourse on good governance in the country for national and international exchange and experience sharing for good governance practices. Work in the outcome area has also helped sustain results of the community development work of HDI through the establishment of 31 Township leading groups of self-reliance groups who increasingly engage in local development and are a key element of UNDP's gender mainstreaming strategy.

82.   Other work has included the facilitation of the drafting and adoption of a national roadmap on financial inclusion (with UNCDF) and support to roadmap implementation in policy terms (inter-ministerial Steering committee) and through program activities. There is also a strong emphasis on learning and attitude change through South-South and triangular cooperation. There have been governance related study tours to Cambodia, Vietnam and Mongolia and Sweden and conflict and peace building related study trip to Indonesia. The latter being followed-up through programmatic activities on support to Women in Peace building.

83.   Under the second outcome area which is focused on environmental sustainability, climate change and disaster risk management, UNDP has supported work to build the institutional capacity for mainstreaming disaster risk reduction into national policy and planning, the development of an early warning system and a number of demonstration project initiatives at community level. UNDP has led a network of agencies and partners (including 8 UN agencies) that was established in 2008 and which has led to good coordination and improved capacity to advocate for further coordination and resource mobilization. The full range of support to be provided through the two outputs under this outcome area are still being rolled out but has benefited both from the design of significant UNREDD, GEF and Adaptation Fund projects. It has also benefited from partnering with UNESCO, FAO, UNEP and international and national NGOs. A major challenge for the implementation of the outcome area remains the recruitment of suitably qualified staff.

84.   The Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS) has been closely involved in the development of the GEF 5 project document that was signed at the time of the midterm evaluation. WCS maintains a close working relationship with the Government and most specifically the Forest Department and under the GEF 5 project will focus further efforts on building the capacity of the Ministry in the areas of both technical and financial management. WCS has been active in Myanmar for many years and clearly has some well- qualified local experts.

85.   A GEF 6 project is also being developed and this will focus on rural renewable energy by building on the livelihoods and social cohesion work and give access to off-grid electricity users to renewable energy opportunities.

86.   Under the third outcome area, with its focus on democratic governance and working with national counterparts at the Union level, UNDP has played a high profile role in supporting reforms in the key institutions of the Union Parliament, Attorneys General, Office of the Supreme Court of the Union and the Ministry of President's Office. Some support was also provided to the General Administration Department of the Ministry of Home Affairs in 2014 but this has now become more a key counterpart for UNDP under the local governance outcome area. The employment of highly qualified technical advisers and the placement of   Chief Technical Advisers inside the national counterpart institutions has helped ensure the efficient delivery of the outputs, with generally carefully designed technical inputs that have responded well in a timely manner.

87.   Support for the Supreme Court has included pre-service and in-service training with guest lectures from UNDP and IDLO. It has also included English language training and legal training.   There has also been support provided to the strategic planning team through the work of an IT consultant. Unfortunately the evaluation team learned that there were some difficulties with the delivery of server and IT system, which simply underlined the complexity of providing such support. Additional training on IT and an e-governance system with connection to the ASEAN judiciary portal and case management system is anticipated.   UNDP in partnership with other organizations, has worked with the Supreme Court and the Attorney General's Office on legal aid reform.

88.   At the Union level, UNDP has supported the Union Attorney General's Office to carry out a consultative process to establish their strategic plan which establishes a vision and objectives around which coordinated justice sector reform initiatives could come together. Throughout UNDP's work, the emphasis has been on enhancing responsiveness, especially towards vulnerable groups. This narrative runs through work on legal aid (at policy level), the Anti-Violence against Women law (also at policy level) and dialogue training and roundtable discussions with multiple actors (at region and state level). The Office welcomed the strategic planning support and new IT system with network to enhance the sharing of information. The development of the training centre has seen effective and coordinated support from UNDP, JICA and USAID.

89.   UNDP is working on a range of support for the Union Parliament including initial support for the development of a Strategic Plan and learning centre that were the foundations for ongoing work, in which support has been provided for the development of a procedures manual that will be a good entry point for the development of an induction workshop for new parliamentarians. UNDP has also supported the development of a Members Handbook and procedures manual. UNDP is helping strengthen the committee system by defining their role and by providing training for the secretariats of the committees and strengthening their research capacity.   The development of service standards will also be provided to the committee Chairs to help ensure there is increased capacity. The service standards will be valuable as part of the monitoring framework for the strategic plan. Civil servants, judiciary and the Parliament are all involved in policy development,

legislative drafting and passing of legislation so it is important that there is a strong interaction and sharing of information.

90.   Myanmar is currently working on a new 5-year medium term development plan. Stakeholders appreciate the support of UNDP and UN agencies in the working groups that are identifying sectoral strategies as well as UNDP's role in the Development Partners Working Group or Development Cooperation Forum. Policy makers have better access to information, supported by the World Bank, Asian Development Bank and the IMF.   UNDP is supporting these efforts through the provision of an expert with the development of social and economic indicators. While the initial focus of UNDP's work was on aid effectiveness, especially aid information management, it now is moving more towards development effectiveness which includes having all development partners supporting the country's priorities with an understanding of Myanmar culture in order to effectively transfer knowledge and technology.

91.   Linked to the support provided to the planning processes has been the specific support provided to the Government in analysing how its LDC status is calculated and work done through a stronger sub-committee process to simplify statistical collection and analysis processes. This support has led to a more comprehensive and nationally owned approach to policy making, including the cost and benefits of LDC status versus graduation from this status and established a platform for how decisions will be taken on the adoption of the global sustainable development goals (SDGs).

92.   The rule of law centres pilot project was a new area in the programme involving government agencies in piloting of Rule of Law and Tranquillity Centres. The Rule of Law Centres pilot project was carried out in Lashio, Shan State and Mandalay, Mandalay Region. The four-month project resulted in the training of 78 lawyers, law teachers and CSO representatives on rule of law issues; the development of an interactive training curriculum centred on applying international rule of law principles to local justice issues; and training and mentoring of a cadre of six national trainers and five community outreach activities on local justice issues.   It appears that the coverage of the training was good and focused on practical understanding of the role of rights holders and duty bearers. Comments by participants were that the training space was limited and once a week training schedule should have been replaced by more intensive training, covering key issues in more detail.   Concern was also expressed about what is the follow-up to the training. However, the support of Government agencies has been withdrawn. One suggestion could be to involve senior police and legal staff in either role of guest speaker or in official opening rather than being invited as participants.

93.   Support to the President's Office in the area of public administration has moved from a series of capacity building and institutional strengthening initiatives, often not linked closely but in response to demand from a range of Government partners, to more upstream policy and strategic support. This latter support has been grounded in the principle of national ownership and seeking to bring a variety of national partners together through the establishment of an Administrative Reform

Coordination Committee. This Committee which involves senior representation from most ministries, Nay Pyi Taw administration and the 14 States/Regions and which is supported by a Public Administration Reform Sector Working Group is in the process of preparing a comprehensive Framework for Administrative Reform that covers all aspects of civil service capacity development, service delivery, decentralization and transparency and accountability. This work, which is very much led and owned by national partners follows a high level consultative workshop in May 2015 and has the potential to have a significant impact on many aspects of future development in Myanmar.

94.   Some development partners consider there are perhaps too many outputs – with the scatter diluting impact. It is important to be clear about what UNDP's comparative advantage is, particularly as other development partners are increasing their engagement. A human rights based approach must remain central to the work of UNDP and while the reform progress remains fragile and conflict continues to exist in certain parts of the country a conflict sensitive approach remains essential to the work of UNDP. Also there is a need to increase the institutionalization of the outcome connections, which at the moment appear to be more opportunistic than pre-determined.

95.   Overall, the evaluation also has some concerns about the location of the majority of programme teams in Yangon when much of the work and key national counterparts are located elsewhere. While it is recognized that this issue is not easily addressed and requires careful reflection, it will be important that in the development of the new programme this issue is considered very carefully to maximize opportunities for co-location of advisers with counterparts; use of national systems and processes; and to ensure UNDP maximizes the use of its scarce resources.

F.3.4   Sustainability

96.   As a midterm evaluation of a programme it is difficult to predict with any certainty that the outcomes will be sustained beyond 2017. This is particularly given the delayed start to the implementation because of the necessity to introduce a series of changes in the way UNDP works in Myanmar; the need to recruit and reorganize programme and operations teams; as well as the need to build relationships and trust with national stakeholders many of whom were adjusting to their own new working environment with the introduction of a significant set of complex reforms.

97.   A key to the approach adopted by UNDP to ensure sustainability has been to focus on institutions and to seek to encourage Myanmar counterparts to lead the development of management frameworks, policies and processes and systems that are locally developed and owned. A good example of this under the first outcome area has been the development, jointly with the GAD of the Ministry of Home Affairs, of a one-stop-shop facility that is being rolled out in the 74 districts and which is expected to give communities easier access to the local services available from at present seven ministries. This initiative follows exposure visits arranged by UNDP of

key personnel from the Myanmar administration who then acted quickly to implement the proposal. UNDP is now helping with the establishment of these facilities and grounding them in effective policies, systems and processes, with an expansion of the initiative to the township level planned for 2016/2017.

98.   The process adopted by UNDP and UNCDF to transition the microfinance work to focus more on policy support for institutionalizing national legal and oversight frameworks, including through strengthening regulatory oversight and promoting provision of diverse and affordable financial products and services, involved the transfer of the existing microfinance portfolio to a financial intermediary. This is considered a clear step to follow through with a successful exit strategy. This strategy underlines the importance of UNDP exiting an activity while ensuring its sustainability.

99.   The evaluation team understands that the transition strategy was developed in a consultative way and as a consequence it was recommended that as prime intermediaries for transfer the existing implementing partners (Pact/ GRET/ and Save the Children) should be considered. The selection of the financial intermediaries was undertaken in consultation with donors as well as Government Counterparts. Despite these processes, the Evaluation team learned of continuing concerns that the decision to transfer the delivery of microfinance services to non-local institutions in the first instance may impact the continued competitiveness of local providers. This will be an important issue for UNDP/UNCDF to consider during the implementation of the support that is to continue to the intermediaries over the next two years.

F.3.5   Gender Equality and Human Rights Approach

100.   There is an impression among some development partners that the UNDP programme should give greater attention to promoting gender equality and a human rights based approach to development. In response, UNDP indicated to the evaluation team that there had been a number of initiatives taken in its work since 2013 to draw attention to the importance of gender equality and the necessity of a human rights based approach to development.   These principles are considered to be at the heart of much of the work with civil society, the work with the 31 women-led township self-reliance groups and are taken into account in the work on livelihoods and social inclusion and early recovery.

