Final Report

Final Evaluation of the PBF project "Overcoming barriers to strengthen the voices of all women in Rakhine State for social cohesion and peace"

Project implementation period: 18 April 2018 to 30 September 2019
Evaluation

4 March 2020

Evaluation Team
Joanna Brooks (Team Leader)
Aye Myat Thu (M&E Expert)

was clearlygaining traction

Key recommendations include conducting robust analysis and assessment, together with a participatory, consultative process to feed into an informed project design with clearly defined and attainable results framework. Where the project was able to gain successes was where it was able to be responsive, flexible and adaptive to the changing context and in this respective, it is recommended that both Agencies consider moving to a more adaptive style of management, particular when implementing projects in conflict contexts. This approach will require strong and measurable system based indicators and routine, rigorous monitoring to make adjustments to programming on a regular basis, but will allow for the potential of better results with the same resources. It will also require a robust risk analysis and risk-log that is frequently and regularly updated, together with budgeted Project Board meetings and adaptation workshops, to facilitate prompt responses and course corrections. Similarly, it is recommended

The overall assessment of the project against the four OECD/DAC evaluation criteria as stipulated by the terms of reference is presented in the analysis of the outcomes and outputs in Chapter 3. A summary is also provided below. Overall the project has received a total of 81/124 points, scoring most highly on relevance and least highly on sustainability, in part because it is too premature to assess sustainability and in part because the nature of PBF funded projects is that they provide seed funding. However, it is reiterated that the evaluation team has looked beyond the results framework to evaluate the project. The overall ratings are provided below:

Relevance	25/32	Successful
Effectiveness	18/32	Partially successful
Efficiency	20/32	Partially successful
Sustainability	15/28	Partially successful

Acknowledgements

The evaluation team would like to thank all staff of UNDP and UNFPA both at the Country Office in Yangon and in the field offices in Sittwe for their assistance during the evaluation and in preparing this report. The constructive comments received from the project team have helped to shape the final recommendations in the report. Particular thanks go to Thomas Crick and Wouter Thirion from UNDP and Janneke Bienert from UNFPA, for their kind assistance and facilitation throughout the final evaluation process

1. Introduction

Myanmar is a lower middle-income least developed country, which continues to navigate multiple transitions: from conflict to peace, from military/autocratic rule to a democratic civilian Government and from a largely closed economy to an open market economy. These transitions are occurring in a complex development context where: high concentrations of poverty in rural areas contrast with accelerated development in urban centres; armed conflict is still occurring in some parts of the country; and frequent natural disasters pose an increasing risk.

D Ç v u Œ [• , µ u v À o } ‰ u v š / v Æ ~ , / • v which put the country in the X ñ ô ð medium human development category, positioning it at 145 out of 189 countries and territories. Myanmar has a Gender Inequality Index (GII) value of 0.458, ranking it 106 out of 162 countries in the

Women(CEDAW)[4], as they incorporate restrictive gender stereotypes and are inconsistent with the ‰ Œ } u } š] } v v ‰ Œ } š š] } v } (Á } u v [• Œ] P[5] Z Á • National • µ u • š n v]] À ‹ µ o Commission has been established but lacks capacity, and there is scope to encourage further convention

inclusive society, governed by more democratic and accountable institutions, and benefit from
•šŒ vPšZ v ZµuvŒ]PZš• v Œµo }(o Á‰Œ}š š]}vX_
dZ W & ‰Œ}i š }všŒ]µš š} }šZ P v]•[}µvšŒÇ WŒ}PŒu
Strategic Plan 2017-2019.

1.3 Objectives and Scope of the Evaluation

dZ W & ‰Œ}i š } µuvš *A final Project Evaluation will be conducted to assess achievement of project results and impact at the outcome-level as articulated in the results framework and to document lessons learned* X_ dZ }µš }u }(šZ À oµš]}v Á]oo]v(}Œu
]u‰o u vš š]}v }((µšµŒ ‰ µ]o]vP š]À]š]•]v Z lZ]v U v l}Œ
PBF Guidelines (2018) outline the concept and rationale for final evaluations.[9] Several key elements of this evaluation, that follow global practice, are that it will be independent and impartial, conducted by a team of external experts, and guided by an Evaluation Reference Group.

