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 – 30 September 2019
Evaluation period: 20 January 2020 – 28 February 2020

Date submitted: 4 March 2020

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

Table of Contents

Acronyms

A2J	Access to Justice
AA	Arakan Army
AGO	Advocate General's Office
CBO	Community-based Organization
CEDAW	Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women
CPD	Country Programme Document
CRSV	Conflict Related Sexual Violence
CSO	Civil Society Organization
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
DSW	Department of Social Welfare, Relief and Resettlement

EAO	Ethnic Armed Organizations
ET	Evaluation Team
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
FLA	Free Legal Aid
GAD	General Administration Department
GBV	Gender-based Violence
GII	Gender Inequality Index
GoM	Government of Myanmar
HDI	Human Development Index
HRBA	Human Rights Based Approach
IDLO	International Development Law Organization
IDP	Internally Displaced Person
ILF	International Legal Foundation
IP	Implementing Partner
IPV	Intimate Partner Violence
ISP	Information Sharing Protocol
IRC	International Rescue Committee
KKT	Koe Koe Tech
LCM	Legal Clinic Myanmar
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MDHS	Myanmar Demographic Health Survey
MOHS	Ministry of Health and Sports
MSDP	Myanmar Sustainable Development Plan
MSWRR	Ministry of Social Welfare, Relief and Resettlement
NCA	Nationwide Ceasefire Agreement
NGO	Non-Government Organization
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
OSCU	Office of the Supreme Court of the Union
PBF	United Nations Peacebuilding Fund
PDI	Peace and Development Initiative
RAC	Rakhine Advisory Commission
RCB	Rakhine Coordination Body
ROL	Rule of Law
ROLC	Rule of Law Centre
SARL	Strengthening Accountability and Rule of Law
SDC	Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation

SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
SGBV	Sexual and Gender-based Violence
SOP	Standard Operating Procedure
SRHR	Sexual Reproductive Health and Rights
ToR	Terms of Reference
ToT	Training of Trainer
UAGO	Union Attorney General's Office
UN	United Nations
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNDSS	United Nations Department of Safety and Security
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
VTA	Village Tract Administrator
WA2J	Women's Access to Justice
WJP	World Justice Project

Executive Summary

This evaluation is a final evaluation of the UNDP and UNFPA implemented Peacebuilding Fund (PBF) project in Rakhine State and covers the full implementation period of the project from April 2018 – September 2019. The objectives of the evaluation were to assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the project while also considering the impact of the project's interventions. The outcome of the evaluation will be used to inform the planning and implementation of future peacebuilding activities in Rakhine and/or Myanmar more generally. The evaluation team followed best practice and adopted a methodology that combined desk review and document research followed by a data gathering process and combined analytical approaches during the synthesis phase. The largest focus of the evaluation was on gathering qualitative data from project partners and beneficiaries to inform the evaluation findings and recommendations. In total the evaluation team met with 67 individuals and conducted 6 focus group discussions with a total of 26 project beneficiaries, which lends to the validity of the report.

The evaluation team found that despite the overly ambitious design of the project given the local context, and short 18-month implementation period, the project managed to achieve some impressive results and successfully addressed the identified drivers of conflict - a lack of women's empowerment and access to justice. It contributed to the peacebuilding process by working with different communities and had considerable catalytic impact on both UNDP and UNFPA's programming. Key results were identified in terms of expanding the capacities of the project's implementing partners and empowering women and girls as well as boys and men in raising their awareness on gender-based violence (GBV) and strengthening their access to justice through the provision of legal advice, counselling and representation. In order to identify these results and successes, the evaluation team had to assess the project beyond the scope of the results framework, which did not adequately capture the positive results and impact that the project made.

The project team inherited an overly ambitious project considering the short timeframe, in particularly when programming on such sensitive issues as gender based violence and conflict related sexual violence (CRSV) in the most conflicted affected State in Myanmar. This was a critical element as working with government on GBV proved to be extremely challenging as the Rakhine State Government felt under attack when speaking about GBV. Further, they were not being able to make the distinction between GBV (often IPV) and Conflict Related Sexual Violence conducted by military or armed groups. Especially in the aftermath of the events in 2017 this has had a huge impact on UNFPA's overall GBV programming in Rakhine State including the PBF project. There was a lack of robust analysis at the design stage, which resulted in an unfeasible results framework consisting of 3 outcomes, 8 outputs and 31 indicators with largely overly ambitious, quantitative targets. There was a lack of baseline data and a lack of flexibility to reprioritise the programmatic strategy and implementation approach considering the changing context. In the time between the design of the project during the first half of 2017 and the beginning of the implementation of the project from April 2018, the context in Rakhine State had changed dramatically. In August 2017, violence erupted as a result of a coordinated attack on dozens of police posts and an army by Rohingya insurgents. As a result of a series of violent clashes in the northern part of Rakhine State, an estimated 700,000 refugees fled the state to neighbouring Bangladesh. Further, the context was ever changing during the 18-month lifespan of the project (April 2018 – September 2019). For example, since the end of 2018, there was a significant upsurge in violence in Rakhine after armed conflict broke out between the Arakan Army (AA) and Myanmar Military.

The evaluation team was informed that within three months of the start of the project implementation, the process of revising the results framework and budget began because they were deemed unfeasible given the ever-changing operational context. PBF advised both Agencies that in the scope of the PBF rules, the project had to remain within 15 per cent changes to budget. However this resulted in only minor adjustments to the indicators and budget, which were accepted in January 2019. Despite this, UNDP and UNFPA were able to make some gains, by shifting resources to activities where the project

was clearly gaining traction. However, when assessed against the results framework, the project was not successful. PBF rules did not allow for a sufficient revision in scope or activities during the project implementation period and while they do allow for a revision of scope and activities during any project extension, government sign off is required for this, which was not forthcoming within the framework of this project. This raises the question as to whether the PBF rules are adequately set up for an adaptive approach.

The evaluators find that the PBF project required a structure that was as adaptive and fluid as the local context within which it was being implemented. The conflict dynamics in Rakhine were not static and did not take a linear path, meaning that the project should have been able to swiftly and appropriately adjust to the changes that it was faced with. However, despite the Agencies seeking to substantially revise the results framework and budget, the PBF mechanisms did not allow for sufficient flexibility, largely due to the requirement for a non-adaptive logframe. The PBF project was thus not equipped to make course changes and better reflect the realities within which it was operating. This does not detract from the achievements of the project or the catalytic impact that the PBF funds produced.

Despite the challenging context and the overly ambitious design of the project, both agencies were able to achieve considerable results and successes, which are either not captured sufficiently, or at all, by the logframe, and were able to address the drivers of conflict through strengthening women's access to justice and empowering them with a voice, as well as knowledge and skills, to access services to resolve their land and GBV related issues. These include the capacity building successes with regards to local implementing partners, and assisting people in resolving their legal issues through the provision of free legal advice and assistance. Beneficiaries of the rule of law training courses from the AGO and the High Court reported that they have been able to apply the knowledge they gained through the training courses into their everyday work, in particular with regards to their increased knowledge of international standards on fair trial standards, as well as on human rights issues. More targeted referrals have been made through the GBV network as a result of both the awareness raising and capacity development initiatives conducted by UNFPA and its implementing partners. The tangible outputs of the project in terms of training manuals, course materials, curricula, and the IT platform/application have been tested, finalised and piloted, with the potential for further expansion and roll-out during future programming, both in Rakhine State and elsewhere throughout the country.

The evaluation team finds that the PBF funds were catalytic in that the PBF project laid the groundwork for both UNDP and UNFPA's further peacebuilding programming in Rakhine State and built trust among implementing partners and beneficiaries that could be capitalised on for future activities. The project was implemented at a time when other international organisations were not present in the State, and provided assistance to the most vulnerable groups when other organisations were unable to assist. The PBF funded project has been instrumental in catalysing both UNDP and UNFPA's peacebuilding programming in Rakhine, in attracting additional donor interest, and in mobilising additional resources for continued programming. While it is difficult to attribute directly, the PBF project contributed to the mobilisation of resources of the Government of Canada towards the Rakhine Area Based Programme with a contract value of 14 million CAD for UNDP and towards Phase II of the Women and Girls First programme for UNFPA, which has a total value of US$25m. Crucially, it also resulted in the successful mobilisation of resources for implementing partners including Koe Koe Tech, Peace Development Initiative (PDI), Thazin and Legal Clinic Myanmar (LCM). Further, the PBF project resulted in jumpstarting other peacebuilding processes conducted by both Agencies within their wider programmatic frameworks and identified areas for the implementation of joint activities with additional UN Agencies, such as UN Women. Through laying the groundwork, the PBF project enabled the expansion of activities during phase 2, for example, the Women's Access to Land, Property and Inheritance Rights seminar and the Women's Access to Justice symposium, both arose as a direct result of the PBF programming, while other activities have been continued under each agencies' wider programming framework.

Key recommendations include conducting robust analysis and assessment, together with a participatory, consultative process to feed into an informed project design with a 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 perspective, it is recommended that both Agencies consider moving to a more adaptive style of management, in 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 changes. Similarly, it is recommended that the PBF mechanisms adopts a more adaptive approach by allowing for the swift adjustment of activities, operations, plans, and strategies based on the changing context. Applying a human rights based approach, with closer government engagement is key to working with service providers. This should be mainstreamed so that any future project works both with service providers in terms of strengthening their capacities to deliver transparent, accountable, equitable and quality services, and with rights-holders to raise awareness of their rights and develop their capacities to demand their rights. Different methods of engaging with partners should also be considered to ensure a more participatory approach.

When assessed against OECD/DAC criteria, the project design was certainly **relevant** at the national level, in that it was aligned with national and state level priorities, notably the Final Report of the Advisory Commission on Rakhine State; the Myanmar Sustainable Development Plan: Pillar 1, the Economic policy of the Union of Myanmar and the National Strategic Plan for the Advancement of Women. It was further in line with UNDAF and both UNDP's and UNFPA's CPD and PBF's Strategic Plan 2017-2019, and contributed to the advancement of the Sustainable Development Goals, in particular SDGs 16, 10 and 5. However, due to the lack of context and political and economy analysis undertaken at the project design stage, lack of baseline assessment and without a participatory consultation phase, combined with the fluid context, the project design was overly ambitious.

In terms of **effectiveness**, the evaluation team found that some activities were highly effective and where the project was able to make gains and successes was where it was able to be responsive, adaptive and flexible given the realities of the operational context. The evaluation team finds that the project was **efficient** overall, with a delivery rate of 95 per cent from UNDP and 94 per cent from UNFPA, largely due to the Agencies being able to make efficiency gains through shifting resources from less successful activities to those where successes were being made. The delivery rate is particularly impressive given the challenging context and overly ambitious project design with which the project teams were faced.

With regards to **sustainability**, while the project activities have largely been absorbed into UNDP and UNFPA's larger programmatic frameworks, within which the PBF project was situated, (the Strengthening Accountability and Rule of Law (SARL) project and Women and Girls First Programme respectively,) this does not address the long-term sustainability of the project activities, but moreover is a continuation of those activities. While an exit strategy and sustainability aspects were not addressed in the project document, 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. Both Agencies are now adapting their work to build on what was put in place through the PBF project.

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 78/124 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 funds. 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 Thiebou from UNDP and Janneke Bienert from UNFPA, for their kind assistance and facilitation throughout the final evaluation process.

In addition, the evaluation team would like to thank all persons interviewed during the evaluation in both Yangon and Sittwe, including government and judicial representatives, implementing partner organisations and beneficiaries for their openness and willingness to share information with us.

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.

Myanmar's Human Development Index (HDI) value for 2018 is 0.584— which put the country in the 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 2018 index. In Myanmar, women hold 10.2 per cent of parliamentary seats, and 28.7 per cent of adult women have reached at least a secondary level of education compared to 22.3 per cent of their male counterparts. For every 100,000 live births, 178.0 women die from pregnancy related causes; and the adolescent birth rate is 28.5 births per 1,000 women of ages 15-19. Female participation in the labour market is 47.7 per cent compared to 77.3 for men.[1]

Myanmar is regarded as one of the most ethnically diverse countries in the world. There are 135 officially recognized ethnic groups, which are grouped into eight[2] major ethnic nationalities. Myanmar has been subject to decades of inter-ethnic conflict. On 15th October 2015, the Government of Myanmar (GoM) and eight out of fifteen Ethnic Armed Organizations (EAOs) invited for peace talks signed a Nationwide Ceasefire Agreement (NCA) signalling the start of a new effort for political dialogue to end the country's armed conflict. A few years later, on 13 February 2018, two EAOs signed the NCA and joined the multilateral peace negotiation. The peace process faces challenges in ensuring an inclusive and flexible approach that is acceptable to all parties involved in the national dialogue, and the Joint Ceasefire Monitoring Committee faces some constraints in fulfilling its mandate to monitor adherence to the 2015 Nationwide Ceasefire Agreement.

As detailed in the PBF project document, the Government is committed to strengthening the country's democratic institutions by promoting accountability and transparency, and improving capacities for service delivery, integrated policy planning, coordination and analysis. The national Parliament and the state/region administrations and parliaments have been operational only since 2011 and are actively pursuing capacity building and institutional strengthening efforts. Despite the first population census in three decades and other surveys, the overall capacity of the national statistical system remains low, resulting in a deficit of reliable, disaggregated data for policy development and targeting of services.