101.   It is also noted that in close collaboration with Department of Social Welfare, Ministry of Social Welfare, Relief and Resettlement, UNDP and other member of the UN Gender Theme Group (UNFPA, UN Women and other UN agencies), and Gender Equality Network, has supported the process to formulate the Law to Protect and Prevent Women from Violence (PoVAW Law). Together with concerned Ministries, Union Attorney-General Office, Union Supreme Court and other stakeholders, UNDP has also supported the CEDAW Report Writing Committee on the State party's 4th and 5th combined report to UN CEDAW Committee. UNDP has also contributed to the national gender situation analysis. In the area of gender mainstreaming, the programme design gave some focus to the issue and in the implementation a number

of outputs have addressed the issue, but in many cases it is still mainly focused on the number of women in training activities or reflected in policies and programmes of government agencies that have yet to be fully tested in actual implementation. The programme has supported the strengthening of associations of women and the delivery of training on leadership. UNDP has also supported south-south learning in women in peacekeeping and the empowerment of women in microfinance.

102.   A very recent development has been the launch of a new initiative aimed at establishing a pool of trainers specializing on gender equality and women's empowerment. Ultimately, it is expected that members of this pool will become resource persons and focal points on gender training in Myanmar. The selected participants for the national trainers' pool have come from a mixed background of academia, CSOs, Government of Myanmar, training providers, press/media, etc. The pool will comprise of a maximum of 25 motivated trainers/experts, willing to benefit from this tailored capacity development programme and, in turn, allocate time to deliver gender trainings in the future. Once successfully completing this programme, the selected participants from the pool will be registered in the UNDP Myanmar roster of trainers. It is expected that the Government of Myanmar institutions will tap into the pool for providing gender trainings within the Myanmar civil service training curricula.

103.   The difference in opinion with UNDP programme staff and development partners can be partly explained by the way this work has been reported – often included as part of an output report and not given adequate attention when reports are prepared at outcome or programme level. It may also be linked to the fact that much of the reporting is focused on the actual activity and may not cover the processes involved in the design and implementation of the activity. In Annex 5, which outlines a common understanding among UN agencies for a human rights based approach, emphasis is given to focusing as much on the process as the outcome.

F.4   Response to Changing Circumstances and Building Trust

104.   As has already been noted, UNDP's work in Myanmar had to undergo a number of significant changes as a consequence of the reform agenda introduced in the country. Executive Board approval for the restoration of UNDP's mandate in Myanmar meant that the organisation needed to adjust its mode of operations and engage in a more traditional way with the Government and other stakeholders in the country. This adjustment required the approval of the Government and other counterparts and their willingness and openness to re-engage with UNDP and other development partners. It also required a significant re-engineering of the UNDP office in the country while simultaneously seeking to build the trust of the Government and national counterparts. Finally, while UNDP had some core funding available to help make this transition it also needed to work closely with a range of development partners to ensure that the programmes designed were adequately resourced.

105.   There is clear evidence that in most respects UNDP has handled the transition process effectively and been successful in gaining the trust of the Government and national counterparts as well as the broader development partner community. The willingness of a number of development partners to provide funding at programme or outcome level has allowed UNDP the flexibility to adjust programme inputs to changing circumstances and to provide the organisation with the ability to build trust across parliament, government and a wide range of counterparts. In fact it has also meant that the UNDP programme over the period 2013-2015 could perhaps be best described as a platform or springboard for governance reform in the country. Governance reform which is being led by the Government and supported by UNDP without prejudice or undue influence of how reform of parliament, legal system and rule of law issues should be addressed. As much as possible, UNDP has facilitated opportunities for learning and reflection by national counterparts on the global options for governance systems that are available.

F.5   Commitment to National Ownership and Development Effectiveness

106.   While it may be too early to assess the level of national ownership or the commitment of the Government and other stakeholders to many of the concepts introduced through technical advice, training or study visits, it was made clear in a number of the consultations that many of the counterparts of the programme feel strongly about many of the intentions of the programme outputs and indicated that they were pleased with the manner in which the programme is being implemented and the level of their involvement in the design and delivery of many of the activities. The evaluation team was made aware on more than one occasion that many of the UNDP programme outputs are most importantly considered the outputs of national stakeholders and are not simply consultants' reports but the work of local institutions.

F.6   Working with Partners

107.   A number of stakeholders expressed very real appreciation for the way UNDP has been implementing the programme and the way in which it involves partners and as noted in other parts of this report there have already been good examples of cooperation between partners such as the effective cooperation between UNDP, IPU and the United Kingdom in support of the Union Parliament.

108.   At this point in the programme, there has only been limited success in the development of joint UN programming. However, there has been some successful joint work with UNESCO, UNCDF, UNODC and other UN Funds and Programmes. There has also been some very useful work done through the UN gender theme group with a joint effort to support the development of a law addressing violence against women.

G.   Findings and Conclusions

109.   Following an assessment of the key documentation for the programme and the in-country consultations, the midterm evaluation found a number of issues that should be considered in more detail.

110.   It is recognized that the programme implementation was required to start from basics in terms of what is meant by democracy in an emerging political culture. It also required flexibility and creating opportunities to revisit the programme strategy and outputs. The willingness of development partners to provide largely untagged support to UNDP has facilitated this and was highly appreciated by UNDP management. It has increased capacity to respond to new demands but it remains important that increased flexibility does not divert resources from "core" level work.

111.   The changed programme modality, also has required UNDP Myanmar to make significant changes in its staffing and internal management processes; to strengthen its M&E capacity to ensure a focus on measuring behaviour change and change in governance structures and systems; as well as to develop a culture in the office that promotes coordination and effective ways of working with Government counterparts at national regional and township levels. The substantial shift in the way UNDP does business in Myanmar has required it to be opportunistic – recognizing that it cannot be too carefully 'stage-managed'. However, in ensuring responsiveness it brings new challenges and in this regard, it is important to make sure that systems are in place to change direction when and if required. It is not a perfect science so there is a need for care and good political judgement.

112.   UNDP and other UN agencies have been successful in building and maintaining relationships. This has been possible because UNDP has been able to work closely with the Government and other stakeholders and not just with the community as it was prior to 2013. UNDP's engagement with the Government and Union parliament has also provided a platform for smaller development partners to engage government officials and participate in a policy dialogue.

113.   The programme is being delivered under the framework of 3 outcome areas with a primary focus on governance at Union, State and regional levels as well as environmental management/governance, climate change and disaster risk management. Flexibility has been required in the delivery with a periodic adjustment of the outputs and associated indicators. While the need for flexibility in approach continues to be required there were a number of observations made by stakeholders that need to be taken into account for the remaining period of implementation. These comments included:

- The need to balance flexibility with the need to consider a narrowing of the output coverage to maximize the opportunities for supporting achievement of the outcomes defined in the programme;

- The importance of activities having well defined objectives agreed with stakeholders and which include a strategy for follow-up. Must move away from simply information sharing activities to those which build capacity;
- The need for a clearer understanding of the contribution being made to poverty alleviation;
- A human rights based approach and one which addresses gender inequality must remain central to the work of UNDP and while the reform progress remains fragile and conflict in certain parts of the country, a conflict sensitive approach remains essential to the work of UNDP;
- The need for a stronger reflection of how the three outcome areas are interrelated and together are influencing/contributing to broader governance outcomes/service delivery and poverty reduction. There is a need to increase the institutionalization of the outcome area connections, at the moment more opportunistic than pre-determined; and
- Some development partners consider there are perhaps too many outputs – with the scatter diluting impact. Important to be clear about what UNDP's comparative advantage is, particularly as other development partners are increasing their engagement.

114. There is generally a high degree of satisfaction with the support provided by UNDP among the national stakeholders under the country programme and while many of the counterparts are still getting accustomed to the UNDP programming approach a number demonstrated a willingness to offer suggestions for improvements as well as an openness in considering and testing new ideas and concepts to promote improved governance.

115. There was some general criticism about slowness in UNDP procurement and delays in the delivery of some activities and specific comments made about the IT procurement in the Supreme Court. While these comments were made they were often followed by a reflection that there are also often delays on the side of the Myanmar institutions.

116. There was strong support from the stakeholders who have most benefited from the range of initiatives delivered under the outcome areas on Democratic Governance. The evaluation team gained a strong impression that a number of the main counterparts at the Union level demonstrate 'commitment, capacity and a willingness to take the lead'. However, there is concern that these attributes are often only possessed by a few with most institutions lacking a real depth in the number of people understanding the key concepts associated with democratic governance, rule of law, human rights and the difference between government and parliament.

117. In implementing some aspects of the programme, it is clear that UNDP has benefitted from its long association in working with communities and civil society at the sub-regional and village level. There was specific acknowledgement of the local governance mapping, simple community based poverty scorecard and support for CSO and media networks.

118.   Although the delays in initiating a number of the bigger projects under the second outcome area makes it difficult to provide a comprehensive analysis at the mid-point of the programme, it is clear that the small UNDP programme team has been working alongside national counterparts and other partners to progress work on a national environment policy framework; support in the area of environmental protection (Inle Lake), including positive acknowledgement for the partnership between UNDP and UNESCO and the development of an effective governance structure for management of the lake; UNDP leadership in disaster risk management coordination and the support with the implementation of the national disaster management law; work on a national disaster loss and damage database; and support to Myanmar in its role with Indonesia to design a draft ASEAN disaster recovery plan.

119.   Overall, the evaluation concluded that while the programme design remains **relevant** it was necessary to revisit a number of the performance indicators to recognize that even as a five year programme some aspects were considered too optimistic given the broader economic and social issues facing the country's leadership.   The programme management was generally considered to be both **efficient and effective** but again with the emergence of new development partner initiatives and uncertainty over continued support for UNDP among some partners, it will be important that careful consideration is given to the future internal structure of the outcome areas as well as what opportunities there might be for a greater integration of the work occurring under the three outcomes.

120.   The future **sustainability** of the governance work is clearly highly dependent on the continued commitment of the national stakeholders to the full range of governance changes that are underway across the country.   However, at the time of the evaluation there appeared to be significant enthusiasm for the support being provided by UNDP and the motivation this has given to counterparts to strengthen democratic decision making at national, regional and town levels.