The evaluation is a final evaluation and as such covered the full implementation period from April 2018 to September 2019.

9

	significant and have been managed effectively.
3 Satisfactory (Mostly, with some exceptions)	Performance is reasonably strong on mo aspects of the evaluation question/criterion. No significant gaps or weaknesses, or less significant gaps or weaknesses have mostly been managed effectively.
2 Moderately satisfactory (Sometimes, with many exceptions)	Performance is inconsistent in relation to the question/criterion. There are some serious weaknesses. Meets minimum expectations/requirements as far as can be determined.

- *Selection bias*: Beneficiaries provided by the implementing partners could mean that the evaluation team heard only from people who had positive experiences. As with the other forms of bias, multiple sources of data and questions asking specific examples helped mitigate the risk of this bias.

Overall, the team mitigated all of these biases by clearly discussing the intentions of the evaluation with key informants and by using multiple sources of data for analysis. By combining information found in

paralegals (output 2.1) and legal awareness sessions (output 2.2) implemented through two local implementing partners, Thazin and LCM, with both activities far exceeding their targets (paralegal trainings exceed the target of training 300 paralegals by training 406 and awareness raising sessions exceed the target of training 450 community representatives by training 2,926). These legal empowerment activities

It was initially envisaged that the trainings were to be conducted by IRC in two Rakhine locations and by PDI in one Muslim location. However, due to the access challenge of IRC, trainings were conducted by PDI in all three locations within one month in September 2019, although it was originally planned to provide the training over six months to reach the targeted beneficiaries and sufficiently cover the training components in all three levels. The

d Œ] v] v P Á • ‰ Œ } À] Ç š Á } } (h E W [•] u ‰ o u] v P ‰ Œ š v Œ • U participants, the IPs went to villages and informed the Village Tract Administrators (VTAs) and CSOs about the training. Those interested were able to apply to attend the training, which was for a total of 5 days and covered basic legal concepts and various issues related to land cases, including rules and procedures, instruction on how to complete forms and information about which institutions can provide which services.

In focus groups discussions conducted with some beneficiaries of the paralegal training course, all participants expressed their level of satisfaction with the course. They informed that they shared the knowledge they had gained in their communities and that as a result of the training, their level of knowledge and understanding of land issues and how to resolve them increased significantly (this is evidenced by the pre- and post-training evaluation forms). There is a causal link between the provision of training and increase in knowledge, and the subsequent increase in requests for assistance on GBV and land related issues, indicating increased access to justice as a result of better awareness of rights and service provision (see for example the success story). There is demand for additional training. It is noted that part of the reason for the over-achievement of this target was that project funds were transferred from output 1.1 to this output.

Recommendation

take organized training mate

Effectiveness When assessing the effectiveness of activities against the indica

Overall		13/16

Legend:
1 = Unsuccessful
2 = Partially successful
3 = Successful
4 = Very successful

3.3 Outcome 3 *Women's access to local justice, peace and policy-making mechanisms increased.*

This outcome was a joint outcome between both Agencies, with UNDP focusing on justice coordination and provision of Free Legal Aid (FLA), and UNFPA focusing on social cohesion and peacebuilding. This outcome contains three outputs with 11 indicators, two at the outcome level and nine at the output level.

With regards to the outcome level indicators, UNDP aimed to develop two joint justice sector plans and actions as a result of increased coordination in the sector, combined with increased data analysis and public consultation. The project worked with the Rakhine Coordination Body (RCB) and Rakhine Legal Aid Board to be more inclusive to vulnerable groups. Due to internal issues within the RCB, the project was not able to achieve this target and zero joint justice sectors plans were developed.

PBF project, as an alternative platform for bringing together justice stakeholders throughout the justice chain.