Multiple assessments have highlighted increased vulnerability to gender-based violence (GBV) including fear of sexual assault and exploitation, domestic or intimate partner violence, and early/forced marriage.[3] The lack of women's empowerment has been clearly identified as a driver of conflict. There have been reports of violence during the conflicts, the flight, and within the current displacement situation. Although the country has ratified several international human rights instruments, notably on women, children, persons with disabilities and trafficking, the policy and legal framework need to be aligned to international conventions to adequately address GBV. Myanmar does not have specific legislation against gender based violence, although there are Penal code provisions against sexual assault and rape. Myanmar's legal framework is drawn from a mix of colonial and traditional sources. A preliminary analysis of laws conducted by the Gender Equality Network reveals that many of the laws are not compatible with the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against

---

[1] http://hdr.undp.org/sites/all/themes/hdr_theme/country-notes/MMR.pdf
[2] Kachin, Kayah, Karen (or Kayin), Chin, Mon, Burman, Rakhine (or Arakan), and Shan.
[3] Strategy and Action plan for GBV sub-sector, Multi-sectoral Prevention and Response to Gender-Based Violence (GBV) in Humanitarian settings in Myanmar, December 2013

Women (CEDAW)[4], as they incorporate restrictive gender stereotypes and are inconsistent with the promotion and protection of women's rights to substantive equality[5]. A National Human Rights Commission has been established but lacks capacity, and there is scope to encourage further convention ratifications and implementation of universal periodic review recommendations. Women continue to be underrepresented in governance institutions across all three branches of government especially at senior levels; and only 84 of over 17,000 elected ward/village tract administrators are women.[6]

The lack of participation of women and minority communities in decision making and normalization of gender-based violence is compounded by a weak justice system, characterized by a judiciary which is perceived to be not fully independent, impartial and effective and by weak representation of minority communities in government structures. The weak justice system and representation of minority groups further undermines the government's ability to uphold the rule of law and protect and uphold human rights, particularly for women and vulnerable and disadvantaged groups. Myanmar ranked 110 out of 126 countries in the World Justice Project (WJP) rule of law index 2019. The justice sector faces institutional capacity challenges and is focused on justice reform, strengthening the rule of law and improving access to justice for all. Women's access to justice, particularly in rural areas, is limited and this is also corroborated by the lack of cases, which are managed and resolved by the justice system. Widespread distrust of the state justice system among minority communities, corruption and gender bias, the high-cost of legal fees, lengthy trial delays and language barriers for non-Myanmar speakers are factors which deter survivors from seeking redress through the formal state justice system. To compound the lack of access to justice, non-formal mechanisms adhere to patriarchal norms, which do not necessarily ensure human rights of women and girls. Furthermore, women's access to formal justice may also be perceived as an action in opposition to their ethnic identity.[7] Limited access to justice, and in particular for women, is another identified driver of conflict.

1.1 Context

Situated in western Myanmar, Rakhine State is the second-most populous and second poorest state in Myanmar. Rakhine State is composed of 4 Districts and 17 Townships. Its population is estimated at 3,188,807 with 84.2% of the population living in rural areas. The state has a diverse ethnic population, with ethnic Rakhine making up the majority with a number of other ethnic minorities including those who identify themselves as Muslim residents, Kaman, Chin, Mro, Khami, Dainet and Maramagri. Muslims make up between 30-35% of the total population. Of the Muslims, a significant number self-identify as Rohingya, though they are not one of the constitutionally recognized ethnic groups nor recognized as citizens of Myanmar.

Rakhine State is culturally diverse, with cultural and social norms serving as barriers to women's access to services, information, economic opportunities as well as overall public life across both Muslim and Buddhist Rakhine communities. Women and girls are generally expected to stay in the home, take up traditional gender roles including looking after the family, elderly parents, caring for children, housework, and concerning themselves with matters of the family and the home. This in turn limits women's employment opportunities and space for them to engage in formal and informal decision-making processes at home in the family, in the community, at township and at state level.

While gender inequality is prevalent among all communities in Rakhine, Muslim women face additional gender barriers. They can be subject to more severe curtailment on their mobility outside the home,

---

[4] Myanmar acceded to CEDAW in 1997
[5] Myanmar Laws and CEDAW, Gender Equality Network, January 2013
[6] UNDP Country Programme Document for Myanmar 2018 - 2022
[7] United Nations Peacebuilding Fund, Overcoming barriers to strengthen the voices of all women in Rakhine State for social cohesion and peace, Project Document, April 2018

especially in rural areas and in camps. While there are variations based on levels of education, wealth, and urban versus rural contexts, gender segregation is generally common amongst the Muslim population in Rakhine, closely connected to conservative cultural and religious practices alongside political restriction.

The Myanmar Demographic Health Survey (MDHS) 2015-16 identifies Rakhine as the state where Myanmar women experience the highest levels of spousal violence and the second highest levels of physical violence and sexual violence in the country. Due to patriarchal power structures, widespread acceptance of gender inequality, and normalization of gender-based violence, as well as conflict related sexual violence, working on GBV is particularly sensitive and challenging in Rakhine State.

The conflict in Rakhine State is complex, with centre-periphery tensions and inter-communal conflict. It is fuelled by experiences of disenfranchisement and discrimination, chronic poverty and competition over natural and economic resources. These tensions primarily affect relations between the majority ethnic Rakhine and minority Muslim, and specifically those who identify themselves as Rohingya, communities. The tensions also extend to those between national government and ethnic Rakhine interests which are partially rooted in historic legacies as well as tensions associated with local versus central control and revenue sharing of resources. Over the past years, inter-communal tensions and conflict between ethnic Rakhine and Muslim communities have resulted in a number of serious waves of violence in 2012, 2014, 2016 which have caused mass displacements. These bouts of violence resulted in loss of life, destruction of livelihoods and public assets, and displacement, which disproportionately impacted the Muslim community. Communal violence and displacement have put the most vulnerable, especially women and children, further at risk.

At the time that the project was conceived and developed during the first half of 2017, there had been peace in Rakhine for approximately 18 months. Yet by the time the project was approved and implementation commenced, the context had already changed drastically. In August 2017, violence erupted as a result of a coordinated attack on dozens of police posts and an army by Rohingya insurgents. As a result of a series of violent clashes in the northern part of Rakhine State an estimated 500,000 refugees have fled the state to neighbouring Bangladesh.

The context was ever changing during the 18-month lifespan of the project (April 2018 – September 2019). Since the end of 2018, there has been a significant upsurge in violence in Rakhine after armed conflict broke out between the Arakan Army (AA) and Myanmar Military. The conflict has led to civilian casualties, the destruction of property, and a significant displacement of people currently estimated at more than 50,000. While fighting has occurred largely in rural areas and remote locations, key transport routes and urban and semi-urban areas have also been impacted. Tens of thousands of civilians living in villages have been caught in the middle of intense armed conflict. Due to the worsening security situation, aid organizations face challenges in getting travel authorization to access different communities in rural areas and IDP camps. The International Rescue Committee (IRC), the main implementing partner of UNFPA, was suspended by the government and thus, starting 2019, IRC no longer has access to major project sites where they have been working. Local implementing partners of UNDP also face challenges in reaching target areas and beneficiaries; Thazin Legal Aid could not reach 3 targeted Muslim camps and Legal Clinic Myanmar (LCM) faced restrictions to implement activities in 5 targeted townships that are affected by conflicts. As reported in the project progress reports submitted to PBF, some activities foreseen in the project design such as supporting local consultations and dialogue efforts on transitional justice mechanisms were unrealistic and too sensitive in the fragile context that evolved during the implementation. Instead the Agencies endeavoured to make progress where it was possible, knowing that the context was fluid but that it was possible to deliver significant work through national implementing partners.

It is within this overall context that UNDP and UNFPA designed the *Overcoming barriers to strengthen the voices of all women in Rakhine State for social cohesion and peace project* (the project). The project

was designed within a women,, peace and security and rights-based framework (Protection, Participation and Prevention pillars of SCR1325) to address the social and structural barriers that prevent women's participation and voices both in the formal peace process and in bottom up peacebuilding processes through fostering social cohesion between communities in Rakhine State, and had three outcomes:

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;

Outcome 2: Values, skills, and knowledge of local communities and justice actors to provide gender and conflict sensitive mediation and resolutions, enhanced; and

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

It is important to note that the project was developed within a short space of time in order to respond to an opportunity to receive Peacebuilding Fund (PBF) support. The PBF is the UN's financial instrument of first resort to sustain peace in countries or situations at risk or affected by violent conflict. The PBF works across pillars and supports integrated UN responses to fill critical gaps; respond quickly and with flexibility to peacebuilding opportunities; and catalyse processes and resources in a risk-tolerant fashion.[8]

1.2 Linkages of the Project with National, State and UN frameworks and strategies

The project was aligned with the national strategic and policy framework, Myanmar Sustainable Development Plan (MSDP) Pillar 1: Peace & Stability. Under MSDP this project contribute to MSDP Goal 1: Peace, National Reconciliation, Security and Good Governance and MSDP Strategy 1.3: Promote greater access to justice, individual rights and adherence to the rule of law.

This project contributed to the 12-point "Economic Policy of the Union of Myanmar" that prioritizes strengthening the rule of law (Point 7). The PBF project supported select national sectoral strategic plans, including the Judicial Strategic Plan 2015-2017 and Myanmar's National Strategic Plan for the Advancement of Women. Specific to the context in Rakhine State, the project supported the Government, to implement key recommendations of the final report of the Advisory Commission on Rakhine State to "provide adequate training to members of Rakhine's judiciary, including on: rule of law principles; fair trial and due process; accountability and transparency; mediation principles; gender sensitivity and gender equality; and international standards related to the judiciary." The project also contributed to the advancement of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in particular SDGs 16 (peace, justice and strong institutions), 5 (gender equality), and 10 (reduced inequalities), for example through addressing issue's relating to the lack of women's empowerment and lack of access to justice, in particular for women and other vulnerable groups.

Under the UNDAF 2018 – 2022, the Government has committed to the vision of building a "peaceful, prosperous and democratic Myanmar." The UNDAF partnership includes a further commitment to "strengthening the rule of law to create a fair and just society for all our people based on freedom, equal rights and self-determination, and by strengthening democratic values and norms in line with international standards" and "accountability of institutions to meaningful participation by all people in decision-making". The Peace outcome of the UNDAF is **"People in Myanmar live in a more peaceful and**

---

[8] See further https://www.un.org/peacebuilding/fund

inclusive society, governed by more democratic and accountable institutions, and benefit from strengthened human rights and rule of law protection."

The PBF project contributed to both agencies' Country Programme Documents and with the PBF Strategic Plan 2017-2019.

1.3 Objectives and Scope of the Evaluation

The PBF project document outlines that "*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*." The outcome of the evaluation will inform the planning and implementation of future peacebuilding activities in Rakhine, and/or Myanmar more generally. The UN's 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 – September 2019.

---

[9] See UN, Secretary-General's Peacebuilding Fund (PBF): Guidelines, 2018, http://www.unpbf.org/application-guidelines/

2. Methodology

2.1. Description of the strategy and approach

The evaluation was guided by the basic methodology as set out in the ToR and the overall objective of the project "to overcome barriers to strengthen the voices of all women in Rakhine State for social cohesion and peace." In line with the UNEG, OECD/DAC Quality Standards for Development Evaluation, and keeping in mind the Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, as required by the ToR, the evaluation assessed the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability of the project. In addition, impact was addressed as a cross-cutting element of the effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability aspects of the project as reflected in the Inception Report and evaluation matrix, and has been referenced throughout this report.

The evaluation was multi-faceted and the methodological approach used mixed (qualitative and quantitative) methods, as the best vehicle for meeting the evaluation's needs. The evaluation team endeavoured to ensure that the evaluation was conducted through a participatory and consultative process, which included all relevant national stakeholders, the international community and the project beneficiaries.

In total, the evaluation team conducted 23 meetings with 67 stakeholders and beneficiaries that included 4 meetings with UNDP senior management and project management team, 2 meetings with UNFPA programme team, 3 meetings with implementing partners in Yangon, 2 meetings with UNDP and UNFPA Field Office staff in Sittwe, 5 meetings with project partners who have Sittwe bases, 6 focus-group discussions with 26 project beneficiaries, and 1 meeting with the Government Counterpart State Advocate General. Please see Annex 3 for a full list of interviews conducted. The evaluation team identified a cross-section of data sources in order to optimise data collection and ensure triangulation. A large focus of the evaluation was on obtaining qualitative data through interviews and focus group discussions (FGDs) with relevant stakeholders and beneficiaries.

A more detailed methodology, including the key review questions and analytical evaluation matrix is included in the Inception Report. It is important to note that the evaluation team, in consultation with UNDP and UNFPA, deviated from the proposed methodology and went beyond using the results framework and logframe as the main tool for assessing the project. This was to enable the evaluation team to identify successes and results that were achieved but not adequately captured by the indicators included in the logframe. The evaluation team also assessed how the project addressed identified drivers of conflict, in particular women's empowerment and access to justice.

Evaluation ranking scale
The evaluation used a rating scale to rank each evaluation criteria – relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, and sustainability. The evaluation team evaluated the project against a 4-fold rating scale as described below:

- Highly Satisfactory (4)
- Satisfactory (3)
- Moderately satisfactory (2)
- Unsatisfactory (1)

Scoring of Project Performance:

Rating	Performance description
4 Highly satisfactory (Always/almost always)	Performance is clearly very strong in relation to the evaluation question/criterion. Weaknesses are not

	significant and have been managed effectively.
3 Satisfactory (Mostly, with some exceptions)	Performance is reasonably strong on most 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.
1 Unsatisfactory (Never or occasionally with clear weaknesses)	Performance is unacceptably weak in relation to the evaluation question/criterion. Does not meet minimum expectations/requirements.

2.2 Challenges and limitations of the evaluation

The evaluation team faced some challenges and limitations in assessing the project. First, due to staff turnover, both with the UN agencies and within implementing partner organisations, institutional knowledge regarding the preliminary project discussions and project design has largely been lost. The evaluation team mitigated this by meeting with as many UNDP and UNFPA representatives as possible, who had some knowledge of this process and piecing the information together. Secondly, the PBF project activities have been largely absorbed into larger UNDP and UNFPA projects – UNDP's wider rule of law programme and UNFPA's Women and Girls First Programme and GBV programme. This meant that it was sometimes challenging for the evaluation team to identify which activities were conducted as part of the PBF project and which were conducted through the "sister" projects. By obtaining a deeper understanding of both agencies' programming framework, and the inter-relation between different projects, the evaluation team sought to overcome this.