H.   Recommendations

121.   The midterm evaluation makes a number of recommendations that could be addressed immediately by the UNDP Myanmar Office, in conjunction with national stakeholders and other development partners and which if implemented are expected to enhance the programme impact and the likelihood of UNDP achieving the three outcomes.   In addition, the evaluation team has identified a number of recommendations that it believes could be considered in the lead-up to the design of the next country programme.

Recommendations that could be addressed immediately:

1) **Reinforce the importance of seeing the programme approach as the most effective way to design, deliver and report progress towards achievement.** There is a tendency under the current governance structures to focus more attention at output or outcome levels.   This is best achieved through a stronger

focus on identifying key governance issues and working with Myanmar counterparts to find mechanisms to deliver a more integrated set of activities that consistently draws together the national and local levels or the role of Union level institutions and communities. In the short term this could include a stronger reporting framework that draws out the common intentions of improved governance across outputs and helps demonstrate how through working at a number of levels or with different groups of stakeholders progress is being made towards the achievement of the programme goal. In this way there is a clear understanding among all parties that the work done at township, regional/state level is important for helping advocate and mobilize change among those national level decision makers who can impact the policies and processes for improved service delivery.

2) **Identify ways to more effectively tell the story of achievement.** At the moment it is difficult to fully understand what the real vision or expected contribution UNDP is making at overall programme or even outcome level – the output results are often presented individually and too many may appear fragmented. They are often seen as standalone activities with little evidence of systematic tracking or tracer studies to assess results – e.g. how training has contributed to changed behaviour or how a microfinance loan has changed the lives of a family, community or individual. There is also evidence that results are often being delivered through work across outputs and/or outcome level but these are not easily identified. The evaluation learned that these types of results are available but are not necessarily being reported in terms of their contribution at programme level.

3) **Continue to build the capacity of stakeholders in the Myanmar institutions** so that the support for reform can go to the next level while consistently demonstrating an understanding of the hierarchy and interconnections between the various levels of government and the administration. This will inevitably lead to an increased use of national systems, which will only be possible if delivery targets are realistic and ensure a retention of high quality support that takes adequate account of the degree and depth of commitment of national partners.

4) **Ensure a rights-based approach is consistently applied across the programme as well as how gender equality in all aspects of development can be maximized.** The evaluation recognizes that the promotion of these principles requires leadership and respect for a country's culture.   However, it is important that the design and implementation of UNDP programme outputs acknowledge the importance of these principles and continues to pursue an increased commitment to them by the Government and other stakeholders. The evaluation notes the steps taken in some areas and in particular the work done with civil society organisations and communities to promote gender equality and ensure that access to programme support is available to all segments of the community. This is also a clear objective of the rule of law support.   However, it is important that human rights standards, contained in

the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other international human rights instruments, guide all development cooperation and programming in all sectors and in all phases of the programming process.

5) **Explore the potential to involve key Myanmar officials more directly in the promotion of UNDP's comparative advantage to development partners and in doing so underline the importance of maintaining UNDP involvement in the post-election period and as a key partner to support Myanmar as it seeks to implement the SDGs.** The current programme provides assistance to Myanmar counterparts as they seek to create the environment for progressing a full range of political, economic and social reforms. This assistance must continue to emphasise the building of trust; a capacity to innovate and test new processes and systems; and support to encourage the country to open up gradually to a consistent human rights approach to development.

6) **Given the confidence shown in UNDP by the Myanmar counterparts to date, it is important that the organisation has the necessary resources and the support of development partners to stay engaged.** This will help ensure continuity and coherence in the areas in which UNDP works.

7) **In the delivery of the outcome areas continue to look for new partners,** including increasing opportunities for broader UN engagement. This would include by taking advantage of improved availability of data and the potential for increased evidence-based policy, planning and implementation and as noted above might also include working with a number of UN agencies to ensure a human rights based approach and increased gender equality in the work of parliamentary committees at Union and State or regional levels.

8) **Identify ways to promote more consistently the idea of "learning by doing" and encouraging cross-fertilization between agencies to encourage 'learning from each other'.** The evaluation learned of a number of examples where a 'learning by doing' approach has already been adopted, these include the strategic planning processes adopted under the democratic governance outcome area and the approach adopted in the civil society forums. The enthusiasm of a number of the counterparts met by the evaluation team suggests that there is also considerable scope for drawing on this expertise and commitment to build an even broader base and support for the programme outcomes. One specific example of this could be achieved immediately by arranging an 'information sharing consultation/workshop' involving staff of the Union Parliament, Attorney General, Supreme Court and General Administration Department, given their similar experience in receiving similar support from UNDP since 2013.

9) **Complement the higher-level promotion of development effectiveness by identifying potential sector level partners to pilot aid management and development cooperation** principles, thereby demonstrating at sector level the real benefits of the government taking the lead in development partner

coordination and aid effectiveness. The evaluation learned of the success UNDP has had in strengthening local ownership of development planning and policy formulation that is based on sound statistical analysis and considers that there now maybe opportunities to demonstrate a commitment to support more directly the use of national systems in the implementation of the programme.

10) **Continue to build the capacity of parliamentarians** through orientation and induction training following the forthcoming elections as well as the continuation of ongoing exposure visits and arrangements of conferences/workshops to strengthen and broaden the understanding of all aspects of democracy. The orientation training and the ongoing exposure visits and knowledge sharing are opportunities to join with other UN agencies to ensure coverage of issues such as population and development, human rights based approaches, gender equality, conflict prevention and environmental sustainability. It would also be an opportunity to underline the important role that civil society organisations and the media can play in drawing to the attention of the community the role of parliament as well as an avenue for community aspirations to be better understood by parliamentarians.

11) **Continue to ensure a balance between provision of TA and workshops with provision of hardware or practical tools and on-going support.** There is evidence that the mix of "soft" and "hard" support is appreciated and seen as an important element for building trust, commitment and capacity among stakeholders in many aspects of the programme both at Union and Region/State and township levels. UNDP is encouraged to continue to ensure that comprehensive and meaningful consultations (involving all impacted parties) are undertaken prior to undertaking activities.   This includes discussion on the TOR, especially for advisory inputs; increasing opportunities for the translation of key shorter documents to improve understanding and timeliness and information flow on the programme; and consideration of expected next steps and follow-up.

12) **Address overall programme governance arrangements** and in particular clarity around the role of various boards and committees as well as timeliness in terms of meeting notices and documentation. Internally in UNDP, it would be useful to reassess the structure of the teams to underline the importance of differentiating between programme/output management and quality assurance. In undertaking the evaluation it became clear that a significant amount of time and resources is devoted to the three levels of governance and appears to reduce opportunities for a more integrated programmatic monitoring and reporting process. Consultations with the programme partners and development partners suggest that there is an opportunity to reconsider the governance arrangements and to find a solution that not only meets the need to monitor at output level (where partners often have specific

involvement) and the importance of focusing attention on programme outcomes and their interrelationship with each other. Some development partners also commented that they had found the meeting schedule onerous.

Recommendations on issues to consider in the design of a future programme beyond 2017:

13) **Analyse the current programme structure and outputs to ensure that the next programme cycle builds on its success and remain responsive to emerging challenges and needs**. This is important in a Myanmar context where reform is gradual and where there is a 'appetite' to adopt new approaches to government and public service delivery. However, it is important to allow the reform process to emerge and grow while encouraging the introduction of new ideas or change, taking opportunities when and where they arise. This requires a less prescriptive approach to programming than is more often the case and the full involvement of all stakeholders from the beginning of the process. With national elections in late 2015 and a new government in place in early 2016, it will be important to allow time for the new administration to be in place and functioning before work begins on the design of the new programme. Building a new programme where there still remains much to do to deepen the understanding of democracy and the accompanying commitments to widespread reform, requires UNDP to be realistic about what can be achieved. One specific area that may offer scope for further development and continued support from UNDP is the key area of public administration reform and implementation of the draft national Framework. If this work, which is currently under development, continues to be supported with leadership from the President's office, it might provide a platform for the design of a programme for implementation beyond 2017 that supports decentralization and focuses on: strengthening the capacity of the civil service at Union, State/Region and township levels, improved service delivery; and increased transparency and accountability – providing a nationally led chapeau with clear targets and indicators that are already owned nationally and which can be supported by UNDP.

14) **The potential to strengthen role of the field coordinator offices alongside the adoption of a stronger area-based approach** where the UNDP programme outcomes are fully integrated and delivered in two or three clearly defined areas of the country. In fact work is already underway to develop an area-based approach in Rakhine and the South East (potentially Kachin) and this will link even more closely UNDP's support for strengthening civil society networks and livelihoods and social cohesion with the peace process. At the present time, the field offices provide very good liaison and support services but UNDP could be expected to get greater returns on this investment if the capacity in these offices were to take on greater responsibility for the implementation with performance monitoring the role of the Yangon-based staff. Under the present structure, Yangon based staff tend to be responsible for both the

implementation and performance monitoring of outputs. A greater degree of decentralization would ensure that field staff are fully aware of all aspects of UNDP's work, are the 'local eyes and ears' and a facilitator for knowledge sharing. The field offices could also be strengthened through the adoption of a more systematic approach to supporting other Yangon based UN offices and a point of contact for other agencies working in the area on a full cost recovery basis.

15) **Explore within the UN agencies, initially with those with offices in Myanmar, the opportunity to develop a joint programme** that recognizes the comparative advantage of each agency and which builds on work already completed. One suggestion already made to the evaluation was the potential for developing a project in the area of urban planning that could make use of the national census supported by UNFPA, addresses a range of environmental and community challenges such a water quality, sanitation, child and family health as well as urban planning and governance. Such an approach would give a focus to poverty in urban areas but may also provide a way to promote MDG/SDG achievement in a local (manageable) context.

I.   Lessons Learned

122.   A number of lessons have been learned already during the implementation of the Myanmar programme. These are outlined as follows:

- The importance of being <u>very realistic in setting outcome targets</u> when designing a programme in a situation where there is the need to build understanding and trust with national stakeholders, while also embarking on significant organisational change in the UNDP office that involves staff re-profiling and changes in programme management processes and systems.

- The necessity to ensure that there is <u>adequate flexibility in the programme design</u> when seeking to implement a governance based programme, given that behaviour change of individuals as well as how institutions and Government agencies work together are often not easy to predict.

- The importance of ensuring UNDP has and retains the <u>capacity to build and maintain trust and the technical background to support a range of Government led sector groups</u> as the country seeks to set new directions and implement extensive reforms.

- The need to establish and maintain <u>effective partnerships</u> with as many development partners as feasible so they remain confident about the programme design. It is critical to ensure that the Government and other national stakeholders fully understand the role played by UNDP and are willing to advocate for the programme on behalf of UNDP.