Finding: The evaluation team finds that these activities were too premature for the lifespan of the PBF project and required more time to secure government buy-in and commitment and stakeholder interest.

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Assessment	Ranking
Relevance	While the evaluation team finds that this output was relevant at t national level, at the local level they were not adjusted to the lifespan of the project in order to ensure full stakeholder buy-in and commitment.	2
Effectiveness	With regards to effectiveness, the evaluation team finds that t output was unable to implement the activities as planned and t was not effective.	1
Efficiency	Very few resources were allocated to UNDP under this output they were able to fully deliver the $7000 that was allocated $43,000 was allocated to UNFPA under this output but since UNI were not responsible for implementing any of the activities, it is clear to the evaluation team where the $40,837 delivered w spent.	2
Sustainability	Because the activities were not implemented as planned, the evaluation team cannot assess sustainability aspects	N/A
Overall	This was one of the least successful outputs implemented by project, largely due to the lack of government buy-in and stakeholder commitment generated through the lifespan of t project. This is reflected in the low score.	5/12

Legend:
1 = Unsuccessful
2 = Partially successful
3 = Successful
4 = Very successful

Output 3.3: *Women and vulnerable groups are more aware of their rights and empowered to demand accessible and equitable legal services and participate in local justice and decision-making mechanisms*

This output was focused on four main activities, men and boys participating in social behavioural change and gender equality programmes and increasing the participation of women in decision making processes under UNFPA; and conducting community forums, legal discussions outreach activities, and provision of legal information, counselling and/or representation under UNDP.

With regards to activities focused on social and behavioural change of men and boys, UNFPA conducted two main activities, through its partner, IRC.

addition, UNFPA reached a total of 1,440 men and boys who participated in GBV information and SRHR education sessions across 8 locations in 6 IDP camps and 2 Rakhine villages. Each of these locations had a prevention hall where people convene for different purposes and the approach is similar to that of the coffee and tea sessions. For example, the topic could be on safety and security and then GBV is gently introduced and the participants are trained on their role and responsibility preventing GBV and how they can support women to access care and services etc.

A rapid assessment of the coffee and tea sessions undertaken in June 2017, showed initial progress towards attitudinal and behavioural changes, which IRC confirmed during KII has continued

Rapid Assessment of Coffee and Tea Sessions conducted in June 2017
Male participant: Before I attended the session, I used to be quite violent and aggressive to my family very often. And only after participating in the session, I began to change my behaviour and ways of treating to my family and friends into more friendly and better ways. And I have become more polite and respectful in dealing with people and also become aware of how to communicate and deal with people in more mutually respectful ways. Male participant: I explained everything I learned to the people and my family by inviting them to discussions and meetings. I also explained about equal rights and opportunities between men and women and explained that we should not have any problems and violence in the family, and that we should give equal opportunities for education to our children regardless of sex, and that women should have access to education, employment and going out for trainings and meetings

Finding: The evaluation team finds that the coffee and tea sessions and the information and education

Finding: The evaluation team finds that the provisi

The evaluation team notes that there was no exit strategy or sustainability strategy provided in the project document. Because the project was PBF funded, the funds were used as seed funds for conducting pilot activities, the result of which the agencies could showcase for attracting additional donor interest and mobilising resources for a full-fledged programme. In this sense the project was successful and this is discussed further below in lessons learnt. Despite this, the evaluation team finds that during the lifespan of the PBF project there was limited local ownership of activities and no real consideration was given to achieving this or to identifying any financial and economic resources that may be available to sustain the benefits achieved by the project. That said, both agencies implemented activities that contributed to sustainability. For example, UNFPA supported extensive capacity building of PDI as a local CSO, including through conducting a needs assessment, designing a capacity building plan focusing on both organisation development and strengthening the skills and knowledge of PDI on GBV. UNDP similarly supported extensive capacity building of Thazin and LCM and achieved a degree of sustainability through impact, such as obtaining land titles, challenging GBV abuses through legal systems and establishing 3 legal clinics, which are operating and receiving referrals. These capacity building efforts were conducted with a view to making the organisations more sustainable, effected,

In addition to the lack of consultation, there was a lack of assessment and analysis of the local context, including detailed situation analysis, baseline assessment, stakeholder analysis and political economy analysis, further contributing to the overly ambitious nature of the project design, and its lack of adherence to the reality on the ground. Neither was there a continuous process of political economy context analysis throughout the implementation of the project.