Thirdly, the evaluation team were faced with some key biases, including the following:

- *Recall bias*: Because of the sister UNDP/FPA projects in Rakhine, it is quite possible that key informants may not accurately remember particular specific PBF project intervention activities. A similar problem could be that participants in multiple UN activities may blend their experiences into a composite memory or response and, subsequently, will not distinguish between them as separate activities in their responses.

The evaluation team mitigated this bias primarily through a semi-structured interview protocol that called for questioning about specific activities. In addition, the PBF project was referred to as Phase 1, with subsequent projects being referred to as Phase 2, which assisted in particular implementing partners in distinguishing the relevant activities.

- *Response bias*: Informants may give the team positive remarks about the project because they would like to stay involved with the intervention in the future and they think that a negative evaluation could mean the end of project opportunities.

The team had two main strategies for mitigating this bias. First, it stressed for each informant that we will maintain confidentiality and then explained the team's independence from both the UN and the project. Second, as with recall bias, questions designed to elicit specific examples will help to identify response bias.

- *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 eliciting 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 documents or interviews from multiple sources, any one piece of biased data did not skew the analysis. Finally, rather than asking questions that elicit answers based only on perceptions, the team also asked questions about behavioural changes, requesting specific examples of knowledge use.

Lastly, the evaluation team were constrained by not being able to meet with beneficiaries who reside in the camps. Despite proposing this in their initial methodology, the evaluation team were informed that they would not be successful in obtaining travel authorisation to meet with beneficiaries in the camps. To mitigate this, the evaluation team tried to obtain a 360 degree view of the capacity development and awareness raising activities conducted in the camps by meeting with the full set of implementing partners in Rakhine State and conducting as many focus group discussions with other beneficiaries as possible. The evaluation team were able to meet with Rakhine beneficiaries who had previously resided in the camps during the project implementation period, but whose camps have subsequently been closed and they have been released.

3. Evaluation Analysis

The following section presents an analysis of the PBF project by each of the 3 outcomes and their corresponding outputs. It contains a narrative section looking at each of the outcomes and their indicators, each output and its indicators and is followed by an assessment of the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability of each output. Dispersed throughout the narrative are relevant activity level findings and recommendations. The subsequent Chapter 4 will present broader, higher level findings, lessons learnt, and recommendations.

3.1 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*

This outcome contained two outcome level indicators, one under UNFPA's responsibility and one under UNDP's. The first relates to UNFPA and the development of recommendations for peacebuilding, social cohesion or civic engagement as a result of women's access to ICT platforms and inter-communal dialogues. The ET was informed that the ICT platform developed was different from the original idea of creating a digital and chat platform to facilitate communications and foster social cohesion between Rakhine and Muslim communities. Due to the highly sensitive operating environment, it was not possible to create such a platform and to hold inter-communal dialogues. Thus, the concept was adapted, and a dedicated mobile App called 'Sarama' was developed by UNFPA's implementing partner, Koe Koe tech (KKT), for internally displaced (ID) women and girls in Rakhine State covering both Rakhine and Muslim camps. Given the limited implementation period and access challenges of partners, as described above, it was not possible to roll out the Application during the project period. Through the local implementing partner, Peace and Development Initiative (PDI), the Digital literacy and Story-telling trainings were provided to Rakhine and Muslim women and girls in 3 targeted locations. The post-training evaluation results showed a significant improvement in women and girls' ability to utilise mobile technology. An average of 14 per cent of participants felt more confident in identifying/verifying, responding and preventing cyber bullying and over 58 per cent of participants reported an increase in their capacity to utilise ICT to access information post training.

The second indicator relates to UNDP and the improvement of perceptions on women's increased access to platforms to discuss justice and peace related issues. UNDP's local implementing partners, Legal Clinic Myanmar (LCM), implemented this activity. Through legal awareness meetings and paralegal trainings, women and girls were engaged in justice and peace-related issues and the results of the perception survey showed a 15 per cent increase in the perceptions of women to discuss justice and peace related issues. This indicator was met. It is noted that there is no related activity/output for this indicator under outcome 1. Training of paralegal and legal awareness sessions were conducted as part of outputs 2.1 and 2.2 under outcome 2.

Output 1.1: *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 SR 1325)*

Under this output, UNDP planned to facilitate community forums, public debates and inter-communal dialogue on peace and reconciliation, GBV and access to justice (involving government, Civil Society Organizations (CSOs), women and girls) which generate action and plans for improving social cohesion and access to justice. As reported in the project's final report and by stakeholders during the KIIs, UNDP was unable to organize advocacy dialogues, as the operating environment was highly sensitive and not conducive to holding inter-communal dialogues at the time of project implementation. In response to increasing restrictions and tensions, this activity was revised, and UNDP decided to intensify training of

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 focused on two pertinent issues in Rakhine: Housing, Land, and Property (HLP) rights and gender-based violence. In

> **Male participant of paralegal and legal awareness session/farmer**
> The training is very useful for us; we are now aware of land rights, rules and regulations of holding land, and procedures. I think legal awareness raising on land rights issues is very much needed for farmers.

focus group discussions conducted with some beneficiaries of the awareness raising sessions and paralegal trainings, participants informed that trainings were very useful for them as the awareness raisings on land issues dealt with major problems for most villagers/farmers, and GBV awareness sessions were beneficial in particular for men and boys as they learnt how to prevent GBV, and for women and girls, who learnt where to seek advice and support for GBV cases.

Finding: The evaluation team finds that the activity related to inter-communal dialogues was overly ambitious in the context of inter-communal violence and conflict in Rakhine State.

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Assessment	Ranking
Relevance	While this output was relevant in the national context, the ET finds that this output was premature and too sensitive in the fragile/conflict context with access challenges at the time of project implementation, in particular with regards to holding inter-communal consultations and dialogues on women priorities on peace and reconciliation, GBV and access to justice including transitional justice mechanisms. The original elements of the project strategy in this regard proved to be unrealistic in the operating context. UNFPA used the monthly coordination meetings as a platform for reaching out to community groups with information on GBV and access to justice and for consultation and dialogues. In addition, referral pathways are in place and LCM is included as part of the referral mechanism. An online discussion/chat forum component could be potentially added to the dedicated mobile App developed for IDP women in Rakhine to facilitate communications and dialogues between different communities.	2
Effectiveness	The ET finds that this output was not fully achieved because it was not possible to organize inter-communal dialogues given the context in Rakhine. This activity was revised to intensify paralegal trainings and legal awareness meetings under outcome 2 and they were well received. Over 80% of training participants reported an increase in knowledge post-training and the project saw an increase in the number of requests for assistance on land and GBV issues as a result of the increased knowledge within the communities.	2
Efficiency	UNFPA underspent on this output and delivered approximately 43% under the originally approved budget. UNDP achieved efficiency and transferred funds to intensify legal empowerment activities under outcome 2.	2
Sustainability	'Sarama' App for women and girls in both Rakhine and Muslim camps was developed and can be expanded and rolled out further through UNFPA and/or partners' projects.	2

Overall		8/16

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

Output 1.2: *Evidence generation and data collection strengthened to inform stronger formal justice responses for survivors of GBV*

Under this output, UNDP and UNFPA jointly planned to conduct a baseline assessment and produce a report highlighting opportunities and challenges associated with women's pathways through the formal justice system in Rakhine; and UNDP planned to support the rollout of a Case Information System as part of the work conducted at Union level to improve the formal justice system's data collection for cases of SGBV.

As reported in the project's final report and as the ET was informed by stakeholders during the KIIs, it was not possible to conduct a baseline assessment in the highly sensitive Rakhine context, particularly given the access restrictions of implementing partners and that all data gathering exercises in Rakhine need Union level approval. However, as the Chair of GBV coordination at both Union and State/Region level, UNFPA used monthly coordination meetings as a platform for involving key protection/GBV service providers and legal service providers to facilitate discussions on GBV and access to justice issues and to identify key gaps and ways to work together to address these gaps.

Under the SARL project, UNDP supported the development of a Case Information System (CIS) for the Supreme Court at Union level to be able to track and log all court cases digitally and to analyse the gender-disaggregated data from these cases. The stakeholders showed interest and support for expansion of this initiative. It was planned to roll out the CIS in Rakhine State, but it was not possible within the assigned duration of the project. The ET is informed that USAID's supported Case Management Programme (CMP) is being implemented in courts in Rakhine starting August 2019 and that the CMP is more sophisticated and ambitious. It is not clear if it would succeed or what the buy-in is so the UNDP supported CIS could be a good interim measure with a view to potentially merging the systems if such time arises.

Neither indicator relating to these activities was met.

> **Recommendation**: UNDP should advocate at both Union level and State level for obtaining government's approval for rolling out of Case Information System (CIS) in Rakhine.

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Assessment	Ranking
Relevance	The ET finds that the activity with regard to supporting the development and rollout of CIS is relevant to the objectives of the project that is aligned with the Union Supreme Court's Judicial Strategic Plan. And if conducted, the baseline assessment report would have provided an excellent baseline for the project, but it was not feasible given the sensitive context of Rakhine during the project implementation.	3
Effectiveness	The ET finds that both indicators under this output were not met. The CIS roll out was not possible within the implementation period. And the baseline assessment was not feasible due to the highly sensitive operating environment in Rakhine.	1

Efficiency	The activity envisaged for the criminal case information system in Rakhine is the expansion of the CIS system initiative at the Union level, and the implementation strategy is found to be efficient. It was however not possible to roll it out during the project period. And the baseline assessment activity was not feasible, as the fragile situation in Rakhine did not allow conducting any kind of assessment. As such, the funds allocated under this output were not spent.	2
Sustainability	There is strong stakeholders' support to expand the CIS developed for the Union Supreme Court for tracking and analysing gender-disaggregated data from all court cases and the system could potentially be rolled out to Rakhine State if approved by the government.	2
Overall		8/16

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

Output 1.3: *Provision of an information platform to enable inter communal consultation and dialogues*

This output was focused on training displaced women and girls who have little to no IT experience in digital literacy to improve their ability to access information including legal advice and services; introducing story-telling sessions to build a shared understanding with peers and female role models within their communities, to develop support networks, confidence and leadership skills; developing a virtual platform for sharing information on job opportunities as well as service delivery and social cohesion dialogues; and creating an online community in which women and girls can access GBV, SRHR and justice information through text, audio, and video and participate in peace building and conflict resolution interventions. UNFPA implemented these activities through its implementing partners, KKT, IRC, and PDI.

IRC conducted an ICT assessment in three IDP camps (1 Rohingya and 2 Rakhine camps) to inform the design of the digital literacy training and integrated story-telling activity for women and girls. KKT developed a dedicated mobile App, called 'Sarama,' for IDP women in Rakhine State (both Rohingya and Rakhine IDP camps), which is available in both Rakhine language and Rohingya language (by using Voice Recorded Messages - VRM as Rohingya language has no written form). The App includes training materials for the digital literacy course at 3 levels, which can be accessed offline. At introductory level, the users can self-study basic usage features of mobile phones, tablets, and laptops. At Level 1, the users can learn about installing mobile applications; creating Facebook and Gmail accounts; and using Google Maps. Level 2 teaches users how to - stay safe online; identify misinformation; use Microsoft Word and Excel. The App also includes information about Hotline Services for GBV and legal assistance, articles for raising women's awareness on GBV, health, etc.; and other useful applications such as 'May May' (maternal and child health) and 'Lann Pya' (access to justice). IRC and PDI staff were trained by KKT to deliver the digital literacy training to the targeted beneficiaries in IDP camps. Curriculum review workshops between KKT and IRC/PDI were held to ensure the App contents and curriculum was best suited to the local context and level of participants. The ET was informed that the communication channel among UNFPA, KKT, and IRC/PDI was not as clear as it could be. As such, feedback provided by IRC/PDI was not fully integrated into the App and training curriculum. This could be attributed to staff turnover in the organizations that partners reported during the KIIs.

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, 4-day 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 trainings only reached 48/80 beneficiaries and covered only the Introduction and Level 1. As a result, the target related to training on mobile technology and usage of mobile applications was only partially achieved. This was partly due to the restrictions in travel authorization for the most part of 2019 and the delay in implementation while waiting for the government's suspension on IRC to be lifted. It is noted that because of the limited training period, the App was not used in the training. However, the trainers used illustrations and printed icons to demonstrate the different components and functions of the App. In focus groups discussions conducted with some beneficiaries of the digital literacy and story-telling training, all participants expressed their level of satisfaction with the training. They shared that as a result of training, their level of ICT knowledge increased, and they could use the knowledge they had gained in their daily lives. Participants reported that they have been applying what they learned in training on 'how to use smart phone' - such as saving contact numbers in their mobile phones; recording important dates and events by using calendar feature; taking pictures and saving important documents by using mobile phone camera, and opening their own Google email accounts, etc.

Finding: The digital literacy training helped empower women and girls through providing them with IT skills to enable them to access information and services. Participants were able to apply the new IT skills, in particular with regards to using smart mobile phones in their daily lives.

Meeting with participants of Digital Literacy and Story-telling Training

26-years old female training participant: From digital literacy training, I learnt how to take pictures and save important documents and identity cards by using the smartphone. Now I don't need to carry my ID card with me all the time. I can show the picture of my ID card saved on the phone when asked.

19-years old female training participant: From story-telling session, I learnt how to share my life stories and experiences with others and how to conduct interviews to understand and learn from experiences of others.

It is noted that there was a change of participants over the training period. In the beginning, there were 48 participants across the 3 different locations and 5 participants had to quit the training due to their health problems and 6 participants out of the rest of the 43 were replaced with new trainees. The target relating to the capacity of women to utilize ICT to support access to information was partially achieved. In terms of women's empowerment, post-training evaluation results showed that 25/43 women reported an increased capacity to utilise ICT to access information and legal advice and services. During KIIs, stakeholders reported that the majority of participants do not have access to smartphones/tablets to apply the new knowledge and skills after the training. Only 25% of training participants own smart phones. The IT assessment conducted at the start of the project indicated that majority of the women and girls do not own a smart phone, but have access to a phone in their household. It was envisaged under PBF that women and girls would be able to access smartphones and tablets in the Women and Girls Centres which are managed by IRC. However, this did not materialize as IRC was not able to operate the Centres during 2019 due to access constraints imposed by the Government of Myanmar.