- The need at the time of programme design to <u>work closely with stakeholders and potential partners</u> rather than develop the programme outcomes and then seek their support. Gaining agreement after a design process reduces ownership and effective commitment.

- The importance of outputs being <u>realistic and accompanied by indicators that can be measured and easily monitored</u>. Implementation plans should be flexible but remain focused on the achievement of the agreed outputs. Activities should also lead to progress towards the relevant output and be designed with the involvement of national stakeholders.

Annex 1: Terms of Reference

1. General Information

Title: One International Consultant and One National Consultant for midterm evaluation of Country Programme (CP) – Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) 2013-2017
Programme Name: Country Programme – Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP)
Reports to: Country Director – UNDP Country Office
Duty Station: Yangon
Expected Places of Travel (if applicable): Nay Pyi Taw, and selected townships (to be discussed with evaluators and Programme Managers)
Duration of Assignment: June 2015 – September 2015 (with 35 effective working days)

2. Background

June 2015 marks the mid-point of the UNDP Myanmar country programme. The UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD) 2013-2015 was approved by the Executive Board in January 2013 for the period 2013-2015, and extended in January 2015 to 2017. It defines three outcomes, which represent the anticipated development changes to be achieved after a five-year period, at the end of 2017. A Country Programme Action Plan, CPAP (2013-2015, extended to 2017) was subsequently derived from the CPD.[5] The CPAP is UNDP's main programme monitoring instrument, detailing outcomes, outputs, with measurable annual targets, baselines and indicators. The CPAP has three programme components and 3 outcomes. The three programme components are: (1) Promoting Local Governance; (2) Promoting Environmental

---

[5]The CPAP was signed by the Deputy Minister for National Planning and Economic Development and the UNDP Country Director 8 April 2013.

Governance, Climate Change, Adaptation and Disaster Risk Reduction; and (3) Promoting Democratic Governance.

The current Country Programme was developed in a particular context. In 1993-2012, the UNDP mandate in Myanmar was restricted to "the Human Development Initiative (HDI)", which consisted of interventions aiming to have grass-roots level impact by providing crucial livelihood support where other development partners had a limited presence on the ground. In effect, UNDP operated as a large scale INGO.

Beginning of 2013 was marked by the removal of mandate restrictions in response to the evolving development context in the country. UNDP has been strategically re-positioning – or, to be more precise – crafting itself a new identify – as an impartial development partner and source of international expertise. Subsequently, the new country programme has evolved around the Governance focus, addressing the three dimensions that form the three above mentioned programme components.

The programme seeks to provide catalytic support to Myanmar's reforms towards modernizing, democratizing, and decentralizing the state and society, and in so doing pursues an incremental approach

Institutional approach that is people- and rights- oriented and places emphasis on women, youth, and vulnerable groups[6].

Since the inception of the Country Programme, UNDP has conducted regular reviews of established CPAP annual targets. As a result of the review process and in conjunction with national counterparts, annual targets and indicators at output and outcome level were revised and adjusted taking into account evolving national development priorities and context. The mid-point of the Country Programme now provides an opportunity to undertake a comprehensive review of UNDP contribution to development effectiveness.

Consistent with UNDP policy guidance all outcomes to which UNDP is contributing through aligned activities and planned outputs must be monitored. The mid-term review is an opportunity to monitor the strategic course, relevance and effectiveness of the implementation of the country programme. The exercise allows UNDP to engage key stakeholders to discuss achievements, lessons learned and adjustments required in response to an evolving development landscape and changing national priorities. The exercise will allow UNDP to make any changes to the strategic direction of the country programme, as well as the allocation of resources, ensuring it is aligned to national priorities and responsive to national demand. It will also be used as a tool to guide programmatic planning.

---

[6]Vulnerable groups were identified by the Access to Justice mapping as – women, children, poor people with little or no land.

3.   Objectives of the Assignment

The mid-evaluation is a comprehensive assessment of the progress of implementation of the country programme towards achieving the established outcomes, with the following six objectives:

1) Review the progress and achievement;

2) Review of factors influencing the achievement;

3) Assess the continual relevance of the programme including its strategies and progress towards the delivery of the expected outcomes taking into account the emerging development challenges;

4) Identify gaps/risks to be addressed, lessons learnt to be applied, and any modifications to be made in the programme to support the achievement of national development priorities;

5) Revisit program approach, in order to be consistent with the development framework and propose a roadmap/ action plan for the UNDP Country Office on how to support the achievement of national development priorities over the remaining CPAP period;

6) Provide key recommendations/directions (both substantively in terms of focus and allocation of resources) for the second half of the extended CPD implementation, a well as for the next Country Programme cycle.

4.   Scope of Work

The Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) is derived from the UNDP Executive Board approved Country Programme Document. The results chain links the CPAP outputs to the United Nations Strategic Framework (UNSF) outcomes. The CPAP defines 3 broad outcomes and 12 outputs (reduced to 10 after the 2013 Steering Committee Meeting), with multi-year annual targets, demarcating achievements for the duration of the Country Programme. The evaluation will assess the strength of the results chain by reviewing achievements at the output level and their corresponding contribution to meeting CPAP outcome targets.

The evaluation will assess the quality, quantity and timeliness of progress towards delivering intended results. It will include an assessment of the performance of on-going and recently completed projects and consider lessons learned from annual project reviews, project evaluation (one to be conducted in 2015 on Social Cohesion and livelihood interventions) and the results of previous annual CPAP review exercises as conducted by the Steering Committee in order to define progress achieved in meeting stated outcomes.

An outcome model (see UNDP Outcome Level Evaluation Guideline: http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/UNDP_Guidance_on_Outcom e- Level%20_Evaluation_2011.pdf also known as results maps, logic models,

46

programme logics, intervention logics, logical frameworks, theory of change) is a (visual) map of the causal logic of an initiative being evaluated and in this case the CPAP. This outcome model includes a description of what UNDP contributes in its own right, what it contributes with partners, what partners may do independently, and what non-partners might do.

The following questions should be answered:

- If we were successful in achieving this outcome, what would we actually see happening?
- Who would be doing what differently as a result of our programme
- Identify projects, programme and policies being undertaken by UNDP, by partners, and by other organization that may contribute to – or be a barrier to achievement of the outcome. These should be listed.

5.   Evaluation criteria

While as detailed below, the evaluation exercise shall use the standard OECD/DAC Evaluation Criteria for Evaluation of Development Assistance namely: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability (For details see pages 168-170 of the Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results)[3], the evaluation will also focus on other aspects that are particularly relevant to the Myanmar country programme. Indeed, because of its particular context of being the first UNDP country programme in 25 years and following the lifting of mandate restrictions, the UNDP Country Office underwent an important restructuring, in order to ensure the new sets of skills necessary to the implementation of the country programme were available. The office also invested into ensuring a relationship of mutual trust and respect was established with government counterparts. The evaluation will focus on establishing how successful UNDP has been in establishing itself as a trusted partner to the Myanmar Government, as well as vis-à-vis other development partners. In this regard, the evaluation will not only focus on a quantitative assessment of the number of partnerships formed, but also on a qualitative assessment of the quality and relevance of the UNDP set-up, as well as establish whether the expertise provided by UNDP in the various thematic areas (including RBM, M&E and risk analysis) is adequate.

Relevance concerns the extent to which the programme and its intended outputs and outcomes are consistent with national and local policies and priorities and the needs of intended beneficiaries. The following types of questions may be asked:

- To what extent is the programme in line with UNDP's mandate, national priorities, and the requirement of targeted women and men?
- How did the programme promote UNDP principles of gender equality, inclusiveness, human rights based approach, and human development? How

were these cross-cutting areas mainstreamed into the programme?

● To what extend is UNDP's engagement a reflection of strategic considerations, including UNDP's role in particular development context and its comparative advantage?

● To what extend was UNDP's selected method of delivery appropriate to the development context?

● To what extend was the theory of change presented in the outcome model a relevant and appropriate vision on which to base of the programme?

● To what extent has UNDP been able to demonstrate responsiveness and adaptability to evolving government reform priorities?

Emphasis will be put on relevance, to ensure the UNDP Myanmar programme is "on track" in supporting the achievement of the "right" development results in Myanmar. This is of particular importance in the country context as not only is this the first UNDP country programme without mandate restrictions in 25 years, but the midterm evaluation also takes place on an election year and should establish the relevance of the programme regardless of any political agenda.

Effectiveness: The extent to which the programme's intended results (output /outcome) have been achieved or the extent to which progress toward output /outcome has been achievedThe following types of questions may be asked:

● To what extent have outputs been achieved or has progress been made toward their achievement?

● How have corresponding outputs delivered by UNDP affected the outcomes, and in what ways have they not been effective?

● What has been the contribution of partners and other organization to the outcome, and how effective have UNDP partnership been in contributing to achieving the outcome?

● What are the positive or negative, intended or unintended, changes brought about by UNDP's work?

● To what extend did the outcomes achieved benefit women and men equally?

Efficiency: A measure of how economically resources/inputs (funds, expertise, equipment, time, etc.) are converted to results. The following types of questions may be asked:

● To what extent have the programme outputs resulted from economic use of resources (both human and financial)?

● To what extend were quality outputs delivered on time?

● To what extend were partnership modalities conducive to the delivery of

outputs?

- To what extend did monitoring systems provide management with a stream of data that allowed it to learn and adjust implementation accordingly?
- To what extent did the risk analysis and risk management system support the programme in managing risks?

Sustainability: The extent to which the programme continues after external development assistance has come to an end. The following types of questions may be asked:

- What indications are there that the outcomes will be sustained, e.g., through requisite capacities (systems, structure, staff, etc.)?
- To what extent has a sustainability strategy, including capacity development of key national stakeholders, been developed or implemented?
- To what extent are policy and regulatory frameworks in place that will support the continuation of benefits?
- To what extent have partners committed to providing continuing support?
- How will concerns for gender equality, human rights, inclusiveness, and human development be taken forward by primarily stakeholders?