The indicators were largely quantitative indicators based on the achievement of activities. This resulted in the situation whereby if the project was evaluated solely on the basis of its indicators, it would be assessed as having failed on nearly every indicator, as it succeeded in meeting or exceeding only 7/31 indicators. The focus on largely quantitative, activity-based indicators resulted in the monitoring system being overly burdensome and being unable to capture progress that the project made in terms of progress towards the outcomes and the impact. While some indicators were modified during the project implementation period, they were modified rather than being changed substantially and remained

international organisations were not present in the State and provided assistance to the most vulnerable groups when other organisations were unable to assist.

d Z W & (µ v ‰ Œ } i š Z • v] v • š Œ µ u v š o] v š o Ç •] v P } š Z h

introducing mechanisms that will allow it to under

both UNDP and UNFPA signed separate agreements with each partner. Consideration should be given to having one agreement with all of the implementing partners (per agency), which sets out a clear •šŒ š PÇ v À]•]}v • Á oo • Z ‰ ŒšvïŒ[ŒÇ]vÀ]µ contribute ‰}v•] to increased communication, coordination and knowledge sharing among the partners. A number of partners commented that opportunities were missed because this approach was not taken, and because mandates were overlapping, without a clear strategy or shared vision.

ANNEX 1 Evaluation Matrix

Evaluation Matrix

[redacted]

rts (MOHS)
Office of the
General

of Ethnic

of Home

vernmental
ations
ational Rescue
ee (IRC)
and
ment
(PDI)
Clinic
r (LCM)
Legal Aid
ational Legal
ion (ILF)
ational
ment Law
ation (IDLO)
oe Tech (KK

ncies
PBF project
e of law team,
anagement
At staff
in PBF

	- To what extent did the Project have an impact on the targeted population, in particular, women, GBV survivors, minorities? - What was the intervention coverage t have the planned geographic areas and target groups been successfully reached? - What were the constraining and facilitating factors and the influence of the context on the achievement of results? - In what way did the Project come up with innovative measures for problem solving? - What good practices or successful experiences or transferable examples were identified? - To what extent did the Project help to	*What are the direct and indirect results (a both outcomes and impact level) of the project implementation and their sustainability? *How does the project complement/overlap with other UNDP, UNFPA and UN initiatives?	results orientated monitoring reports, field visit reports *Implementing partners progress reports			*Fact checking by UNDP/UNFPA comment and feedback to evaluation team

	increase stakeholder/citizen dialogue and/or engagement on peacebuilding protection and development issues and policies?					
Outcome 1 Protection and participation of marginalized women, including IDP women and survivors of GBV, strengthened to support increased civic engagement and inter-communal dialogue	- To what extent did the implemented activities deviate from what was originallyenvisaged? - What were the reasons for a shift away from transitional justice elements? - In what way has indicator 1.1 been achieved as reported in the Final Project Report? - What tools were used to measure the improvement of Á } u v [• ‰ Œ					

Local inter-communal consultations and dialogue, that include women priorities on peace and reconciliation, GBV and access to justice, including transitional justice, fostered as part of the national peace process and SR1325	output 1 modified during the project implementation? - What were the underlying causes for this? -