Recommendations: UNFPA should consider providing community kiosks services for women and girls in Rakhine to facilitate their access to smartphones, tablets, and laptops / computers and also explore other strategies and interventions that could be more adjusted to the Rakhine context.

As reported in the project's final report and discussed elsewhere in this report, it was not possible to roll out the virtual platform in Rakhine as envisaged due to access challenges of partners and the government's reluctance to approve a non-cost extension of the project. As such, the indicator relating to the activation of a virtual platform for information on job opportunities and service delivery and social cohesion dialogues, and the indicator relating to women accessing the online forums to participate in peace building and interventions, were not met.

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Assessment	Ranking
Relevance	The ET finds that this output was relevant to the Rakhine State context. With the continuing access challenge in Rakhine, face-to-face knowledge sharing is a challenge. Digital platform / App is the possibility of a new way of communicating to young girls and vulnerable groups. And digital literacy trainings were needed for utilizing App / digital platforms.	3
Effectiveness	When assessing the effectiveness of activities against the indicators, this output partially achieved the indicator related to training on mobile technology and usage of mobile applications; partially achieved the indicator related to capacity of women to utilize ICT; did not meet the indicator relating to activation of a virtual platform for information on job opportunities and service delivery and social cohesion dialogues; and did not meet the indicator relating to women accessing the online forums to participate in peace building and conflict resolution interventions. This was in part due to the access challenge of partners and the government's unwillingness to approve a non-cost extension of the project. Over 58% of training participants reported an increase in capacity to utilise ICT to access to information post training.	2
Efficiency	UNFPA overspent on this output and delivered approximately 16% over the originally approved budget. The additional funds were allocated for developing the ICT platform and for Digital Literacy curriculum development.	3
Sustainability	Digital literacy training curriculum and materials were developed and can be used in future training. UNFPA is discussing with its partners to continue digital literacy training and to expand the usage of 'Sarama' App through other UNFPA and /or partners' projects.	2
Overall		10/16

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

3.2 Outcome 2: *Values, skills, and knowledge of local communities and justice actors to provide gender and conflict sensitive mediation and resolutions, enhanced;*

This outcome contained three outcome level indicators, one under UNFPA's responsibility and two under UNDP's. The first related to UNFPA and the number of sectoral and intersectoral gender-based violence response and prevention guidelines adopted relating to the use of virtual platforms. As reported in the project's final report and discussed under outcome 1 above, it was not possible to roll-out the virtual platform in Rakhine as envisaged due to access challenges. However, UNFPA used the

GBV monthly coordination meetings as a platform for reaching out to community groups with information on GBV and access to justice. Key partners like LCM were invited from time to time to provide legal education to NGOs/CSOs as a way of enhancing their knowledge. In addition, referral pathways are in place and LCM is included as part of the referral mechanism. As such LCM has reported that more NGOs/CSOs are reaching out to them each time they have protection cases in need of legal assistance. Nonetheless, this indicator was not met.

The second indicator related to the percentage of UNDP attended trials in compliance with fair trial standards. International Legal Foundation (ILF), who applied the 5 key standards as contained in the UNDP-supported "Fair Trial Standards Manual," and monitored 15 trial sessions, implemented this activity. The results showed that there was over 50 per cent compliance with fair trial standards, and the target of 25 per cent compliance was exceeded to 50 per cent.

The final indicator related to the percentage of men and women (including lawyers, community leaders, government officials etc.) who show/state an increased understanding of RoL, SGBV, gender equality and women's rights and barriers to women's access to justice. The target was for an 80 per cent increase, which based on pre and post training evaluations conducted by Thazin, LCM and IDLO, was met. No additional disaggregated data was provided to the evaluation team in respect of this indicator.

Overall, this outcome contains two outputs and 11 indicators.

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 vulnerable groups, including survivors of GBV*

Under this output, UNDP planned to develop Standard Operating Procedures and Information Sharing Protocols for GBV survivors between protection partners and the law enforcement sector; to train government officials on rule of law, GBV and human rights; to develop RoL Foundation Courses, which would be delivered by the Rule of Law Centre (ROLC); and to train paralegals in the target communities.

> **Finding:** The evaluation team found that the most successful of these activities is the training of paralegals in the target communities, which is evidenced by exceeding the target of training 300 paralegals, by training 406. This significantly increased the knowledge and understanding of participants on land issues and how to resolve them. The participants have transferred this knowledge throughout their communities.

Training was provided by two of UNDP's implementing partners, Thazin and LCM. In order to reach 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

> **Success story:** One of the LCM's paralegal training participants received a small grant and is providing GBV trainings, and legal assistance to victims of human trafficking and domestic violence.

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 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**: UNDP should develop advanced training for paralegals as well as paralegal training on different issues, such as inheritance rights and property rights, with a focus on women.

Although not meeting its target, UNDP also achieved considerable success with regards to the delivery of training of government officials on RoL, GBV and human rights, whereby it succeeded in training 121 government officials. The reasons for not succeeding in reaching the anticipated 300 government officials relate to the low numbers of government officials in Rakhine, which a robust context analysis during the project development phase would have identified, combined with the fact that the low human resource capacities means that officials are not able to take time off to participate in training activities during work hours. Furthermore, due to the security situation there are constraints with regards to participants travelling to Sittwe to participate in the training. The evaluation team met with training participants from the State Advocate General's Office (AGO), the State High Court, CSOs and individual lawyers. The participants confirmed the utility of the courses and course materials, the quality of the trainers, and the relevance of the topics in their everyday work. In particular the fair trials standards and Code of Ethics trainings and materials were highly regarded by the AGO and the fair trial standards by the High Court. These courses lasted for between 1-2 days.

> **Recommendation**: UNDP should consider implementing post-training monitoring to assess how participants are applying the new knowledge into their work. Advanced training courses should also be considered.

> **Recommendation**: UNDP should assess the feasibility for alternative means of delivering training to overcome the access issues and travel restrictions, as well as the restricted opportunities to deliver training due to the high workload and low number of law officers. For example, training could be delivered before 10.00 or after 16.00 or at weekends. Training could be delivered via an online communication application, such as Skype, with the provision of a computer, projector and dongle to overcome the Internet issues.

The Rule of Law Foundation Course implemented through the International Development Law Organization (IDLO) lasted for 5 days and was conducted in Yangon. It covered basic legal principles, GBV, how to make GBV referrals, land issues, constitutional issues, RoL principles and law making. It total, two participants from each of the 17 townships participated in the course. Participants commented on their disappointment that there was no training manual and that they were unable to

take organized training materials away with them. ToT training should have been conducted but was not possible within the timeframe of the project due to the access constraints, but the possibility raised beneficiary expectations. They also commented on the need for follow-up in terms of advanced training and regular monitoring to assess how participants are applying the knowledge in their regular work. Overall, the participants confirmed their satisfaction with the course and detailed how they are able to apply it in their daily work. As a result of IDLO not obtaining approval to proceed with the establishment of the ROLC in Rakhine, the project was unable to meet its targets and delivered 1/6 specialised legal courses, 1/1 ToT/advanced foundation course and 3/5 foundation courses.

Meeting with participants of RoL Foundation Course (organized by IDLO)
Male training participant: As a member of the Coordination Body for RoL and Justice Affairs, I contributed the knowledge I gained from the RoL foundation course to drafting the Law of the Coordinating Body for RoL and Justice Affairs. As a Board Member of Arakan Human Rights Defender and Promoter Association, I also shared what I learnt from the training with fellow members of the Association.
Female training participant: I work with both Rakhine and Muslim camps on protection/GBV/ women empowerment issues. After the training, I learnt how to refer those needing legal assistance to appropriate service providers.

Recommendation: UNDP should consider developing a training manual that participants are able to keep and refer back to after the training in order to bolster the knowledge and confidence of the training participants.

UNDP was unable to advance with regards to the development of SOPs and ISPs for GBV survivors between protection partners and law enforcement. This was due to the lack of space or platform to discuss this issue, as a result of the ROLC not being established and the non-functioning of the RoL Coordinating Body, and because it is not seen as a priority for the courts and other stakeholders. Instead resources were transferred to legal aid providers, results of which are discussed below under output 3.3.

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Assessment	Ranking
Relevance	The ET finds that this output was highly relevant. It is aligned with national priorities including the Final Report of the Advisory Commission on Rakhine State; the Economic Policy of the Union of Myanmar and the National Strategic Plan for the Advancement of Women. It is in line with UNDAF and both UNDP's and UNFPA's CPD and contributes to the advancement of the SDGs notably SDGs 16, 10 and 5. Further, it addressed the identified drivers of conflict – lack of women's empowerment and lack of access to justice, in particular for women and other vulnerable groups.	4

Effectiveness	When assessing the effectiveness of activities against the indicators, this output successfully exceeded the indicator related to paralegal training; partially achieved the indicator related to training of government officials and the RoL foundation course and did not meet the indicator relating to GBV SOPs and ISPs. This was in part due to lack of space and changing priorities of the government. Over 80% of training participants reported an increase in knowledge post-training and the project saw an increase in the number of requests for assistance on land and GBV issues as a result of the increased knowledge within the communities. UNDP was able to adequately adapt and focus additional resources on areas where it had gained traction and achieved successes. It responded to the need for additional paralegal training and shifted its attention from activities where the need was not recognised by government.	3
Efficiency	This output achieved efficiency with a delivery rate of 95%. This was largely due to efforts with regards to training government officials and paralegals and delivering the RoL Foundation Courses.	4
Sustainability	The curricula and training materials were developed, tested and piloted and are ready and being used for further rollout. The methodology for the paralegal training has been developed and can be applied in future paralegal training. Discussions have been initiated with government officials regarding institutionalising the training but have not yet proceeded beyond discussion phase. Additional donor funding has been secured to continue with project activities beyond the life of the PBF project but these activities are as yet not sustainable.	2
Overall	UNDP was able to achieve successes under this output and respond adequately to changing circumstances to most effectively channel programme resources.	13/16

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

Output 2.2: *Local capacities for gender and conflict sensitive mediation, dispute and conflict resolution enhanced*

This output was focused on training mediators on basic mediation skills, developing the training curricula on rule of law, human rights, GBV and conflict and gender sensitive mediation, as well as training Village Tract Administrators (VTA) and delivering basic legal awareness outreach activities to the community through mobile training sessions.

Finding: The evaluation team finds that the most successful activity under this output was the mobile training sessions.

The initial activity with regards to training mediators was merged with the third activity of training VTAs in five townships in Rakhine State on dispute resolution. However, during the implementation of the project, this activity was not approved by the General Administration Department (GAD) and UNDP was unable to progress with this. It is noted by the evaluation team that the activity has subsequently been approved and will be delivered through the SARL project. Thus, neither indicator relating to these

activities was met. UNDP were successful in developing the training curricula on rule of law, human rights and GBV and this training was delivered by IDLO under output 2.1 as described above.

The most successful activity under this output related to the delivery of basic legal awareness through mobile training sessions at the community level. Thazin and LCM conducted these activities. The initial target was far exceeded because UNDP decided to intensity legal empowerment activities as a response to the increasing restrictions and tensions and allocated additional resources to this. In total 97 community sessions were held with 2926 community representatives being trained. The original target was to reach 450 community representatives through 15 sessions. Participants from different sectors in the community were targeted including women's organisations, CSOs, CBOs, VTAs, township administration staff, teachers, students, housewives and farmers.

> **Finding:** Access to justice was enhanced through the delivery of basic legal awareness training sessions, providing beneficiaries with knowledge of their rights and how and where to access services.

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Assessment	Ranking
Relevance	The ET finds that this output was relevant to the objectives of the project in that it is aligned with national priorities in the context of the Final Report on Rakhine State, UNDAF and both UNDP's and UNFPA's CPD and contributes to the advancement of the SDGs notably SDGs 16, 10 and 5. At the state level, the ET finds that this output was less relevant, or perhaps too premature, at the time of the project implementation, in particular with regards to conflict sensitive mediation. The revised focus on legal empowerment enabled the project to be more relevant to the needs and realities on the ground.	3
Effectiveness	The ET finds that UNDP successfully developed RoL curricula but did not meet the targets with regards to mediation training for VTAs. This was in part due to a lack of understanding among VTAs as to the role and importance of mediation, which took time to explain and secure buy-in. In that sense it is questionable whether this activity responded to the needs of the beneficiaries. The mobile training was successful and generated considerable interest among the communities.	3
Efficiency	UNDP overspent on this output and delivered approximately 40% over the originally approved budget. This was due to the reallocation of funds based on the realities on the ground whereby community training proved successful and other activities were constrained by the unstable and increasingly restrictive environment.	4
Sustainability	The methodology for the awareness raising has proven to be successful and there is sustainability with regards to the knowledge shared. The RoL Foundation Course curriculum was developed, tested and piloted and is available for public use. IDLO is using the curricula through its 4 operational ROLCs throughout Myanmar. Due to the lack of progress with regards to the mediation related activities, the ET is unable to assess sustainability of these activities. The legal empowerment activities were conducted successfully, knowledge has been shared and the activity is continuing under the SARL project. The long-term sustainability in terms of continuation after SARL is unknown and not assessed by the evaluation team.	3

Overall		13/16

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 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 justice sectors plans were developed.

In terms of increasing the number of women and other vulnerable groups represented by free legal aid providers, the project over-exceeded its targets through activities conducted by LCM, Thazin and ILF, with 126 cases being represented. This activity is discussed further under output 3.3.