Evaluation questions: The consultant will work in a team of two to develop a list of questions based on the criteria above section and the following broad questions, which are the minimum that need to be addressed in this evaluation:

- Are stated outputs on the way to being achieved or expected to be achieved within the programming cycle, do they contribute to the achievement of the outcome?
- Is the focus of the programme appropriate to achieving priority development results in Myanmar, and in line with the UNDP mandate?
- What progress toward the outcome has been made, and to what extent have UNDP outputs contributed to the outcomes?
- How relevant is UNDP's contribution amongst other development partners' active in the same areas of intervention?
- Have synergies between the various areas of intervention been taken into account to ensure achievement of results, and how could these linkages be strengthened?
- What factors are contributing to progress or obstacles towards the achievement of the outputs?
- How does the UNDP management structure facilitate the implementation of the programme and achievement of results?
- Has the UNDP partnership strategy been appropriate and effective?

- What factors contributed to effectiveness and ineffectiveness?

Methodology The team of the evaluators will design a detailed step-by-step work plan that specifies the methods the evaluation will use to collect the information needed to address its purpose and objectives. The overall approach and methodology should ensure the most reliable and valid answers to the evaluation questions and criteria within the limits of resources (for more details see pages 172-177 of Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results: http://www.undp.org/evaluation/handbook)[4]. The evaluation will consist of three main stages: 1) preparation and planning, 2) in-depth data collection, and 3) analysis and report writing.

Preparation and planning stage

Desk review of CPAP: The evaluation team will review the CPAP RRF: 3 outcomes with 9 indicators and 10 outputs with 60 indicators. This midterm evaluation will focus on the review at outcome level.

Following the desk review, the evaluators will develop an inception report. An evaluation matrix should be included in the inception report and used as a reference in planning and conducting the evaluation. The evaluation matrix should summarize the evaluation design and methodology and should include data sources, data collection, analysis tools or methods appropriate for each data source, and the standard or measure by which each question will be evaluated (For details see pages 199-200 of the Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results).

In-depth data collection stage

Interview with Key Stake holders

The UNDP country office has assigned a programme manager for each outcome to be responsible in managing each outcome. The consultant will interview all the programme managers to get the information needed for the evaluations. The programme managers will use results of the previous two Steering Committee Meetings (2013/2015) as well the ROAR (Result Oriented Annual Report) 2013/2014 as reference for discussion. The consultant will also need to interview chairs of the Outcome Boards: 1) Local Governance, 2) Environmental Governance, Climate Change, Adaptation, and Disaster Risk Reduction, and 3) Democratic Governance. The consultant will also interview selected Government counterparts to get the information on the achievement of the programme and outputs' contribution to the

outcome. Also as indicated in figure 1 outcome model above the consultant needs to interview selected donors / development partners, NGOs (including civil society actors), and media that are relevant for UNDP activities.

Field visits: Field visits will be undertaken to at least three selected implementation sites (i.e. one site representative of each of the three programme components). The selection of the site to be visited will be discussed with the programme managers, and interviews will aim at including opinions of different stakeholders.

Data analysis and report writing stage

During this stage, the evaluation team will use the results from the data collected to answer the evaluation questions and criteria. Any additional consultations with key informants can be held at the national level during this stage. A debriefing will be held with project board members to present and confirm findings.

In the evaluation report, findings should be presented as factual statements based on an analysis of the data. They should be structured around the evaluation questions and criteria. Conclusions should be comprehensive and balanced, and highlight both strengths and weaknesses. Recommendations provided should be targeted, practical and feasible. The report should include a discussion on lessons learned, which should be concise and based on specific evidence presented in the report.

At minimum the evaluation team is accountable for the following products:

- **Evaluation inception report:** An inception report should be prepared by the evaluators before going into the full-fledged data collection exercise. Based on the Terms of Reference, initial meetings with UNDP senior management, programme managers and M&E, and desk review of relevant documents, the evaluators should develop the inception report. The report should include, at minimum, a detailed description of the evaluation purpose and scope, evaluation criteria and questions, methodology, sampling, evaluation matrix, and a revised workplan.
- **Draft Evaluation report:** M&E Specialist of UNDP Myanmar will review the draft evaluation report to ensure that the evaluation meets the required quality criteria. The UNDP M&E Specialist will facilitate the presentation of the preliminary findings to get inputs and feedback from UNDP. Based on the inputs and feedbacks the consultant will draft the first draft of the evaluation and submit to the M&E Specialist for review and get second inputs and feedbacks from the reference group and UNDP especially to find any factual error in the report.
- **Final evaluation report:** based on the second inputs and feedbacks the evaluators will revise the first draft and submit to M&E Specialist as the final report. The final report will be reviewed for approval by UNDP senior management.

The evaluation team will consist of one international consultant as team leader and one national as member of the team.

The international consultant should possess the following competencies:

- Experience in monitoring and evaluation including demonstrated experience with program assessments;
- A background in development;
- Experience in monitoring and evaluation techniques including in-depth interviews; focus group discussions and participatory information collection techniques;
- Strong analytical skills;
- Experience in working with government agencies (central and local), civil society organizations, international organizations, UN Agencies, and Donors. Direct experience working in Myanmar is an asset;
- Understanding of Results Based Approach and Human Rights Based Approach
- Understanding of policy-making and capacity development issues in Myanmar;
- Understanding of Myanmar government systems
- Good interpersonal and cross-cultural communication skills
- Ability to work efficiently and independently under pressure, handle multi-tasking situations with strong delivery orientation;
- Experience in leading evaluation teams. A good team player committed to enhancing and bringing additional value to the work of the team as a whole;
- Fluent written and oral English.

*Note: The International Consultant need to travel 2 visits to Myanmar with the possible for additional travel if required.

The national consultant should possess the following competencies:

- The two consultants should have combination of experiences in monitoring programme / project in the areas of : Local Governance, Sustainable environment, Climate Change, Adaptation & DRR, and Democratic Governance;
- Familiarity in in-depth interview; focus group discussion and participatory information collection techniques;
- Understanding of Myanmar government systems;
- Experience in working with government agencies (central and local), civil

society organizations, international organizations, UN Agencies, and Donors.
Direct experience working in Myanmar is an asset;

● Fluent written and oral English.

For Team Leader (international consultant)

Education: Master degree or higher in public policy, political science, public administration, economics, regional planning, or other relevant field.

Experience: Minimum of 10 years, in design, monitoring, management and evaluation of development projects. Experience working in policy and advocacy works on development issues, particularly in developing countries, experienced in Myanmar context is an advantage.

Specific skills: Ability and experience to lead evaluation teams, and deliver high quality reports.

Language Requirements: Excellent command of the English language, spoken and written. Knowledge of Myanmar language is an asset.

Understanding of cultural and socio-economic context and development challenges in Myanmar.

For Team member (national consultant)

Education: Master degree or higher in public policy, political science, public administration, economics, regional planning, or other relevant field.

Experience: Minimum of 6 years, in design, monitoring, management and conducting evaluation of development projects. Experience working in policy and advocacy works on development issues

Specific skills: Ability and experience to work in a team, and deliver high quality reports. Language Requirements: Excellent command of the English language, spoken and written.

Annex 2: Mid-term Evaluation Work Plan

Date	Activity	Location	Comment
16 June 2015	International Consultant contracted and finalization of travel to Myanmar	Home Station (Suva, Fiji)	
17-22 June	Initial review of documentation	Home station	

22 June	National Consultant contract finalized	Yangon, Myanmar	
22 June (evening)	Arrival of International Consultant	Yangon, Myanmar	Initially intended to travel to arrive 21 June but arrived evening of 22 June to minimize ticket cost.
23 June	Consultants meet with UNDP senior management and three Outcome area teams	UNDP Office	
24 June, am	Working breakfast meeting with development partners	Signature Restaurant	
24 June, pm	Meetings with Development Partners	UNDP Office, Yangon	
25 June	Travel to Nay Pyi Daw		
25 – 26 June	Meetings with Union Parliament, Government representatives and UNDP Programme CTA's	Nay Pyi Daw	The two-day programme was very full and allowing for travel between appointments with six meetings each day was a little too crowded.
27 June	Free day	Yangon	
28 June	Travel to Mon State with a number of meetings organized on route with Kyaik Hto township administrator and Mawlamyein where meetings arranged with UNDP Regional Office staff and CSO network	Mon State	
29 June	Meetings with State Speaker and Minister for Development Affairs and Secretary of Mon State Government	Mon State	
30 June	Meetings In Mandalay with UNDP Regional Office, Vice-Speaker of Mandalay Parliament, Minister of Planning and Rule of Law trainees.	Mandalay	
1 July	Meetings with UNDP Staff and development partners	Yangon	
2 July	Meetings with UNDP Staff and development partners	Yangon	
3 July	Debrief and Initial Findings	Yangon	
4 July	International Consultant departs Myanmar		
4July – 25 August	Report Drafting		
7 – 30 September	Presentation of Draft and discussions on	Yangon	

	recommendations and conclusions		
30 September	Submission of final report	Yangon	

Annex 3: List of People Consulted

Tuesday 23 June – Yangon

Time	Meeting	Location
9:30am	Welcome to UNDP, meeting with Dania Marzouki	UNDP Office
10:00am - 11:00am	Meeting with UNDP Country Director, ToilyKurbanov	UNDP Office
11:30am – 12:30pm	Meeting with National Consultant, Htun Paw Oo	UNDP Office
12:30pm – 2:00pm	Working lunch with Htun Paw Oo/Dania Marzouki	
2:00pm – 3:00pm	Meeting with Outcome Area 3 – Emma Morley, Team Leader, Mascha Matthews, Jessica Price and Edin Elgsaether	UNDP Office
3:00pm – 4:00pm	Meeting with UN RR/RC – Renata Lok-Dessallien	UNDP Office
4:00pm – 5:00pm	Meeting with Outcome Area 1 – Christian Hainzl (Team leader), Jitendra Jaiswal, Allison Moore and Daw Khin May Shin	UNDP Office
5:30pm – 6:30pm	Meeting with Outcome Area 2 – Daw Lat Lat Aye (Team leader)	UNDP Office

Wednesday 24 June – Yangon

Time	Meeting	Location
8:30am - 9:30am	Breakfast Meeting with Donors and UNDP Team, Toily Kurbanov, Country Director, UNDP Ulrich Sorensen, Charge d'Affaires, Danish Representation Office Michael Ronning, Director, USAID Hideaki Matsuo, Counselor, Embassy of Japan Maria Suokko, Counselor, Diplomatic Mission of Finland David Holmertz, Counselor , Embassy of Sweden Nick Cumpston, Counselor, Australian Embassy Peter Tschuml, Minister, Embassy of Switzerland Christian Hainzl, Team leader, Outcome Area I, UNDP Emma Morley, Team leader, Outcome Area III, UNDP Lat Lat Aye, Team leader, Outcome Area II, UNDP	Yangon
9:30am - 11:00am	Meeting with Maria Suokko, Counsellor, Development Cooperation, Diplomatic Mission of Finland And with David Holmertz, Counsellor, Development, Embassy of Sweden	Yangon
2:00pm – 3:00pm	Mr. Gisle Joachim Hagen, Counsellor, Royal Norwegian Embassy	UNDP Office