					Activated virtual platform for information on job opportunities and service delivery and social cohesion dialogues (UNFPA) Indicator 1.3.5: # of women with increased capacity to utilize ICT to support access to information including legal advice and services (UNFPA)	
Outcome 2 Values, skills and knowledge of local communities and justice actors to provide gender and conflict sensitive mediation and resolutions, enhanced	- How it the virtual platform under this outcome different from the online platform envisaged under outcome 1? - What were the constraining factors preventing rollout of the virtual platform? - How were project activities adjusted to address this? - What criteria were used for assessing compliance with fair	- How did the project obtain baseline and endline data pertaining to indicator 2.3? - How did the project increase capacities of targeted beneficiaries with regards to GBV gender awareness, Ro v Á } u v [• Œ] P A2J?	*National policy documents including relevant strategies and action plans, in particular the RAC Recommendations *UNDP/UNFPA Strategic Documents *PBF Project Document *PBF Progress Reports *PBF Quality Assurance report,	· Document review · Site and field visits · Stakeholder interviews · Independent external research and reports · Focus groups · Email, phone and Skype follow-up where necessary · Interviews with stakeholders as detailed above · Implementing	Indicator 2.1: Number of sectoral and intersectoral gender-based violence response and prevention guidelines adopted relating to the use of virtual platforms (UNFPA) Indicator 2.2: % of UNDP attended trials in compliance with fair trial	

	trial standards? - How were courts and cases selected for assessment?		results orientated monitoring reports, field visit reports *Implementing partners progress reports	partners reports	Indicator 2.3: % of men and women (including lawyers, community leaders, government officials, etc.) who show/state an increased understanding of RoL, SGBV, gender equality and Á}u v[•Œ]P and barriers to Á}u v[•• justice (UNDP)	*Fact checking by UNDP/UNFPA comment and feedback to evaluation team
Output 2.1 Enhanced aptitude and skills of local justice institutions and security providers to uphold human rights and improve access to justice for women, ethnic groups and other	- What were the constraints preventing the development of SOPs and ISPs? - How was the project able to adapt to overcome this? - What referral mechanisms exist for women and other vulnerable groups? Was the project able to enhance these referral mechanisms	- How did the work with paralegals under this output complement the activities with paralegals under outcome 1? - Which government officials were trained and on which topics? - Were pre and post training evaluations undertaken and if so what were the results of these? - Has any follow-up	*National policy documents including relevant strategies and action plans, in particular the RAC Recommendations *UNDP/UNFPA Strategic Documents *PBF Project Document *PBF Progress Reports *PBF Quality	· Document review · Site and field visits · Stakeholder interviews · Independent external research and reports · Focus groups · Email, phone and Skype follow-up where necessary · Interviews with stakeholders as detailed above	Indicator 2.1.1: Number of areas covered by Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) and Information Sharing Protocols (ISP) for GBV survivors between protection partners and law enforcement sector (UNDP) Indicator 2.1.2:	*Qualitative and quantitative data analysis *Data synthesis *Descriptive statistical analysis *Process tracing *Triangulation *Discussion of data amongst the Review Team *Verification of data with

vulnerable groups, including survivors of GBV		in any way? - Why was it not feasible to establish a ROLC and what was the process that led to this decision? - What were the

			reports			

Output 3.1

needs	reasons that the CB only met twice during the project implementation period? Were there any outcomes from this meeting? How did the project address this? - Have any initiatives been developed by communities to address WA2J and rights? If so what were they and what successes/challenges have they had?	women? Who were these findings shared with and how were they used to address women's justice priority needs?	*PBF Project Document *PBF Progress Reports *PBF Quality Assurance report, results orientated monitoring reports, field visit reports *Implementing partners progress reports	Skype follow-up where necessary Interviews with stakeholders as detailed above Implementing partners reports	# of actions/ initiatives jointly developed by communities and

local justice and decision-making mechanisms	families? - What mechanisms are in place to track Á } u v [• participation in decision-making processes? How did the project measure the pre-	famrepJ 2Trts

expected results	for-money, and effectiveness of implementation strategies and overal

	the initiatives forward? * Did the project have an exit strategy? . * Were initiatives designed to have sustainable results given the identifiable risks?	project activities? *Were relevant stakeholders included in the development of the project?	reports			