Output 3.1: *Strengthened relationships between Rakhine women and national civil society and networks*

This output focused on two areas, one per agency. The first was under the UNFPA component and related to the digital literacy training (also discussed under outcome 1) and an increase in the perceptions of women from all sites with improved perceptions of the benefits of social cohesion and peacebuilding. Due to the travel restrictions imposed on IRC, UNFPA successfully found a way to mitigate this constraint by identifying PDI as an alternative implementing partner and all digital literacy training was provided by PDI. IRC provided PDI with organisational development support, monitoring and evaluation and human resources training. The original idea was to provide basic digital literacy training as well as an introduction to all KKT produced applications. Due to the time it took in identifying a solution to IRC's travel restrictions, this was not possible and PDI implemented a one-month training programme to three communities – two Rakhine camps and one Rohingya camp. The training was conducted over the weekend, due to beneficiary availability and consisted of one full day of training each week for four weeks. The training covered basic digital literacy such as operating a smart phone, connection to WiFi, use of applications, use of the calendar function. It also contained some discussion on the dangers of smart phone usage and applications. The basic concept of the Sarama application was also introduced. Training was conducted in local languages, meaning in Rakhine for the Rakhine camps and in Rohingya for the Rohingya camp. Participants at the FGD on digital literacy training expressed their high level of satisfaction with the training and confirmed that they are able to apply the knowledge and skills they learnt in their everyday lives. They also expressed a desire for more advanced training, to include computer literacy training, which they believe will be an advantage for them in securing employment. The development of the app is further discussed above under outcome 1.

Recommendation: To develop advanced training for more capacitated beneficiaries, which would also include computer literacy training, preparing a CV and applying for jobs online.

The second activity related to the development of a Rakhine specific outreach strategy being developed and implemented. Due to the ever-changing context on the ground, it was deemed more relevant to develop a conflict sensitivity strategy, which would include outreach as one of its components. The strategy was developed during Q3 and Q4 2018, and was due for revision in Q3 2019, to reflect the new realities. This target was met although modified from an outreach strategy to a conflict sensitivity strategy.

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Assessment	Ranking
Relevance	The evaluation team finds that this output was relevant to the national and local context in terms of the delivery of digital literacy training and was able to adapt the relevance of an outreach strategy to a conflict sensitivity strategy.	4
Effectiveness	The delivery of the digital literacy training was partially effective, although reached fewer beneficiaries than envisaged due to access constraints and the short project lifespan. The evaluation team did not assess whether the conflict sensitivity strategy is being implemented and/or monitored.	3
Efficiency	No budget was allocated to UNFPA under this output and UNDP did not report any expenditure under this output in the final project report.	0
Sustainability	The curricula for the digital literacy training has been developed and can be further rolled-out and expanded. The strategy was developed but no assessment was undertaken regarding its implementation.	2
Overall		9/16

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

Output 3.2: *Local justice and peace mechanisms are more accessible to women and sensitive to their identified justice priority needs*

This output was focused around three key areas, all implemented by UNDP. The first was to establish regular meetings for the Rakhine Coordination Body, the second to the number of actions/initiatives jointly developed by communities and local government actors to address women's justice issues and the third to the number of reports outlining findings and strategies to address women justice priority needs shared with decision makers.

Finding: The evaluation team finds that this output had weak government stakeholder buy-in and very limited achievements.

With regards to the RCB, only two of the six originally envisaged meetings were conducted, largely due to the lack of interest among the RCB, combined with their own internal tensions (unrelated to the project). This impacted on the lack of success with regards to indicator 3.2.2 as well, regarding the development of joint initiatives, of which none were developed, due to similar reasons. That said, the foundations were laid during the PBF project to initiate a series of Women's Access to Justice Forums, the first of which was conducted in November 2018, and which secured considerable government buy-in and a high level of active participation among stakeholders. Further, UNDP has been able to develop its relationship with the Rakhine Legal Aid Board through the SARL project, which was initiated during the

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 the 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 this output was unable to implement the activities as planned and thus was not effective.	1
Efficiency	Very few resources were allocated to UNDP under this output and they were able to fully deliver the $7000 that was allocated. $43,000 was allocated to UNFPA under this output but since UNFPA were not responsible for implementing any of the activities, it is not clear to the evaluation team where the $40,837 delivered were 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 the project, largely due to the lack of government buy-in and stakeholder commitment generated through the lifespan of the 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 and 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. Men and boys Coffee and Tea sessions were conducted in camps, as a key prevention strategy, and as an informal, but effective way of reaching men and boys. These activities were aimed at promoting male engagement on GBV awareness. Male facilitators find men and boys and sit with them for coffee/tea and gradually introduce topics on GBV, gender equality, sexual and reproductive health rights (SRHR), the role of women, women's empowerment etc. in a sensitive and non-confrontational manner. The sessions are conducted weekly for a period of 6 months and then new men and boys are identified to participate. This activity was initially conducted successfully with UNFPA reaching 85 beneficiaries, however due to the access restrictions imposed on IRC, this activity had to be postponed and the target of reaching 200 men and boys was never met. In

addition, UNFPA reached a total of 1,440 men and boys who participated in GBV information and SRHR education sessions across 8 locations – 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 well 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 sessions are a highly effective way of engaging with men and boys and in starting to achieve attitudinal and behavioural changes.

The second activity under this output relates to the digital literacy training, which has been discussed above under output 3.1 as well as under outcome 1. No additional findings or recommendations are made by the evaluation team with regards to this.

UNDP aimed to deliver 10 community forums, legal discussions and outreach activities through its partner IDLO, who planned to deliver these activities through the ROLC envisaged to be established in Rakhine State. As a result of government approval for the establishment of the ROLC not being received, IDLO was only able to conduct 4 such sessions and the activities were not continued.

Success story: Thazin provided support to 32 villagers that were separately sued by GAD for trespassing to grazing land (as the villagers built houses in the grazing land). Thazin team held consultation and mediation meetings with the accused villagers and the VTA who filed the case suing the villagers. As a result, the VTA decided to withdraw the case at court, and 5 out of 10 acres (50%) of grazing land will be granted for villages to live on.

Finally, under this output, UNDP planned to reach 200 beneficiaries through the provision of legal information, counselling and/or representation. This target was exceeded with 69 persons being represented in court, 103 receiving counselling, legal advice and/or mediation in person, and 80 supported through the legal advice hotline. All activities were conducted through Thazin, LCM or ILF and both Thazin and LCM have their own 24/7-hotline service. During focus group discussions with beneficiaries of these services, the evaluation team was informed of a number of successes that both organisations have had as well as with the high level of satisfaction among beneficiaries of these services. It was noted that awareness of free legal aid services are low as well as awareness of the provision of a 24/7-hotline service.

> **Finding:** The evaluation team finds that the provision of legal information, counselling and/or representation was highly relevant and effective.

> **Recommendation:** Awareness of the free legal aid services and the 24/7 hotline service should be further increased. It is noted that the most effective way to reach beneficiaries is through radio broadcasts since many potential beneficiaries are either illiterate or do not have access to a television or online services.

Evaluation Criteria	Evaluation Assessment	Ranking
Relevance	The evaluation team finds that this output was highly relevant both to the national context, but specifically to the local context in Rakhine State.	4
Effectiveness	Both UNFPA and UNDP found highly effective methods of reaching beneficiaries and of achieving significant impact in their daily lives. Initial attitudinal and behavioural changes can be seen. Initial government buy-in for the establishment of a ROLC in Rakhine was rescinded and this activity could not be achieved.	3
Efficiency	UNFPA underspent on this activity due to activities ceasing as a result of IRC's access issues. UNDP delivered 100% of resources under this output.	3
Sustainability	All activities under this output need to be institutionalised to ensure their long-term sustainability. It is noted that both agencies are continuing with these activities under their wider programmatic framework so activities have been continued.	2
Overall		12/16

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

4. Findings, Lessons Learnt and Recommendations

Introduction

Due to the constraints of the results framework as discussed elsewhere in this report, the evaluation team went beyond the logframe and looked more broadly at the results and impact of the project, identifying key areas where the project has contributed and advanced its overall outcome – *social and structural barriers that prevent women's participation and voices both in the formal peace processes and in bottom up peacebuilding processes addressed through fostering social cohesion between communities in Rakhine*. The findings provided below are based around the four evaluation criteria, while the lessons learnt and recommendations reflect the broader level analysis that was undertaken by the evaluation team.

4.1 Findings

1) Relevance – 25/32
The linkages of the PBF Project with National and UN frameworks and strategies has been detailed under 1.2 above and is assessed by the evaluation team as being relevant. In particular, the project was aligned with the Myanmar Sustainable Development Plan, the Economic Policy of the Union of

Myanmar, the Judicial Strategic Plan 2015-2017 and Myanmar's National Strategic Plan for the Advancement of Women, as well as the Final Report of the Advisory Commission on Rakhine State. Further, it was aligned with UNDAF and the UNDP and UNFPA CPDs, the PBF Strategic Plan 2017-2019 as well as with the 2030 Agenda and the Sustainable Development Goals, including SDGs 5, 10 and 16. More broadly, the project responded to the protection, participation and prevention pillars of SCR 1325 and to the Peacebuilding and Participation Principles and the New Deal for Engagement in Fragile States. However, at the State level, while the project was relevant in terms of its adherence with the recommendations of the Final Report of the Advisory Commission for Rakhine, due to the lagging political will to address social cohesion and peacebuilding in the State, combined with the lack of initial and continuous assessment and analysis, the project design was not tailored sufficiently to the specific context and realities on the ground.

In terms of addressing identified drivers of conflict including the lack of women's empowerment and access to justice, the evaluation team finds that the project was able to successfully address these issues. By raising awareness of their rights and how to access services and building capacities of women and girls to utilise IT tools, while at the same time introducing dialogue on women's empowerment issues with men and boys, the project was able to empower women beneficiaries of the project by giving them a voice. It was able to strengthen their access to justice, through awareness raising activities and through the provision of legal advice, counselling, mediation and representation.

2) Effectiveness – 18/32
The evaluation team finds that the project was partially effective in achieving its goal of fostering social cohesion between communities in Rakhine through addressing barriers that prevent women's participation and voices both in the formal peace process and in bottom up peacebuilding processes. In terms of meeting its targets, the project was successful in reaching 7/31 indicators, however as discussed elsewhere in this report, the project design was overly ambitious given the specific and fluid context on the ground and the results framework and logframe were poorly designed. In addition, the project was implemented in an ever-changing conflict context that required a more adaptive approach. Thus, when looking beyond the results framework, additional successes and results can be identified that are not captured by the project's indicators. These are presented in the executive summary and discussed further below in lessons learnt.

3) Efficiency – 20/32
When assessed against delivery rates, the evaluation team finds that the project was successful in that UNDP delivered 95 per cent and UNFPA delivered 94 per cent of the project budget in a timely manner. The project management structure as outlined in the project document was efficient in terms of generating results and the evaluation team in this respect identified no issues. However, where the project was able to make most gains was where it was able to be flexible, responsive and adaptive and shift project resources according to where project results were being achieved and in response to the changing situation on the ground – e.g. the access restrictions. The M&E systems utilised were able to ensure effective and efficient project management, however the indicators did not allow for the capturing of progress. Cost efficiencies were gained and maximum impact ensured through shifting resources as mentioned above. One issue with regards to efficiency related to the PBF requirement for both Agencies to reach 70 per cent of delivery before the next tranche of funds could be transferred. This proved problematic because UNFPA's spending overtook UNDP's for a while due to the systems for implementation being different as well as the nature of the work. This resulted in impacting delivery for a while until UNDP could deliver at 70 per cent and the next tranche could be made. Both Agencies commented that this was a challenge. In view of the fact that the project had two partners both with their own detailed budgets, consideration should be given by PBF to looking at the expenditure for each individual partner, rather than the overall expenditure of the project.

4) Sustainability – 15/28

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, stronger and better placed to carry on with their work and attract funding. This support has subsequently led to large funding for LCM from Unicef and for Thazin from USAID on UNDP's side and for PDI and Koe Koe Tech through Christian Aid on UNFPA's side. Both Agencies are now adapting their work to build on what was put in place through the PBF project, through exploring opportunities to institutionalise these activities in the existing government programmes. For example, through institutionalising fair trial standards, specialised legal skills courses, gender equality and SGBV counselling guides, and online court information systems. In terms of capturing lessons learnt, the evaluation team finds that lessons learnt were regularly captured at the field office level and communicated to the country office level within both agencies. However, within the framework of the PBF project, no mechanisms, procedures or policies were developed that allowed primary stakeholders to carry forward the results attained on gender equality, empowerment of women, human rights and human development.

4.2 Lessons Learnt

1) Reality of Operational Context
The project was designed at a time when there had been peace in Rakhine for approximately 18 months, which it was anticipated would continue. Yet by the time the project was approved and implementation commenced, the context had already changed drastically (see above under chapter 1). Further, the context was ever changing during the 18-month lifespan of the project, in particular with regards to the appearance of the Arakan Army, leading to renewed conflict and tensions, which proved to be particularly challenging, notably with regards to accessing different communities. Where the project was able to gain traction and advance was largely on activities where it was able to adapt and respond to the changing circumstances. Despite this, the evaluation team finds that the initial project design was still overly ambitious, including at the time when it was written, particularly given the (albeit peaceful) local context at the time, combined with the short implementation period.

> **Lesson learnt**: In a fragile or conflict context, projects must respond to the realities on the ground and have mechanisms in place to enable them to adapt to the changing situations with which they are faced.

2) Project design
The evaluation team finds that while some preliminary consultations were undertaken at the project design and development phase, in particular by UNFPA, the consultation phase was not sufficiently thorough, inclusive or participatory. Had it been, the information and data gained through consultations would have fed into the design, which would have made it more context specific and tailored to the realities on the ground, and almost certainly, more realistic and achievable.

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 – 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 heavily focused at the quantitative, activity level. Please see Annex 4 for a comparison of the initial indicators contained in the project document and the final indicators as reported on in the final report. Qualitative indicators that measure changes in attitude and perceptions would have provided more in-depth information and if they were adequately measured would have better captured the project's progress and results.