Thursday 25 June – Nay Pyi Taw

Time	Meeting	Location
09:00am	Meeting with Daw Tin New Soe, Director, OSCU, Supreme Court of the Union	Office of the Supreme Court
10:00am	Meeting with U Mya Than, Director General, Small Scale Industries Department, Ministry of Cooperatives	Small Scale Industries Department
11:00am	Meeting with Daw Le Le Thein, Deputy Minister, Ministry of National Planning and Economic Development (MNPED) U Htun Htun Naing, Permanent Secretary, MNPED	MNPED office
12:15pm	Lunch Meeting with Ms. Caitlin Reiger, CTA, Rule of Law, Outcome Area III, UNDP	YKKO, Ocean Center
13:00pm	Meeting with U Htun Hla Aung, Permanent Secretary, General Administration Department U Min Swe, Deputy Director General, GAD	GAD office
14:00pm	Meeting with Daw Hrin Nei Thiam, Meteorology and Hydrology Department, Ministry of Transport	Meteorology and Hydrology Department, Early Recovery Centre
15:00pm	Meeting with U Win Aung, Director General, Financial Regulatory Department, Ministry of Finance U Myint Oo, Deputy Director General, Financial Regulatory Department U Ko Ko Maung, Director, Financial Regulatory Department	Financial Regulatory Department
16:00pm	Meeting with U Kyaw San, Director General, Union Attorney General Office (UAGO) Daw Khin Cho Ohn, Deputy Director General, UAGO	UAGO office

Friday 26 June – Nay Pyi Taw

Time	Meeting	Location
8:00am – 9:30am	Breakfast meeting with Warren Cahill, CTA Parliamentary Strengthening, UNDP	Thingaha Hotel
10:00am – 11:00am	Meeting with U Hla Maung Thein, Deputy Director General, Environment Conservation Department, Ministry of Environment Conservation and Forestry U Min Maw, Deputy Director,	Environment Conservation Department
11:00am – 12:00pm	Meeting with Dr Wah Wah Maung, Acting Director General, Central Statistical Organization, MNPED	MNPED, Building No 32
1:00pm-2:00pm	U Aung Ngwe, Director, Information and Public Relation Department, Ministry of Information	Information and Public Relation Department
2:00pm – 3:00pm	Meeting with U Kyaw Soe, Director General, Pyidaungsu Hluttaw Office (Union Assembly) U Zaw Hein, Deputy Director General, Pyidaungsu Hluttaw Office (Union Assembly) Dr Myat Soe, Deputy Director Daw Ni Ni Aye, Researcher	Pyidaungsu Hluttaw , Zabuthiri
3:00pm – 4:00pm	Meeting with U Htay Aung, Director General, Dry Zone Greening Department (DZGD) U Ba Kaung, Director, Planning Division, DZGD U Phone Lwin, Deputy Director, DZGD	Office of Ministry of Environment Conservation and Forest
4:30pm	Departure for Nay Pyi Taw Airport for return to Yangon	

Sunday 28 June - Monday 29 June – Mon State

Time	Meeting	Location
June28 (Sunday)		
7:30 a.m.	Travel to Kyaik Hto	By road
11:00 11:45a.m.	Meeting with U Myo Aung, Township Administrator, General Administration Department, Kyaik Hto, Mon State	Kyaik Hto GAD Office
12:30-3:00 p.m.	Travel to Mawlamyine	
3:30-4:30 p.m.	Meeting with U Kyin Pe, Speaker of Parliament for Mon State U Sein Myint, Member of Parliament Naing San Mon, Member of Parliament U Aung Naing Oo, Member of Parliament	Parliament Meeting Room
3:30-4:30 p.m.	Meeting with U Min Aung Htoo, Coordinator for Mon State CSO Forum	UNDP Mawlamyine Office
June29 (Monday)		
9:00-9:45 a.m.	Meeting with U Sein Ti, Director, Mon Social Regional Development Network	UNDP Mawlamyine Office
10:00-11:30 a.m.	Meeting with U Zaw Lin Htun, Secretary of Mon State Government and Dr Toe Toe Aung, Minister for Planning, Mon State Government	Mon State Gov. Office
12:30-1:15 p.m.	Meeting with U Thaung Sein, PBANRD (Na Ta La), Township Officer, Mawlamyine	UNDP Mawlamyine Office
13:30 p.m.	Travel back to Yangon	

Tuesday 30 June 2015– Mandalay

Time	Meeting	Location
06:10 – 8:15	Depart Yangon to Mandalay by air	Yangon
08:45 – 9:45	Depart Tada Oo airport to Mandalay by car	Mandalay
09:30 – 10:30	Meeting with U Win Myint, Chairperson of Byamaso Humanitarian Aid Organization & U Tun Win, Chief Editor, Shwe Mandalay Journal	
11:00 – 12:00	Courtesy meeting with U Aung Zan, Minister for Planning and Economic, Mandalay Region Government	Mandalay Region Government Office
13:00 – 14:00	Meeting with Rule of Law Team U Myo Swe, Advocate Daw Sadar Aung, Lecturer, Dept. of Law, Mandalay Distant Uni Dr Myo Ma Ma, Asst. Lecturer, Dept. of Law, YadanponUni Daw Thuzar Myint, Tutor, Dept. of Law, Mandalay Uni Daw Yadanar Than, Advocate U Myint Tun, Myint Myat Ayeyarwady Social Network Daw Yin Min Aye, Advocate Ma Su Lat Zaw, Local Resource Center U Khin Maung Thaw, Advocate Daw Nyein Nwet Nwet Aung, Dept. of Law, Yadanpon Uni Daw Aye Thandar, Lawyer, Legal Clinic Myanmar Daw Mon Mon Kyaw, Asst. Lecturer, Dept. of Law, Mandalay Uni	Mandalay UNDP Office
14:30 – 15:30	Courtesy meeting with U Aung Htay Kyaw, Vice Speaker for Mandalay Regional Parliament Dr Kyaw Hla, Member of Parliament U Thein Lwin, Member of Parliament U Htun Htun Win, Director, Mandalay Regional Parliament Office	Mandalay Regional Parliament Office
15:30 – 16:30	Depart Mandalay to Tadar Oo airport by car	Mandalay
17:10 – 19:00	Depart Tadar Oo airport to Yangon by air	Yangon

Wednesday 1 July – Yangon
(Meetings with UNDP staff – Gender and Yangon based stakeholders)

Time	Meeting	Location
9:00am – 10:00am	Meeting with Janet Jackson, UNFPA Representative	UNFPA Office
10:00am - 11:00am	Meeting with Saw Daniel, Analyst, Admin and Operations, UNDP	UNDP Office
11:00am – 12:00pm	Meeting with U Thing Khaing, Senior Coordinator for Field Offices, UNDP	UNDP Office
2:30pm – 3:20pm	Renata Lok-Dessallien, UNDP Residence Representative	UNDP Office
3:30pm – 4:30pm	Sanda Thant, Gender Specialist, UNDP	UNDP Office

Thursday 2 July – Yangon

Time	Meeting	Location
9:00am – 10:00am	U Than Myint, WCS Country Director (Implementing partner on GEF 5) Robert Tizard, Technical Advisor U Saw Htun, Deputy Country Director	WCS Office
11:00am - 12:00am	Meeting with Mr Umar Sardar, UNESCO Representative	UNESCO office
12:00pm – 1:00pm	Meeting with Peter McDermott, DFID	UNDP Office
1:00pm – 2:00pm	Lunch	
2:00pm – 3:00pm	Ulrich Sorensen, Charge d'Affaires, Danish Representation Office	UNDP office
4:45pm – 6:00pm	Meeting with Seema Chandra, First Secretary (Development Assistance - Governance), Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Australian Embassy	Savoy Hotel

Friday 3 July – Yangon (Final meetings and debriefing with Senior Management)

Time	Meeting	Location
13:00 – 13:30	Toily Kurbanov, Country Director, UNDP Myanmar	UNDP Office

Phase 2 of Midterm Evaluation

Tuesday 8 September 2015- Yangon

Time	Meeting	Location
11:00am - 12:00am	Meeting with UNDP Country Director, Toily Kurbanov	UNDP Office
12:00am – 14:00pm	Meeting with Dania Marzouki, Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist	
16:00pm – 17:00pm	Meeting with Daw Ei Cho Nyunt, Procurement Analyst, UNDP	UNDP Office

Wednesday 9 September 2015 – Yangon

Time	Meeting	Location
10:30am - 11:30am	Meeting with Toily Kurbanov and Programme Team	UNDP Office
2:00am - 3:00pm	Meeting with Meeting with Pillar 3 – Emma Morley, Team Leader, David Huysman, Jessica Price for (Pillar 3, Output 4, PAR)	UNDP Office
3:00pm – 4:00pm	3:00PM - 4:00PM: Meeting with Thuy Hang To, DRR (Operations) and U Saw Daniel, Admin Analyst	UNDP Office
4:00PM - 5:00PM	Meeting with Emma Morley, Hyeran Kim and U Min Sann (Pillar 3 Output , Development Effectiveness)	UNDP Office

Thursday 10 September 2015– Yangon

Time	Meeting	Location
10:00am- 11:00am	Meeting with Dilrukshi Fonseka (Social Cohesion and Governance Specialist (Pillar 1, Output 5, Livelihood and Social Cohesion)	UNDP Office
1:00pm-2:00pm	Meeting with Township Leading Groups (TLG), Daw Hla San Htwe, May Doe Arrman, Kyaiklat, Ayeyarwady Region	UNDP Office

	and Daw Aye Cho, Kyaikhto, Mon State, Daw Naw Nau Htoo, Programme Analyst	
2:30pm-4:00pm	Meeting with Christian Hainzl, Team Leader (Pillar 1)	UNDP Office
4:00pm-5:00pm	Meeting with Allison (Pillar 1, Output 2, Civil Society & Media)	UNDP Office
5:00pm-6:00pm	Meeting with Stean Auguste N. Tshiband, Early Recovery Manager and Head of Office, UNDP	UNDP Office