12. Overall, which were the most important or relevant changes you have noticed as a result of the project?

Interview questions for Implementing Partners

1. Please elaborate your cooperation with the project.
2. In which outcome area have your organization partnered with the project?
3. In your view, did the project design address the context, needs and priority of intended target groups?
4. Have any planned activities not been implemented and if so, what have been the biggest

ANNEX 3: List of interviews conducted

UNDP Yangon

- Wouter Thiebou, Civil Society Partnerships Coordinator, SARL
- Thomas Crick, SARL Project Manager
- Joerg Stahlhut, Programme Advisor / Chief of Unit, Governance and Sustainable Peace
- Sujeeta Shakya Bajracharya, Quality Assurance and Reporting Specialist
- Chifarai Dube, Gender Specialist

UNDP Nay Pyi Taw

- Scott Ciment, Chief Technical Adviser (RoL)

UNDP Sittwe

- Sarah Mcguckin, d1rah Mcguckin, d1rah

- Chinyelumugo Okoh, Field Program Manager

Thazin Legal Aid, Sittwe

- Nyein Chan, Program Director
- Myat The Khine, Legal Officer
- B Htoo, M&E Officer

Legal Clinic Myanmar, Sittwe

- U Zaw Min Than, Senior Program Officer
- U Nyunt Maung, Advocate / Branch Head of Kyauk Phyu
- U Khine Lin, Senior Program Officer / Advocate
- U Tun Myat Lin, Senior Program Officer

International Legal Foundation (ILF), Sittwe

- U Nyi Nyi Aung, Finance & Administration Officer
- U Nay Min Soe, Lawyer
- Daw Nan Zinmar Aung, Lawyer
- Daw Thein Tan May, Paralegal / Translator

Peace and Development Initiative (PDI), Sittwe

- Myo Ma Aye, Project Officer
- Zaw Win Nai, CEP Coordinator
- Ma Than Htay, Project Assistant
- Aung Paing, Project Assistant
- Myat Myat Oo, Case Worker

Sittwe High Court, Judges and Court Staff

- U Sein Kyaw Phyu, Assistant Director
- U Maung than, Staff Officer
- Daw Khine Mar Htun, Clerk
- Daw Marlar Tin, Clerk

Sittwe Advocate General Office

- U Kyaw Hla Htun, State Advocate General
- U Kyaw Min Naing, Head of Office
- U Win Maw, State Law Officer
- Daw Myat Myat San, Deputy District Law Officer
- U Than Htun Myint, Township Law Officer
- U Htun Sein, Township Law Officer

UNDP / IDLO RoL Foundation Course Participants

- Ma Thet, UNFPA consultant, former UNDP
- Ma Hla Ye, Teacher, PBS Private High School
- U San Lin, Lawyer, Bar Association, CB member

µ Zaw Zaw Min, Lawyer, Bar Association

Output 2.2: Local capacities for gender and conflict sensitive mediation, dispute and conflict resolution enhanced	Same as original	Output Indicator 2.2.1 : % of locations in Sittwe Township where functional service provision for mediation, dispute and conflict resolution are accessible for women and vulnerable groups Baseline: 0 Target: 33%	Indicator 2.2.1: # of mediators trained on basic mediation skills (UNDP) Baseline: 0 Target: 20
		Output Indicator 2.2.2: Training curriculum developed on conflict and gender sensitive mediation and resolutions and implemented Baseline: 0 Target: 1	Indicator 2.2.2: Training curriculum developed on rule of law, human rights, SGBV and conflict & gender sensitive mediation (UNDP) Baseline: 0 Target: 1
		Output Indicator 2.2.3: # of government officials trained by UNDP on social cohesion and conflict sensitivity Baseline: 0 Target: 100	Indicator 2.2.3: # of government officials trained by UNDP