As a result of the lack of assessment at the project design stage, there was a complete lack of baseline data, resulting in only 2/31 indicators having a baseline. All other baselines were set at 0, which was neither accurate nor conducive to measuring progress.

The project document did not contain an exit strategy or a sustainability strategy for the project's interventions, although sustainability elements were incorporated into activities, notably through the organisational capacity development of local implementing partners.

> **Lessons learnt**: The design of all projects must be based on thorough analysis and assessment and a participatory consultation process during its development. Indicators should be realistic and attainable and should be able to capture the voices of people, requiring qualitative as well as quantitative indicators. Accurate baselines should be provided in the results framework to capture progress. An exit strategy and sustainability elements should be provided in the project document, even if this is from a long-term perspective.

3) UNDP/UNFPA Communication and Coordination

The evaluation team finds that overall the UNDP and UNFPA components of the project were implemented independently to the extent that they were to all intents and purposes separate projects. While some communication took place at the Country Office level, the evaluation team was informed that at the Field Office level there was little or no relationship between UNDP and UNFPA, beyond personal relationships between the gender focal points. The evaluation team was informed that this has been strengthened now as a result of IRC regaining access to the camps, meaning that GBV cases from the Women and Girls Centres in the camps can now be referred to the legal aid service providers. It is beyond the scope of this evaluation to assess whether the limited communication between UNDP and UNFPA at the field level resulted in opportunities being missed and whether it impacted on the results achieved through the project or not, however greater communication and knowledge sharing combined with the implementation of joint activities based on each Agencies' strengths and mandates, had the potential for enhancing the results and successes achieved.

> **Lesson learnt**: Enhanced communication mechanisms between implementing agencies at both field office and country office level could lead to enhancing results and successes.

4) PBF Communication and Adaptability

Communication with the PBF took place on an as needed basis, with the PBF being responsive to requirements to modify the indicators and budget within a 15 per cent limit, as well as being open to the request for a non-cost extension of the project. However, this required sign-off by the government, which was not forthcoming and thus the project was not extended, nor its scope and activities adjusted to the new changing context. The evaluation team were informed that delays in communication with PBF did delay the implementation of the project.

However, crucially, the PBF mechanism did not allow for sufficient flexibility in terms of adapting the project activities or the results framework in any substantial manner during the project implementation period. This prevented both agencies from aligning the project with the changing local context and designing activities that were more suited and more achievable given the realities of the operational context. Please see recommendations 4) and 5) where a more adaptive management approach is discussed.

> **Lessons learnt**: The fragile or conflict context within which the project was implemented required implementing entities to seek funding modalities that allowed for a more responsive, flexible and adaptive approach to programmatic activities.

5) Results and Successes
Despite the operational context and realities of implementing the project on the ground, combined with the constraints imposed on the project implementation team(s) as a result of the deficiencies in the project design and inability to extend the project duration in view of the government's lack of support, **both agencies were able to achieve considerable results and successes, which are either not captured sufficiently, or at all, by the logframe. These should not be overlooked or understated.**

These include capacity development successes with regards to the implementing partners. For example, Thazin has expanded its number of lawyers from four during the first phase of project implementation to nine during the second phase and has successfully been able to apply for additional donor funding as a direct result of the capacity development provided by UNDP on project management. Both Thazin and LCM have been able to open branch offices, meaning that they are able to reach more beneficiaries and from a wider ethnic diversity. ILF now has 5 legal clinics operating, 3 in Sittwe, 1 in Ann and 1 in Kyaukpyu, each with mobile legal aid services reaching into communities. As illustrated in the case studies provided in Chapter 3, the project has been able to assist people in resolving their legal issues, in particular with regards to land and GBV, through the provision of free legal advice and assistance. Beneficiaries of the rule of law training courses from the AGO and the High Court reported that they have been able to apply the knowledge they gained through the training courses into their everyday work, in particular with regards to their increased knowledge of international standards on fair trial standards, as well as on human rights issues. More targeted referrals have been made through the GBV network as a result of both the awareness raising and capacity development initiatives conducted by UNFPA and its implementing partners.

The tangible outputs of the project in terms of training manuals, course materials, curricula, ToT and the IT platform/application have been tested, finalised and piloted, with the potential for further expansion and roll-out during future programming, both in Rakhine State and elsewhere throughout the country.

> **Lesson learnt**: A more responsive, flexible and adaptive approach allowed both agencies to achieve results and successes, which were either not captured sufficiently, or at all, by the logframe. These should not be overlooked or understated.

6) Catalytic Impact
The evaluation team finds that the PBF funds provided to the project laid the groundwork for both UNDP and UNFPA's further peacebuilding programming in Rakhine State and built trust among implementing partners and beneficiaries. The project was implemented at a time when other

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

The PBF funded project has been instrumental in catalysing both UNDP and UNFPA's peacebuilding programming in Rakhine, in attracting additional donor interest, and in mobilising additional resources for continued programming. It also resulted in jumpstarting other peacebuilding processes conducting by both Agencies within their wider programmatic frameworks and identified areas for the implementation of joint activities with additional UN Agencies, such as UN Women.

Through laying the groundwork, the PBF project enabled the expansion of activities during phase 2, for example, the Women's Access to Land, Property and Inheritance Rights seminar and the Women's Access to Justice symposium, both arose as a direct result of the PBF programming, while other activities have been continued under each agencies' wider programming framework.

> **Lesson learnt**: Through laying the groundwork, building trust and in piloting different activities and approaches, the PBF project was catalytic in furthering UNDP and UNFPA's programming and in attracting additional donor interest and mobilising additional donor resources for peacebuilding programming.

7) Inclusivity

There are numerous ethnicities that live in Rakhine State, including the Rohingya, and who face challenges in accessing justice. The project was able to adopt an inclusivity approach reaching all communities in Rakhine. For example, through Thazin, the project was able to reach Chin, Khami and Mro communities as well as the Rohingya community. Through ILF, the project was able to reach Maramagri, Hindu and Burmese communities in addition to the Rakhine and Rohingya. Through its establishment of a branch office in Ann Township, Thazin is now working in the most ethnically diverse township in the state and has lawyers and paralegals working for it of multiple ethnicities. PDI has expanded its programming as a result of the capacity development and awareness raising activities provided through the project and is now working with both Rakhine and Rohingya communities, including in camps, which are inaccessible to other organisations.

> **Lessons learnt**: An inclusivity lens is required to ensure that all ethnic communities are being reached, while capacity building of implementing partners can help ensure access to different communities.

4.3 Recommendations

1) Robust analysis and assessment

In designing future programmes and projects, both agencies should ensure that they undertake robust analysis and assessment to feed into the project design process. This should include thorough contextual and political analysis, which is regularly updated throughout the lifespan of the project, and which addresses political economy considerations. In addition, a detailed stakeholder analysis should be undertaken to assess stakeholder levels of power and interest with regards to the proposed project in order to best identify engagement strategies. UNDP may wish to consider using the *UNDP Guidance Note on Assessing Rule of Law using Institutional and Context Analysis*, UNDP's interpretation of political economy analysis[10]. A more robust analysis and assessment at the preliminary stages will help to ensure that *do not harm* considerations are adhered to and adequately factored in project design and implementation.

---

[10] https://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/democratic-governance/access_to_justiceandruleoflaw/guidance-note-on-assessing-the-rule-of-law-using-institutional-a.html

2) Informed project design with clearly defined indicators

As a result of the analysis and assessments undertaken a more informed project can be designed, which is realistic and attainable given the operational realities, the opportunities and constraints on the ground. A small set of high quality, measurable indicators should be developed and reviewed to ensure that the indicators are not only clearly defined but are also representative, reliable and feasible. A greater use of qualitative indicators that measure perceptions and behaviours at the outcome level, as opposed to quantitative indicators that measure activities at the output level, will likely better capture project progress and results, as well as contributions towards the outcomes and impact. These will also allow for capturing the voices of people, which cannot be captured through quantitative indicators, in particular when measuring change on sensitive issues such as GBV.

Once potential implementing partners have been identified during the analysis, a capacity assessment of each partner should be undertaken to assess their respective strengths and weaknesses and activities should then be tailored accordingly. This will result in each partner implementing activities based on their expertise, will avoid possible overlap and duplication of efforts, and will maximise resources.

From the very first stages of the project design process, consideration should be given to the project's exit strategy, and to the sustainability aspects of each of the project's activities. These should be detailed in the project document, but regularly reviewed throughout the implementation period, to capture changing realities and ensure that maximum national ownership is achieved. The exit strategy should specify the transition arrangements to sustain and/or scale-up results, as relevant. It should describe how national capacities would be strengthened and monitored as relevant.

3) Move towards more adaptive programming

Based on the experiences gained during the implementation of the PBF project, which highlighted the need for responsive, flexible and adaptive implementation based on the changing context, both agencies should consider a move towards more adaptive programming. This will allow for the shifting of priorities and resources where results are not being achieved. This approach will require strong and measurable system based indicators and routine, rigorous monitoring, including a regularly updated risk management framework to make adjustments to programming on a regular basis, but will allow for the potential of better results with the same resources. In addition, it will require regular Project Board Meetings – ideally on a quarterly basis – together with review and lessons learned workshops. These should be systematically programmed and budgeted to allow for review, reflection and adaptation as required.

4) PBF Adaptive Management

Tied to recommendation 3) above, a more adaptive style of management is also required on the part of the PBF or whichever donor is funding future initiatives in Rakhine State. As discussed elsewhere in this chapter, the activities envisage under PBF project required a funding modality that was as adaptive and fluid as the local context within which it was being implemented. The conflict dynamics in Rakhine were not static and did not take a linear path, meaning that the project should have been able to swiftly and appropriately adjust to the changes that it was confronted with. The evaluation team found that due to the results-based management approach of the PBF mechanism, which only allows for 15 per cent adaptation during the project implementation period, the project was unable to adapt sufficiently in accordance to the context within which it was operating, largely due to the requirement for a non-adaptive logframe. The PBF project was thus not equipped to make course changes and better reflect the realities within which it was operating. It is noted that the PBF rules and mechanism do allow for adaptation during any project extension period, however the project extension was not feasible due to the reluctance of government to sign off on this. None of these factors detract from the achievements of the project or the catalytic impact that the PBF funds produced.

While it is outside the scope of this evaluation to assess the PBF mechanism, it is strongly recommended by the evaluation team that the PBF adopts a more adaptive style of managing is projects through

introducing mechanisms that will allow it to understand the necessity of experimentation to understand what works, by creating mechanisms for collecting and sharing information about the context, and by allowing for the swift adjustment of activities, operations, plans, and strategies based on this information. Further, in view of the fact that the project had two partners both with their own detailed budgets, consideration should be given by PBF to looking at the expenditure of each individual partner, rather than the overall expenditure of the project in deciding when to transfer resources.

5) Closer government engagement

Closer cooperation with government at both the national and state level is key to working with service providers. The PBF project focused more on bottom-up, demand side capacity building, awareness raising and provision of services through civil society organisations, but future programming, in particular for UNDP, should address top-down, supply side initiatives as well. In part, this was due to the main avenues for working on the supply side, namely through the ROLC and the RoL Coordinating Body being cut off, due to the ROLC not being established in Rakhine and due to the internal issues of the RoL Coordinating Body. Any project implemented in Rakhine has to be part of a broader strategy that is working at the national and union levels and includes peace building and social cohesion activities. UNDP should have specific capacity development initiatives that are working on building capacities of government across the board, and/or should coordinate donors to address this more comprehensively and systematically. In addition, both agencies need to work more on advocacy at a senior level to create coordination and cooperation among institutions, with a view to this ultimately filtering down to the state level. It is noted that the Director General of the Department of Social Work (DSW) cited the lack of government engagement as one of the reasons for the government not agreeing to the no-cost extension, because she felt that UNDP/UNFPA had not engaged sufficiently with the DSW at the Union or State level.

6) Human-rights based approach

As mentioned above under 5), the project focused more on bottom-up, demand style activities and did not fully design or implement the project in line with the human rights based approach (HRBA). The HRBA approach to programming is a conceptual framework for the process of human development that is normatively based on international human rights standards and operationally directed to promoting and protecting human rights. It seeks to analyse inequalities, which lie at the heart of development problems and redress discriminatory practices and unjust distributions of power that impede development progress. Crucially, it works with both service providers in terms of strengthening their capacities to deliver transparent, accountable, equitable and quality services, and with rights-holders to raise awareness of their rights and develop their capacities to demand their rights. It is recommended by the evaluation team that the HRBA is mainstreamed into all UNDP and UNFPA project development and implementation, as a way to bridge the divide between the supply and demand side of its programming and to lead to better and more sustainable human development outcomes.

7) Multi-disciplinary training

During the implementation of the PBF project all training initiatives were conducted with single institutions. The evaluation team recommends that in future UNDP programming, police, GAD, courts and the AGO need to have joint programming and joint training. This will help foster an understanding of the importance of collaboration and communication. These joint, multi-disciplinary trainings should be conducted at the national level as well as at union and state level, to ensure that this understanding is reached at the highest level. It is anticipated that a better understanding would help facilitate programming and in addressing challenges and constraints of programming.