Friday 11 September 2015– Nay Pyi Taw

Time	Meeting	Location
10:00am – 11:00am	Meeting with U Bharat Singh, Deputy Director General, U Myo Min Soe, Assistant Director, Ministry at the President Office (6)	Ministry at the President Office (6), Nay Pyi Taw
11:30am – 12:00	Meeting with Daw Thin Thin Aung, Programme, Specialist UNDP Office, Nay Pyi Taw	UNDP Office, Nay Pyi Taw

Sunday 13 September 2015- Yangon

3:30am – 5:00pm	Skype call with Christophoros Politis, CTA Public Administration Reform	Yangon

Monday 14 September 2015 – Yangon

Time	Meeting	Location
10:00am- 11:00am	Anki Dellnas, Programme Specialist (Local development), Pillar 1, Output 1	UNDP Office
11:00am- 1:00pm	Lat Lat Aye, Team Leader, U Saw Doh Wah, Programme Analyst, Pillar 2	UNDP Office
2:30pm- 4:00pm	Meeting with Pillar 3, Parliament Team, Edin Elgsaether	UNDP Office
4:00pm-5:00pm	Meeting with Caitlin Reiger (Pillar 3, Rule of Law CTA) and Mascha Matthews	UNDP Office
5:00pm-6:00pm	Paul Luchtenburg, Programme Specialist Inclusive Finance, UNCDF	UNDP Office

Annex 4: Reference Material

Sr. No	Title of the Documents	Prepared by
1	UN Strategic Framework (2012-2015), United Nations Country Team in Myanmar, 2011	United Nations Country Team in Myanmar
2	Framework for Economic and Social Reforms, Policy Priorities for 2012-15 towards the Long-Term Goals of the National Comprehensive Development Plan, 2012	Government of the Republic of the Union of Myanmar
3	Pillar 3- Democratic Governance UNDP MYANMAR PROGRAMME INDUCTION, February, 2015	UNDP
4	Strategy for Repositioning the UN in Myanmar, December, 2014	United Nations Country Team in Myanmar
5	Pillar 1/Output 4: Strengthening Institutional Capacity to Support Sustainable Livelihoods, Annual report 2013	UNDP
6	Operationalization of the UN Strategic Framework (2012-2015)	United Nations Country Team in Myanmar
7	Evaluation of the IPU-Project, 'Interim support to the Union Assembly of Myanmar'	Franklin De Vrieze, Brussels, January 2014
8	Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results, United Nations Development Programme, 2009	UNDP
9	Outcome-level evaluation: A companion guide to the handbook on planning monitoring and evaluating for development results for programme units and evaluators, December 2011	UNDP
	Pillar I Pillar Board	
10	Pillar 1: Local Governance Annual Report 2013 - Pillar Board Meeting	UNDP
11	Pillar I: Local Governance Pillar Board Meeting, March 13, 2014	UNDP
12	Pillar I: Local Governance /Local Development Program , Annual Report 2014	UNDP
13	Pillar 1: Local Governance/Local Development Programme, Minutes of the Pillar Board Meeting, February 2015	UNDP
	Output Board 2013	
14	Output 1 : Strengthening Local Governance Report, January to August 2013	UNDP
15	Output 1 : Capacity and Local Administration of Meeting Minutes, September 2013	UNDP
16	Output 2 : Citizen and Communities engaged in Local development and monitoring of service delivery, September 2013	UNDP
17	Output 4: Strengthening Institutional Capacity to	UNDP

	Support Sustainable Livelihoods, Annual report 2013	
18	Output 4:Strengthening Institutional Capacity to Support Sustainable Livelihoods, Output Board Meeting, Semi-annual Report, September, 2013	UNDP
19	Output 4: Strengthened Institutional Capacity of Institutions to Support Sustainable Livelihoods and Reintegration Programmes, Output Board Meeting Minutes, 31 January, 2013	UNDP
20	Output 4: Strengthened Institutional Capacity of Institutions to Support Sustainable Livelihoods and Reintegration Programmes, Meeting Minutes, September, 2013	UNDP
21	Output 4: Strengthening Institutional Capacity to Support Sustainable Livelihoods, Annual Report, January 2014	UNDP
22	Output 5: Livelihoods and Social Cohesion, Output Board Meeting Minutes of the Meeting, September 2013	UNDP
23	Output 5: Livelihoods and Social Cohesion, Output Board Meeting, Bi-Annual Report, January-June 2013,	UNDP
	Output Board 2014	
24	Output 1: Strengthened Institutional Capacity of Local Administration for Participatory Local Development, Second Output Board Meeting, September 2014	UNDP
25	Output 1: Strengthened Institutional Capacity of Local Administration for Participatory Local Development, Second Output Board Report, January 2014	UNDP
26	Output 1: Strengthened Institutional Capacity of State/Region and Township Administrations for Area Related Participatory Development Planning, PFM and Public Service Delivery, Meeting Minutes of the Second Output Board Meeting Minutes, January, 2014	UNDP
27	Output 1: Strengthened Institutional Capacity of State/Region and Township Administrations for Area Related Participatory Development Planning, PFM and Public Service Delivery, Meeting Minutes of the Second Output Board Meeting, September, 2014	UNDP
28	Output 2 : Citizen and Communities engaged in Local development and monitoring of service delivery, Output Board Meeting Minutes, January 2014	UNDP
29	Output 2 : Citizen and Communities engaged in Local development and monitoring of service delivery, Output Board Report, January 2014	UNDP
30	Output 2: Civil Society and Media Summary Minutes of the Output Board Meeting, November 2014	UNDP
31	Output 2 : Citizen and Communities engaged in Local development and monitoring of service delivery, Output Board Report, November 2014	UNDP

32	Output 4: Strengthened Institutional Capacity of Institutions to Support Sustainable Livelihoods and Reintegration Programmes, Output Board Meeting Minutes, January 2015	UNDP
33	Output 4: Strengthening Institutional Capacity to Support Sustainable Livelihoods, Annual Report 2014	UNDP
34	Output 4: Strengthened Institutional Capacity of Institutions to Support Sustainable Livelihoods and Reintegration Programmes, Output Board Meeting Minutes, October 2014	UNDP
35	Output 4: Strengthening Institutional Capacity to Support Sustainable Livelihoods, Output Board Report, October 2014	UNDP
36	Output 5: Livelihoods and Social Cohesion, Output Board Meeting Minutes of the Meeting, February 2014	UNDP
37	Output 5: Livelihoods and Social Cohesion, Annual Report to Output Board, Janauary2014	UNDP
38	Output 5: Livelihoods and Social Cohesion, Semi-=annual Report to Output Board, August 2014	UNDP
39	Output 5: Livelihoods and Social Cohesion Summary Minutes of the Output Board Meeting, September 2014	UNDP
	Output Board January 2015	
40	Output 1 – Strengthened Institutional Capacity of State/Region and Township Administrations for Area Related Participatory Development Planning, PFM and Public Service Delivery, Meeting Minutes of the First Output Board Meeting 2015	UNDP
41	Output 1 – Strengthened Institutional Capacity of State/Region and Township Administrations, Output Board Annual Report, January 2015	UNDP
42	Output 2 : Citizen and Communities engaged in Local development and monitoring of service delivery, Output Board Report, Output Board Annual Report, January 2015	UNDP
43	Output 2: Civil Society and Media, Minutes of the Output Board Meeting, January 2015	UNDP
44	Output 5: Livelihoods and Social Cohesion Summary Minutes of the Output Board Meeting, February 2015	UNDP
45	Output 5: Livelihoods and Social Cohesion Annual Report to the Output Board, February 2015	UNDP
	Pillar II	
46	Pillar Board Meeting, Minutes of Pillar Board Meeting, March 2014	UNDP
47	Climate Change, Environment, Energy and Disaster Risk Reduction, Annual Report for Pillar Board Meeting, 2014	UNDP

48	Environment, Climate Change, Energy and Disaster Risk Reduction programme, Second Quarterly Progress Report, January 2014	UNDP
49	Pillar Board Meeting, Pillar Board Meeting Minutes, March 2015	UNDP
	Output Board 2013	
50	Output 1:Capacities to adapt to climate change and reduce disaster risk, Meeting Minutes of Output Board, August 2013	UNDP
51	Output 2: Environmental Conservation, Meeting Minutes of Output Board, August 2013	UNDP
52	Output 3: Rural Renewable Energy, Minutes of the Output Board Meeting, August 2013	UNDP
	Output Board 2014	
53	Environment, Climate Change, Energy and Disaster Risk Reduction programme, Second Quarterly Progress Report, January 2014	UNDP
54	Output 7: Environmental Conservation, Minutes of the Pillar Board Meeting, January 2015	UNDP
55	Output 7: Environmental Governance, Minutes of the meeting: Output Board Meeting	UNDP
56	Output 6:Capacities to adapt to climate change and reduce disaster risk, Output Board Report, November 2014	UNDP
57	Output 7: Climate Change Adaptation and Disaster Risk Reduction, Minutes of the meeting: Output Board Meeting, January 2014	UNDP
58	Output 7: Environmental Governance, Annual Report Output Board Meeting, November 2014	UNDP
	Pillar III	
59	Democratic Governance Pillar Board Meeting, Annual Report 2013	UNDP
60	Pillar Board Meeting, Minutes of Pillar Board Meeting, March 2014	UNDP
61	Democratic Governance Pillar Board Meeting, Minutes of Pillar Board Meeting, February 2015	UNDP
62	Democratic Governance, Pillar Board Meeting, Report January-December 2014	UNDP
	Output Board 2013	
63	Output 1: Strengthened capacity of national institutions for socio-economic policy-making, planning and development effectiveness with broad stakeholder participation (including women, people with disabilities and HIV/AIDS), Output Board Report, December 2013	UNDP
64	Output 1: Output Board meeting on Development Effectiveness, Minutes of Output Board Meeting, December 2013	UNDP