normalization of gender based violence and extensive socio-cultural norms and structural barriers, the space a
‰]šÇ (}Œ Á}u v[• ‰ Œš]]‰ š]}vU]v oµ]vP]v o} o ‰ ‰Œ}
evident upon analysis of vu v[• ‰}o]š] o Œ ‰Œ • vš š]}v v]À] ‰ Œš]]‰
elected to the Rakhine State Parliament in 2015, and only three were elected from Rakhine State constitue
the Union Parliament in Naypyitaw. There are currently no female administrators (i.e. Village Tract, Townsh
District Administrators) in the state, though women do sometimes hold more junior civil service positions.
also emphasized in the 2015-2016 Myanmar Demographic Health Survey (MDHS) which identifies Rakhine as
state where Myanmar women experience the highest levels of spousal violence and the second highest l
physical violence and sexual violence in the country.

The lack of participation and normalization of gender based violence is compounded by a weak justice sys
characterized by a judiciary which is perceived to be not fully independent, impartial and effective[11] and weak
representation of minority communities in government structures.[12] This furthe Œ µv Œu]v • šZ P
ability to uphold the rule of law and protect and uphold human rights for the traditionally vulnerable
]• À vš P PŒ}µ‰•]v oµ]vP Á}u vX t}u v[• •• š} iµ•š] U ‰ (
this is also corroborated by the lack of cases which are managed and resolved by the justice system. Wid
distrust of the state justice system among minority communities, corruption and gender bias, the high[13] cost of legal
fees, lengthy trial delays and language barriers for non-Myanmar speakers are factors which deter survivors fr
seeking redress through the formal state justice system.[14] To compound the lack of access to justice, informal
u Z v]•u• Z Œ š} ‰ šŒ] Œ Z o v}Œ u •v cess &uoŒ šZ justice Œ]Œ ay also Áb e v[ived
an action in opposition to their ethnic identity.

Target beneficiaries: Rakhine citizens, in particular women and other vulnerable groups, including e
minorities.
Partners:
Government: Office of the Attorney General (UAGO), Office of the Supreme Court of the Union (OSCU), Minis
Soci[( )]161. [(Soci[( )]4l(e)4(o)62(f)4(actn)-3(cRe-3(Ml] T ET Q 4(s)-9(e)4(xu)-Rle)5(v4(ic)t75(grou)-(t: Off

To what extent have stakeholders been involved in project implementation?
To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to the needs of the national constituents and changing partner priorities?
To what extent has the project contributed to gender equality, the empowerment of women and the realization of human rights?

3. Efficiency
To what extent was the project management structure as outlined in the project document efficient in generating the expected results?
To what extent has the project implementation strategy and execution been efficient and cost-effective?
To what extent has there been an economical use of financial and human resources? Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise, etc.) been allocated strategically to achieve outcomes?
To what extent have resources been used efficiently? Have activities supporting the strategy been cost-effective?
To what extent have project funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner?
To what extent do the M&E systems utilized ensure effective and efficient project management?

4.

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

DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Scope of evaluation

which would include conducting Key Informant Interviews (KII) and Focus Group Discussions (FGD) as ap
with key stakeholders (e.g. UNDP, UNFPA, implementing partners, Government counterparts).

Institutional Arrangement

Evaluation Reference Group: In order to maximize the credibility, relevance and utility of the evaluation proc
and the resulting report, the PBF ensures the participation of key stakeholders through different ways in
the establishment of an ERG. The Peace and Development Adviser, UN Res
Secretary of the ERG, in partnership with UNDP and UNFPA. The ERG, an advisory body, will provide a
board for the FIE team while protecting its independence. The ERG will support the conduct of the eva
including to: provide feedback to the evaluation team on the inception report; participate in the final re
validation; provide comments on the draft; ensure distribution of the final report, and; initiate implementatio
its recommendations.