8) Complementarity

The evaluation team recommends that greater consideration be paid to the issue of complementarity between project and programme implementing partners. Ways of engaging with implementing partners should be reviewed, in order to ensure a more participatory approach. For example, as discussed above,

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 strategy and vision as well as each partner's individual responsibilities. This approach would contribute 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			
Relevant Evaluation criteria ●	**Key Questions** ●	**Specific Sub-Questions** ●	**Data Sources** ●	**Data collection Methods/Tools** ●	**Indicators/ Success Standard** ●	**Methods for Data Analysis** ●
The **relevance** of PBF project's design, with a specific focus on its theory of change and how the project outputs realistically and effectively contributed to its overall objective.	Were the objectives of the project and its design appropriate at the time the project was initiated, considering the political/security developments in Rakhine State as well as national priorities, and did they remain relevant in light of the on-going security situation? To what extent does the project contribute to gender equality, the empowerment of women and the human rights-based approach? To what extent has	* Were any stakeholder inputs/concerns addressed at the project formulation stage? *How does the project align with related national strategies? *How does the project address the human development needs of intended beneficiaries? *What analysis, in particular of the Rakhine State context and its political economy was done in designing the project? *Was the project able to adapt to evolving needs/changing context? *How did the project contribute to conflict mitigation surrounding the inter-ethnic	*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, results orientated monitoring reports, field visit reports *Implementing partners progress reports	● 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, including: **Government counterparts** - Ministry of Social Welfare, Relief and Resettlement (MSWRR) - Rakhine State Government - Ministry of Health	N/A	*Qualitative and quantitative data analysis *Data synthesis *Descriptive statistical analysis *Process tracing *Triangulation *Discussion of data amongst the Review Team *Verification of data with Stakeholders *Fact checking by UNDP/UNFPA comment and feedback to evaluation team

the project been appropriately responsive to political, legal, economic, institutional, etc., changes in the country throughout the project period? What is the degree to which the PBF project activities were overlapping with and/or complementing other interventions in the domain? To what extent did UNDP/UNFPA identify and respond to the major external and internal factors influencing the achievement of the project? What is the level of acceptance for and support to the Project by relevant	violence and security context; as well as gender-based violence? *How well were gender aspects taken into account into project design and concretely and effectively implemented? *What project revisions were made and why? *Was a stakeholder analysis conducted as part of the project development phase?		and Sports (MOHS) - Union Office of the Attorney General (UAGO) - Ministry of Ethnic Affairs - Ministry of Home Affairs **Non-Governmental Organizations** - International Rescue Committee (IRC) - Peace and Development Initiative (PDI) - Legal Clinic Myanmar (LCM) - Thazin Legal Aid - International Legal Foundation (ILF) - International Development Law Organisation (IDLO) - Koe Koe Tech (KKT) **UN Agencies** - UNDP - PBF project staff, rule of law team, senior management - UNFPA – staff involved in PBF project		

	stakeholders? How well were relevant contextual elements (i.e. corruption, political interests within institutions, proliferation of informal justice systems, cultural constraints, sensitivity to human rights violation issue, etc.) integrated into project design and addressed?		**Beneficiaries** - Women and girls - Justice sector actors - Paralegals - Community representatives		
Effectiveness – The overall effectiveness of the implemented project activities towards the expected results	- To what extent has the Project contributed to the attainment of outputs and outcomes initially expected in the Prodoc? - To what extent were the Project's outputs and outcomes synergetic and coherent to produce development results? - What kinds of results were reached?	What is the level of expertise and acceptance of UNDP work in the justice sector and UNFPA work on GBV: which added value does UNDP/UNFPA have and what are its comparative advantages in the sector? *Was the division of labour based on each agency's comparative advantages?	*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	N/A	*Qualitative and quantitative data analysis *Data synthesis *Descriptive statistical analysis *Process tracing *Triangulation *Discussion of data amongst the Review Team *Verification of data with Stakeholders

	- To what extent did the Project have an impact on the targeted population, in particular, women, GBV survivors, minorities? - What was the intervention coverage – 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 (at 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 originally envisaged? - 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 women's perceptions - How were implementing partners selected – what were the criteria?	- How was baseline and endline data gathered? - What was the sample for data collection? - In what way have the project activities contributed to achievement of the outcomes? – What are the reasons for this outcome only be partially achieved?	*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, results orientated monitoring reports, field visit reports *Implementing partners progress reports	• 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 • Pre and post evaluation of digital literacy and story telling • Implementing partners reports	Indicator 1.1: Recommendations for peace building, social cohesion or civic engagement developed as a result of women's access to ICT platforms and inter-communal dialogues. (UNFPA) Indicator 1.2: Improvement of perceptions on women's increased access to platforms to discuss justice and peace-related issues (UNDP)	*Qualitative and quantitative data analysis *Data synthesis *Descriptive statistical analysis *Process tracing *Triangulation *Discussion of data amongst the Review Team *Verification of data with Stakeholders *Fact checking by UNDP/UNFPA comment and feedback to evaluation team
Output 1.1	- In what way was	- Why was it decided to	*National policy	• Document review	Indicator 1.1.1:	*Qualitative and

45

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? - How did the project contribute to raising legal awareness? Among which groups of beneficiaries?	work with paralegals? -	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, results orientated monitoring reports, field visit reports *Implementing partners progress reports	• 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 partners reports	Number of advocacy dialogues on peace and reconciliation, GBV and access to justice, organized (including government, CSOs, women and girls) which generate actions and plans for improving social cohesions and access to justice (UNDP)	quantitative data analysis *Data synthesis *Descriptive statistical analysis *Process tracing *Triangulation *Discussion of data amongst the Review Team *Verification of data with Stakeholders *Fact checking by UNDP/UNFPA comment and feedback to evaluation team
Output 1.2 Evidence generation and data collection strengthened to inform stronger formal justice responses for survivors of GBV	- What were the reasons that the baseline assessment was not undertaken and how did UNDP/UNFPA overcome this? - How was the project able to adapt to changing circumstances and modify its activities	- In what way were UNFPA and UNDP able to address the issue of GBV through this output? - Is the Court Information System available yet in Rakhine State – if not, what steps have been undertaken to introduce it	*National policy documents including relevant strategies and action plans, in particular the RAC Recommendations *UNDP/UNFPA Strategic Documents *PBF Project Document	• Document review • Site and field visits • Stakeholder interviews • Independent external research and reports • Focus groups • Email, phone and Skype follow-up where necessary	Indicator 1.2.1: Baseline assessment report produced highlighting opportunities and challenges associated with women's pathways through the formal justice system in Rakhine (UNFPA &	*Qualitative and quantitative data analysis *Data synthesis *Descriptive statistical analysis *Process tracing *Triangulation *Discussion of data amongst the Review

| | | | *PBF Progress Reports *PBF Quality Assurance report, results orientated monitoring reports, field visit reports *Implementing partners progress reports | • Interviews with stakeholders as detailed above

- Implementing partners reports | UNDP)

Indicator 1.2.2: Number of criminal case information forms populated by justice sector institutions that contain data fields related to SGBV (UNDP) | Team *Verification of data with Stakeholders *Fact checking by UNDP/UNFPA comment and feedback to evaluation team |
| Output 1.3 Provision of an information platform to enable inter communal consultation and dialogues | - Please describe the process of developing the digital literacy programme - Please describe the development of the online platform - Which beneficiaries is the online platform targeted, what types of information are available and how is the online platform being used | - What were the results of the pre and post digital literacy training - Has any follow-up been undertaken to see if women and girls are using any of the skills they learned in their every day lives? - How was the 'Sarama' app useful for the IDP women in Rakhine? What were the feedbacks of users? | *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, results orientated monitoring reports, field visit reports *Implementing partners progress reports | • 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 partners reports | Indicator 1.3.1: Number of women (including women within women's groups) accessing the online forums to participate in peace building and conflict resolution interventions (UNFPA)

Indicator 1.3.2: Number of women who have received training on mobile technology and usage of mobile applications (UNFPA)

Indicator 1.3.4: | *Qualitative and quantitative data analysis *Data synthesis *Descriptive statistical analysis *Process tracing *Triangulation *Discussion of data amongst the Review Team *Verification of data with Stakeholders *Fact checking by UNDP/UNFPA comment and feedback to evaluation team |

					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, RoL, and women's rights and 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	*Qualitative and quantitative data analysis *Data synthesis *Descriptive statistical analysis *Process tracing *Triangulation *Discussion of data amongst the Review Team *Verification of data with Stakeholders

	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 women's rights, and barriers to women's access to 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 reasons for not fully achieving this output?	been undertaken to assess he application of knowledge into daily work? - What support has been provided to paralegals to ensure survivor centred service provision?	Assurance report, results orientated monitoring reports, field visit reports *Implementing partners progress reports	• Implementing partners reports	# of government officials trained by UNDP on rule of law, GBV and human rights (UNDP) Indicator 2.1.3: # of TOT, ROL Foundation courses, Legal Skills or specialized legal courses delivered by the ROLC (UNDP) Indicator 2.1.4: # of paralegals trained in target communities (UNDP)	Stakeholders *Fact checking by UNDP/UNFPA comment and feedback to evaluation team
Output 2.2 Local capacities for gender and conflict sensitive mediation, dispute and conflict resolution enhanced	- How many mediators were trained and what were the criteria for selection? - Was a training curriculum successfully developed – if so by whom - Which government officials were	- Were pre and post training evaluations undertaken and if so, what were the results of these? - Has any follow-up been undertaken to assess he application of knowledge into daily work? - Have there been any impact assessments of	*National policy documents including relevant strategies and action plans, in particular the RAC Recommendations *UNDP/UNFPA Strategic Documents *PBF Project Document	• Document review • Site and field visits • Stakeholder interviews • Independent external research and reports • Focus groups • Email, phone and Skype follow-up where necessary	Indicator 2.2.1: # of mediators trained on basic mediation skills (UNDP) Indicator 2.2.2: Training curriculum developed on rule of law, human rights, SGBV and conflict & gender	*Qualitative and quantitative data analysis *Data synthesis *Descriptive statistical analysis *Process tracing *Triangulation *Discussion of data amongst the Review

	targeted to be trained under this output and on which topics? How did this differ from training provided to government officials under output 2.1? - What was the process for the delivery of mobile training sessions?	the mobile training sessions? If so, what were the results?	*PBF Progress Reports *PBF Quality Assurance report, results orientated monitoring reports, field visit reports *Implementing partners progress reports	• Interviews with stakeholders as detailed above • Implementing partners reports	sensitive mediation (UNDP) Indicator 2.2.3: # of government officials trained by UNDP Indicator 2.2.4: # of mobile training sessions delivered to community	Team *Verification of data with Stakeholders *Fact checking by UNDP/UNFPA comment and feedback to evaluation team
Outcome 3 Women's access to local justice, peace and policy-making mechanisms increased	- How did UNDP build capacities of the Coordination Body? Why was this partner selected and why has it become largely obsolete? - Within the framework of the PBF project, how has UNDP engaged with the Rakhine Legal Aid Board? How was this partner selected? - Did any public consultations take place? If so, on what topics and what was the participation level?	- What are the criteria for selection of beneficiaries and types of cases that receive legal aid? - What mechanisms exist to ensure quality of the legal aid provided? - What mechanisms exist to track the cases that receive legal aid through the project?	*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, results orientated monitoring reports, field visit reports *Implementing partners progress	• 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 partners reports	Indicator 3.1: # of justice sector plans and actions informed by increased coordination in the sector and data analysis and public consultation inclusive of women and other vulnerable groups (UNDP) Indicator 3.2: 15% increase of the # of women and other vulnerable groups represented by legal aid providers (UNDP)	*Qualitative and quantitative data analysis *Data synthesis *Descriptive statistical analysis *Process tracing *Triangulation *Discussion of data amongst the Review Team *Verification of data with Stakeholders *Fact checking by UNDP/UNFPA comment and feedback to evaluation team

			reports			
Output 3.1 Strengthened relationships between Rakhine women and national civil society and networks	- Were any baseline or endline surveys undertaken and if so, what did the data show? - What were the reasons for developing a conflict sensitivity strategy and not an outreach strategy? - What is the objective of the CSS and has it been adopted yet – if so, by whom?	- What are the factors influencing women's perceptions of social cohesion and peacebuilding and what did the project do to address these? - What mechanisms are in place for monitoring the implementation of the conflict sensitivity strategy - What does the implementation monitoring show?	*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, results orientated monitoring reports, field visit reports *Implementing partners progress reports	• 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 partners reports	Indicator 3.1.1: Increase in % of women from all sites with improved perceptions of the benefits of social cohesion and peacebuilding (UNFPA) Indicator 3.1.2: Rakhine specific outreach strategy developed and implemented (UNDP)	*Qualitative and quantitative data analysis *Data synthesis *Descriptive statistical analysis *Process tracing *Triangulation *Discussion of data amongst the Review Team *Verification of data with Stakeholders *Fact checking by UNDP/UNFPA comment and feedback to evaluation team
Output 3.2 Local justice and peace mechanisms are more accessible to women and sensitive to their identified justice priority	- What coordination mechanisms exist with regards to women's access to justice? - Which stakeholders are included in the Coordinating Body for RoL? - What were the	- What research if any has been conducted to provide findings and recommendations and strategies on women's justice needs? - What were the findings from the analysis of 100 legal cases relating to	*National policy documents including relevant strategies and action plans, in particular the RAC Recommendations *UNDP/UNFPA Strategic Documents	• Document review • Site and field visits • Stakeholder interviews • Independent external research and reports • Focus groups • Email, phone and	Indicator 3.2.1: Rakhine Coordinating Body for Rule of Law and Justice Sector Affairs meets on regular basis (UNDP) Indicator 3.2.2:	*Qualitative and quantitative data analysis *Data synthesis *Descriptive statistical analysis *Process tracing *Triangulation *Discussion of

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 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 government actors to address women's justice issues and women rights (UNDP) Indicator 3.2.3: # of reports outlining findings and recommendations and strategies to address women justice priority needs shared with decision makers (UNDP)	data amongst the Review Team *Verification of data with Stakeholders *Fact checking by UNDP/UNFPA comment and feedback to evaluation team
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	- What assessments have been undertaken relating to the social behavioural change and gender equality trainings? Has any follow-up been undertaken either with the participants or with female members of their	- How did legal aid provision under this output differ from that provided under outputs 1 and 2?	*National policy documents including relevant strategies and action plans, in particular the RAC Recommendations *UNDP/UNFPA Strategic Documents *PBF Project Document	• Document review • Site and field visits • Stakeholder interviews • Independent external research and reports • Focus groups • Email, phone and Skype follow-up where necessary	Indicator 3.3.1: Number of Men and Boys who participated in Social Behaviour Change and Gender Equality programmes (UNFPA) Indicator 3.3.2: % of women who	*Qualitative and quantitative data analysis *Data synthesis *Descriptive statistical analysis *Process tracing *Triangulation *Discussion of data amongst the Review

local justice and decision-making mechanisms	families? - What mechanisms are in place to track women's participation in decision-making processes? How did the project measure the pre-project situation?		*PBF Progress Reports *PBF Quality Assurance report, results orientated monitoring reports, field visit reports *Implementing partners progress reports	● Interviews with stakeholders as detailed above ● Implementing partners reports	report increased participation in decision making processes (UNFPA) Indicator 3.3.3: # of Community Forums, Legal Discussions and related outreach activities organized (UNDP) Indicator 3.3.4: # of women, girls, and other vulnerable groups benefiting from legal information, counselling and/or representation (UNDP)	Team *Verification of data with Stakeholders *Fact checking by UNDP/UNFPA comment and feedback to evaluation team
Efficiency in delivering outputs The cost efficiency of the implemented project activities towards the	Have the implementation modalities been appropriate and cost-effective? Did the PBF staffing structure and management arrangements ensure cost-efficiency, value-	*Did UNDP/UNFPA choose the best implementing partners? Were there any institutions that should have been included in the PBF project but weren't. ● *How often did the project board met?	*National policy documents including relevant strategies and action plans, in particular the RAC Recommendations *UNDP/UNFPA Strategic Documents *PBF Project	● Document requests ● Site and field visits ● Stakeholder interviews ● Independent external research and reports ● Focus groups Email, phone and	N/A	*Qualitative and quantitative data analysis *Data synthesis *Descriptive statistical analysis *Process tracing *Triangulation *Discussion of data amongst

| expected results | for-money, and effectiveness of implementation strategies and overall delivery of results?