65	Output 1: Strengthened capacity of national institutions for socio-economic policy-making, planning and development effectiveness with broad stakeholder participation (including women, people with disabilities and HIV/AIDS), December 2013	UNDP
66	Output 4: Public Administration Responsiveness, Output Board Meeting Minutes, December 2013	UNDP
67	Output 4:Strengthened capacity for service delivery and improved responsiveness of the public administration reforms, Output Board Report, December 2013	UNDP
68	Output 1: Public Administration Responsiveness, Minutes Output Board Meeting, September, 2013	UNDP
69	Output 1: Public Administration Responsiveness Programmes, Output Board Report, September, 2013	UNDP
70	Output 2: Parliamentary Support Program, Output Board Report, January 2014	UNDP
71	Output 3: Rule of Law and Access to Justice Output Board Minutes of the Out Put Board Meeting, December 2013	UNDP
72	Output 3: Rule of Law and Access to Justice Programmes, Annual Work Plan 2013, December 2013	UNDP
73	Output 3: Rule of Law and Access to Justice, Minutes of Output Board Meeting, July 24	UNDP
74	Output 3: Rule of Law and Access to Justice, Bi-Annual Report of Output Board, July 24	UNDP
	Output Board 2014	
75	Output 1: Development Effectiveness, Output Board Meeting Minutes, September 2014,	UNDP
76	Output 1: Development Effectiveness, Output Board Report, September 2014,	UNDP
77	Output 4: Public Administration Responsiveness, Output Board Meeting Minutes, October 2014	
78	Output 4:Strengthened capacity for service delivery and improved responsiveness of the public administration reforms, Output Board report, October 2014	UNDP
79	Output 2: Parliamentary Support Programme, Minutes 2nd Output Board Meeting, January, 2014	UNDP
80	Output 2:Parliament at Union levels and selected state/regional levels perform their functions, Output Board report, January 2014	UNDP
81	Output 2: Parliamentary Support Programme, Strategic Plan Consultation Meeting Minutes on Output Board, September 2014	UNDP
82	Output 2:Parliament at Union levels and selected state/regional levels perform their functions, Output Board Report, September 2014	UNDP

83	Output 4: Public Administration Responsiveness, Pillar Board Meeting Minutes, October 2014	UNDP
84	Output 4:Strengthened capacity for service delivery and improved responsiveness of the public administration reforms, Output Board Report, October 2014	UNDP
85	Output 2: for Parliamentary Support Programme, Minutes 2nd Output Board Meeting, January 2014	UNDP
86	Output 2:Parliament at Union levels and selected state/regional levels perform their functions, Output Board Report, January 2014	UNDP
87	Output 2: Parliamentary Support Programme, Minutes on Output Board and Strategic Plan Consultation Meeting, September 2014	UNDP
88	Output 2:Parliament at Union levels and selected state/regional levels perform their functions, Output Board Report, September 2014	UNDP
89	Output 3: Rule of Law and Access to Justice Output Board, Minutes of Output Board Meeting, 27th May 2014	UNDP
90	Output 3: Rule of Law and Access to Justice Output Board, Bi-Annual Report, 27th May 2014	UNDP
91	Output 3: Rule of Law and Access to Justice, Minutes of Output Board Meeting Democratic Governance, September 2014	UNDP
92	Output 3: Proposed Pilot Rule of Law Training, Information Sheet	UNDP
93	Output 1: Development Effectiveness, Output Board Meeting Minutes, 30 September 2014, Tuesday	UNDP
94	Output 4: Public Administration Responsiveness, Output Board Meeting Minutes 16th October 2014	UNDP
95	Output 2: Parliamentary Support Programme, Minutes on Output Board and Strategic Plan Consultation Meeting 23 September 2014	UNDP
96	Output 3: Rule of Law and Access to Justice, Output Board Meeting Minutes, Monday 8 September 2014	UNDP
97	Output 1: Development Effectiveness, Output Board 2014 Annual Report,	UNDP
98	Output 4: Public Administration Responsiveness, Output Board 2014 Annual Report	UNDP
99	Output 2: Parliament Support Programme, Output Board Annual Report for 2014	UNDP
100	Output 3: Rule of Law and Access to Justice, Output Board 2014 Annual Report	UNDP
	Output Board 2015	
101	Output 4: Public Administration Responsiveness, Meeting Minutes of Output Board, January 2015	UNDP

102	Output 3: Rule of Law and Access to Justice, Minutes of Output Board Meeting Democratic Governance, January 2015	UNDP
103	Output 1: Development Effectiveness, Output Board Meeting Minutes, 27 January 2015	UNDP
104	Output 2: Parliament Support Programme, Output Board Meeting Minutes, 28 January 2015	UNDP
105	Making Access to Finance Possible (MAP) Myanmar Synthesis Note 2014	UNCDF
106	Making Access to Finance Possible (MAP) Myanmar Road Map Final 2014-2020	UNCDF
107	Making Access to Finance Possible (MA) Myanmar Diagnostic Full Report Final	UNCDF
108	Myanmar Financial Diaries Interim Report	UNCDF
109	Making Access to Finance Possible (MAP) Video	UNCDF

Annex 5: The Human Rights Based Approach to Development: Common Understanding among UN Agencies

The UN Statement of Common Understanding on Human Rights-Based Approaches to Development Cooperation and Programming (the Common Understanding) was adopted by the United Nations Development Group (UNDG) in 2003. The purpose behind developing a common understanding was to ensure that UN agencies, funds and programmes apply a consistent Human Rights-Based Approach to common programming processes at global and regional levels, and especially at the country level in relation to the CCA and UNDAF.

Introduction

The United Nations is founded on the principles of peace, justice, freedom and human rights. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights recognizes human rights as the foundation of freedom, justice and peace. The unanimously adopted Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action states that democracy, development, and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms are interdependent and mutually reinforcing.

In the UN Programme for Reform that was launched in 1997, the Secretary-General called on all entities of the UN system to mainstream human rights into their various activities and programmes within the framework of their respective mandates.

Since then a number of UN agencies have adopted a human rights-based approach to their development cooperation and have gained experiences in its operationalization. But each agency has tended to have its own interpretation of approach and how it should be operationalized. However, UN interagency collaboration at global and regional levels, and especially at the country level in relation to the CCA and UNDAF processes, requires a common understanding of this approach and its implications for development programming. What follows is an attempt to arrive at such an understanding on the basis of those aspects of the human rights-based approach that are common to the policy and practice of the UN bodies that participated in the Interagency Workshop on a Human Rights based Approach in the context of UN reform 3-5 May, 2003.

This Statement of Common Understanding specifically refers to a human rights based approach to the development cooperation and development programming by UN agencies.

The Common Understanding

1.   All development co-operation programmes, policies and technical assistance should further the realization of human rights as laid down in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other international human rights instruments. A set

of programme activities that only incidentally contributes to the realization of human rights does not necessarily constitute a human rights-based approach to programming. In a human rights-based approach to programming and development cooperation, the aim of all activities is to contribute directly to the realization of one or several human rights.

2.   <u>Human rights standards contained in, and principles derived from, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other international human rights instruments guide all development cooperation and programming in all sectors and in all phases of the programming process.</u> Human Rights principles guide programming in all sectors, such as: health, education, governance, nutrition, water and sanitation, HIV/AIDS, employment and labour relations and social and economic security. This includes all development cooperation directed towards the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals and the Millennium Declaration. Consequently, human rights standards and principles guide both the Common Country Assessment and the UN Development Assistance Framework.

Human rights principles guide all programming in all phases of the programming process, including assessment and analysis, programme planning and design (including setting of goals, objectives and strategies); implementation, monitoring and evaluation.

Among these human rights principles are: universality and inalienability; indivisibility; inter-dependence and inter-relatedness; non-discrimination and equality; participation and inclusion; accountability and the rule of law. These principles are explained below.

- Universality and inalienability: Human rights are universal and inalienable. All people everywhere in the world are entitled to them. The human person in whom they inhere cannot voluntarily give them up. Nor can others take them away from him or her. As stated in Article 1 of the UDHR, "All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights".
- Indivisibility: Human rights are indivisible. Whether of a civil, cultural, economic, political or social nature, they are all inherent to the dignity of every human person. Consequently, they all have equal status as rights, and cannot be ranked, a priori, in a hierarchical order.
- Inter-dependence and Inter-relatedness. The realization of one right often depends, wholly or in part, upon the realization of others. For instance, realization of the right to health may depend, in certain circumstances, on realization of the right to education or of the right to information.
- Equality and Non-discrimination: All individuals are equal as human beings and by virtue of the inherent dignity of each human person. All human beings are entitled to their human rights without discrimination of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, ethnicity, age, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, disability, property, birth or other status as explained by the human rights treaty bodies.

- Participation and Inclusion: Every person and all peoples are entitled to active, free and meaningful participation in, contribution to, and enjoyment of civil, economic, social, cultural and political development in which human rights and fundamental freedoms can be realized.
- Accountability and Rule of Law: States and other duty-bearers are answerable for the observance of human rights. In this regard, they have to comply with the legal norms and standards enshrined in human rights instruments. Where they fail to do so, aggrieved rights-holders are entitled to institute proceedings for appropriate redress before a competent court or other adjudicator in accordance with the rules and procedures provided by law.

3. <u>Programmes of development cooperation contribute to the development of the capacities of duty-bearers to meet their obligations and of 'rights-holders' to claim their rights.</u> In a HRBA human rights determine the relationship between individuals and groups with valid claims (rights-holders) and State and non-state actors with correlative obligations (duty- bearers). It identifies rights-holders (and their entitlements) and corresponding duty-bearers (and their obligations) and works towards strengthening the capacities of rights-holders to make their claims, and of duty-bearers to meet their obligations.

Implications of a Human Rights Based Approach to Development Programming of UN Agencies

Experience has shown that the use of a human rights-based approach requires the use of good programming practices. However, the application of "good programming practices" does not by itself constitute a human rights-based approach, and requires additional elements.

The following elements are necessary, specific, and unique to a human rights-based approach:
1. Assessment and analysis in order to identify the human rights claims of rights-holders and the corresponding human rights obligations of duty-bearers as well as the immediate, underlying, and structural causes of the non-realization of rights.
2. Programmes assess the capacity of rights-holders to claim their rights, and of duty-bearers to fulfill their obligations. They then develop strategies to build these capacities.
3. Programmes monitor and evaluate both outcomes and processes guided by human rights standards and principles.
4. Programming is informed by the recommendations of international human rights bodies and mechanisms.

Other elements of good programming practices that are also essential under a HRBA, include:

1. People are recognized as key actors in their own development, rather than passive recipients of commodities and services.
2. Participation is both a means and a goal.
3. Strategies are empowering, not disempowering.
4. Both outcomes and processes are monitored and evaluated.
5. Analysis includes all stakeholders.
6. Programmes focus on marginalized, disadvantaged, and excluded groups.
7. The development process is locally owned.
8. Programmes aim to reduce disparity.
9. Both top-down and bottom-up approaches are used in synergy.
10. Situation analysis is used to identity immediate, underlying, and basic causes of development problems.
11. Measurable goals and targets are important in programming.
12. Strategic partnerships are developed and sustained.
13. Programmes support accountability to all stakeholders