The
1. Both UNDP and UNFPA will each nominate an Evaluation Focal Point
2. Day to day communication and coordination will be exercised between the FIE team lead
ERG Secretary, the UNDP and UNFPA evaluation focal points, and the Chief of Governance a
Sustaining Peace Unit.
3. The UNDP and UNFPA evaluation focal points will be responsible for facilitating data ava
to the FIE and data collection in Myanmar, including scheduling and logistics, and
coordinate assignment-related travel.
4. The team will otherwise work independently.
5. Other arrangements including consulting days per team member and schedule of paymer
be defined in individual contracts.

UNDP will provide the required logistical support (vehicle, arranging meetings, etc).

The International Consultant will be selected based on the following criteria:

Educational Qualifications:

D •š Œ[• P Œ }Œ ‹µ]À o vš]v o Á U À o}‰u vš •šµ] •U ‰} conflict orother related fields

Address: Kozjacka 23A, Belgrade, 11040, Serbia
Tel: 00381 (0) 61 1344 253
Email:joannalbrooks@gmail.com
Skype: joannalbrooks

International Expert t Programme Development t Civil Registry Reform t UNDP Tajikistan, Apr 2019 Sept 2019, Key output: to produce a fully developed project document for the second phase of the Civil Registry Reform Project and to support resource mobilisation efforts.

International Expert t Impact Evaluation and Functional Review: Access to Justice t UNDP Afghanistan, February 2019 t May 2019, to conduct an impact evaluation of the Access to Justice project together with functional reviews of the Legal Aid Department of the Ministry of Justice and the Afghan Independent Bar Association

International Expert t Programme Development t HELVETAS Swiss Intercooperation, Tajikistan, Sept 2018 t June 2019, to elaborate a number of Concept Notes, project Documents and Full Grant Proposals for different donors including EU, DFID, UN on improving migration management, access to justice, and mediation

International Expert t Programme development t UN Women, Albania, Jun 2018 t Oct 2018, Key responsibilities: Provide project development, design and implementation support and implement strategies to raise awareness

Programme Advisor: Human Rights & Access to Justice, UNDP Serbia, Oct 2008 t Apr 2010, Provision of policy
À] • } Œ Ç • Œ À] • š } v • µ Œ š Z } v š] v µ] u ‰ o u v š š] } v v (µ š µ Œ À
to justice programme

Policy Analyst, Judicial Training Centre, Serbia, Oct 2008 t Jun 2009, Developing the capacities of this national partner through advising on the establishment and strengthening of regional mechanisms of cross-borders co-operation amongst judicial training organisations

Independent Expert on Human Rights & Access to Justice, UNDP Bratislava Regional Centre, Oct 2008 t Feb 2009, Provision of advice and expertise to strengthen regional capacities on human rights and justice issues;

Judicial Training and Research Advisor, UNDP Serbia, Feb 2006 t Jun 2008, Responsible for all judicial training and
Œ • Œ Z • ‰ š • } (h E W [• i µ]] o Œ (} Œ u v Œ µ o } (o Á š ‰] } ( ] o] } U
and transitional justice.

Project Coordinator Judicial Education in Development Turn Guide, UNDP Serbia, Nov 2004 t Nov 2005, Creating the Judicial Education for Development: Turn Guide, a groundbreaking learning resource tool which provides a step-by-step guide in establishing a judicial training institution in accordance with internationally recognized standards and best practice.

Legal and Human Rights Programme Manager, International Alliances, FR Yugoslavia, Croatia, FYR Macedonia, Mar 2001 t

Aye Myat Thu t Curriculum Vitae

Email:ayemyatthu2000@gmail.com
Mobile: +959 42 114 8686
Skype: aye.myat.thu83

EDUCATION

Master of Arts (MA), Development and Governance, 2014
University of Duisburg-Essen, Germany

Master of Development Studies, 2008
Yangon Institute of Economics, Myanmar

Diploma in International Relations, 2008
University of Yangon, Myanmar

Bachelor of Science: Computing and Information Systems, 2004

Strengthening Project and Programme Monitoring, *European Commission, 12/2014*
Logical Framework Approach, *European Commission*, 12/2014
Organizational Development, *Crown Agents. 2/2010*