Was there good coordination and communication between partners in the project, incl. between UNDP and UNFPA

Did the project coordinate its activities sufficiently with other initiatives in the field in Rakhine State?

Was the project implemented within deadline and cost estimates?

Did UNDP/UNFPA and its partners solve any implementation issues promptly?

Were project resources focused on | Were there any issues raised regarding implementation? If so, how and to what extent were these addressed by UNDP/UNFPA?
   ●
*What other UN agencies, bi-laterals and INGOs are active in the sector? How did UNDP/UNFPA's programming overlap, if at all with other initiatives?   *To what extent were UNDP/UNFPA able to synergize with other UN agencies?
   ●
*Was the project fully staffed and were the staffing/management arrangements efficient?

*Were procurements processed in a timely manner?
   ●
* Were the resources allocated sufficient/too much? | Document
*PBF Progress Reports
*PBF Quality Assurance report, results orientated monitoring reports, field visit reports
*Implementing partners progress reports | Skype follow-up where necessary
● Meetings with UNDP/UNFPA finance teams | | the Review Team
*Verification of data with Stakeholders
*Fact checking by UNDP/UNFPA comment and feedback to evaluation team |

	the set of activities that were expected to provide significant results Was there any unified synergy between UN/DP/FPA initiatives that contributed towards reducing costs?	*What were the reasons for over or under expenditure within the Project?				
Sustainability of the outcome	*Did the project manage to procure Gov. co-financing for any of the deliverables? Did the project secure financing for 100% of the project activities? If not, why not and what was the shortfall? Did the project provide for the handover of any activities? *What are the perceived capacities of the relevant institutions for taking	* Was there an exit strategy for the Project? Did it take into account political, financial, technical and environmental factors? * What issues emerged during implementation as a threat to sustainability? (if not covered above) *What corrective measures were adopted? How did UNDP/UNFPA address the challenge of building national capacities? (if not covered above) *What is the level of national/regional ownership of the	*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, results orientated monitoring reports, field visit reports *Implementing partners progress	• Document requests • Site and field visits • Stakeholder interviews, in particular with UNDP, SDC and other bilateral donors and the national justice institutions included in the project • Independent external research and reports • Focus groups • Email, phone and Skype follow-up where necessary	% of Government Co-financing procured by project? # of activities absorbed by national partners/other UNDP/UNFPA projects	*Qualitative and quantitative data analysis *Data synthesis *Descriptive statistical analysis *Process tracing *Triangulation *Discussion of data amongst the Review Team *Verification of data with Stakeholders *Fact checking by UNDP/UNFPA comment and feedback to evaluation team

	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			

ANNEX 2 – Draft Informant Interview Guides

Interview questions for government counterparts
1. What are the main challenges of peacebuilding in Rakhine State?
2. Are you familiar with this project? Is the project relevant to peacebuilding in Rakhine? Among the activities conducted under the project (legal aid services for women and girls, trainings to governmental officials, awareness raising, community forums, etc.), which of them were most relevant and why? Were there any less relevant activities?
3. In your view what is the long-term impact made by the project activities?
4. Have you noticed any unintended consequences, whether negative or positive of the project? Give examples
5. In your view, how will the project activities contribute to larger peacebuilding picture of the country?
6. Has the project strengthened local/national capacity for building peace? If yes, in what areas?
7. How this project has contributed to bring changes in cultural barriers, mindsets and traditional practices forming obstacles for women and girls to be able to participate in peacebuilding / decision making process?
8. Is there any other organization/people continuing the project activities after the project has completed?
9. If this project is implemented in the next phase, what would be your suggestion? Which areas it should focus and why?

Interview questions for the Officials (justice sector actors, judges, law officers, ward/village tract administrators and lawyers) trained by UNDP / IDLO on RoL, GBV, human rights
1. In your opinion, what are the (social or economic) barriers for women and girls in Rakhine to access justice / participate in decision-making process? What could be done to improve the situation?
2. If you have been part of the trainings provided by UNDP or partners, how would you assess the trainings? Which aspects seemed most/least useful?
3. How did these capacities affect your work? Can you provide examples of how you applied/used the skills/guidance gained through the training programme?
4. To what extent are you seeing the skills gained through trainings / awareness raising activities provided by the project being applied in the local courts, administration, community decision making, etc.? Which factors come into play in relation to such skill application?
5. How have the awareness raising activities impacted access to local justice (particularly for women and GBV survivors), peace and policy-making mechanisms?

Interview questions for participants of paralegal trainings
1. Tell us about your background and experience in being paralegals.
2. What did you learn during the training processes? *Prompt: did this fit with what you expected from such trainings?*
3. Which elements of the training were relevant to support your day-to-day activities?
4. To what extent have you been able to use the skills that you learned/enhanced during the trainings?
5. What factors have allowed you to use these/not use these?
6. What are on-going challenges for you in being able to carry out your responsibilities as paralegal?
7. To whom are services provided? Do you provide services for all / selected communities? How can clients reach out to you when they need your assistance? Which type of clients do you mostly assist?
8. Do you envision staying in the profession in the near term? Medium term? Why/why not?
9. What advice do you have for the project and others in the legal / justice system to support your profession to further be able to perform your duties?
10. As a beneficiary of the project, any suggestion and things to be improved?

Interview questions for Women and girls who received legal aid services, counselling and/or representation through LCM / Thazin Legal Aid / ILF
1. We understand that at the legal clinic you had the chance to talk about your legal needs. What support/advice did you receive for your problem?
2. Do you think the support/advice you got was helpful? If yes, how, can you describe it to us?
3. If not, what were you expecting?
4. Were you also referred to go elsewhere for advice/service? If yes, where did you go?
5. Was the person giving you advice polite and helpful?
6. Any suggestions to improve support/service to women and girls facing legal problems?
7. Any suggestions to prevent women and girls from getting into such problems?

Interview questions for community leaders / local administrators
1. Are you familiar about the project?
2. What are the peacebuilding needs in your region/locality?
3. Did the project have suitable activities to address those needs?
4. Did anyone consult you in the past to know your RoL / access to justice / peacebuilding / security needs?
5. Have your received any opportunity through this project to express your safety/security concerns in your region/locality? If yes, how?
6. Have you taken part in the awareness raising / trainings conducted by the project? *E.g. training for local administrators in legal aspects of land administration.* How would you assess trainings?
7. Is the project idea relevant to address the issue of women's participation in peacebuilding and women's access to justice?
8. Are the project activities relevant to the local context?
9. How this project has contributed to bring changes in cultural barriers, mindsets and traditional practices forming obstacles for women to be able to participate in decision-making process?
10. What is your view about coordination of activities between UNDP and local partners/stakeholders?
11. Have you noticed any negative impact of the project?
12. Any suggestions and things to be improved?

Interview questions for UNDP and UNFPA
1. To what extent is implementation matching your vision for the project? Why/why not?
2. Has the project been able to reach all target groups that it had intended to reach?
3. How has the changing context in Rakhine impacted on the programme implementation?
4. Which aspects of the project, and which of the approaches (legal aid services for women and girls, trainings to governmental officials, awareness raising, community forums, etc.) used were most successful in bringing about change and why?
5. How was the partnership and coordination among the UNDP, UNFPA, implementing partners, national and local partners?
6. How were implementing partners / service providers held to account for equitable and sensitive delivery of services / benefits?
7. What was the composition (gender, ethnicity, etc.) of project staff of implementing partners and does it reflect the diversity of project stakeholders?
8. What avenues did women and vulnerable groups have to provide feedback on the project, or otherwise influence how and what the project was delivering?
9. Do you think project activities have changed perceptions of women's access to discuss justice and peace related issues? How have activities had this kind of effect?
10. Is there evidence that the project advanced any key national human rights, gender or inclusion policies?
11. Have you observed any unintended impact (could be negative as well as positive) of the project?

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 challenges?
5. What have been some key learning points you have gathered as you carried out your technical/legal assistance and trainings? Have you had any feedback from participants involved in some of these? And adapted?
6. Has the project been able to reach all target groups that it had intended to reach?
7. *Were there any unintended negative consequences of the project implementation?* Prompt: Did the *project create any divisions in the community?*
8. Do you think project activities have changed perceptions of women to discuss justice and peace related issues? How have activities had this kind of effect?
9. Could the same results have been achieved in another way?
10. What avenues did women and vulnerable groups have to provide feedback on the project, or otherwise influence how and what the project was delivering?
11. What challenges of access for participating women and vulnerable groups were identified, monitored and addressed?
12. Is there evidence that the project advanced any key national human rights, gender or inclusion policies?
13. Where should UNDP, UNFPA and others working on RoL, A2J, and gender equality focus their efforts during the next two years? Any specific visions or recommendations for beyond?
14. How do you think the local population perceive your work?
15. Overall, which were the most important or relevant changes you have noticed as a result of the project?

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, RoL, Gender, Justice Officer
- ▪ Hnin Marlar Htun, RoL, Gender, Justice Specialist

UNFPA Yangon

- ▪ Eri Taniguchi, Programme Specialist, Gender Equality / GBV
- ▪ Janneke Bienert, Programme Specialist, Women and Girls First Programme
- ▪ Lai Win Phyu, GBV Program Analyst

UNFPA Sittwe

- ▪ Penninah Tomusange Kyoyagala, Programme Specialist (GBV)
- ▪ Cho Hmi Naing, Program Officer (GBV)

Koe Koe Tech Yangon

- ▪ Hay Mar Win, Partnership Manager,
- ▪ Hein Zaw, M&E Coordinator

IRC Yangon

- ▪ Naomi Rennard, Deputy Director – Program
- ▪ Amy Nieman, Women's Protection and Empowerment Coordinator

IRC Sittwe

- ▪ Harriet Awvor, Senior WPE Manager
- ▪ Hsu Htet, WPE Manager
- ▪ Ei Ei Thin, Senor Response Officer

IDLO Yangon

- 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

- ▪ Zaw Zaw Min, Lawyer, Bar Association

UNDP / Thazin Legal Aid's Beneficiaries

- ▪ 1 female paralegal legal training participant
- ▪ 2 male clients who received legal aid services from Thazin / paralegal legal training participants / farmers
- ▪ 1 male village tract administrator / paralegal legal training participant

UNDP / LCM's Beneficiaries

- ▪ 2 female paralegal training participants
- ▪ 1 male paralegal training participant / camp manager
- ▪ 1 female client who received legal aid service from LCM

UNDP / ILF's Beneficiaries

- ▪ 2 male clients who received legal aid service from ILF

UNFPA / IRC / PDI's Beneficiaries

- ▪ 5 female participants of digital literacy training from Set Yoe Kya camp

ANNEX 4 – INDICATOR COMPARISON TABLE

Original Outcome / Output	Revised Outcome / Output	Original Indicator, Baseline, Target	Revised Indicator, Baseline, Target
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	Same as original	Outcome Indicator 1.1: **Number of action plans** or recommendations for peace building, social cohesion or civic engagement developed as a result of women's access to ICT platforms. Baseline: 0 Target: **5% of women accessing Women and Girls Centres**	Indicator 1.1: Recommendations for peace building, social cohesion or civic engagement developed as a result of women's access to ICT platforms and **inter-communal dialogues**. (UNFPA) Baseline: No Target: **Yes**
Output 1.1 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)	Same as original	Output Indicator 1.1.2: A discussion/position paper on transitional justice produced as result of advocacy dialogues Baseline: 0 Target: 1	**Indicator is taken out**

Output 1.2 Evidence generation and data collection strengthened to inform stronger formal justice responses for survivors of GBV	Same as original	Output Indicator 1.2.1: **Qualitative research report** produced highlighting opportunities and challenges associated with women's pathways through the formal justice system in Rakhine Baseline: 0 Target: 1	Indicator 1.2.1: **Baseline assessment report** produced highlighting opportunities and challenges associated with women's pathways through the formal justice system in Rakhine (UNFPA & UNDP) Baseline: 0 Target: 1
Output 1.3 Provision of an information platform to enable inter communal consultation and dialogues	Same as original	Output Indicator 1.3.1: Number of women (including women within women's groups) accessing the online forums to participate in peace building and conflict resolution interventions Baseline: 0 Target: **200**	Indicator 1.3.1: Number of women (including women within women's groups) accessing the online forums to participate in peace building and conflict resolution interventions (UNFPA) Baseline: 0 Target: **80**
		Output Indicator 1.3.2: Number of women who have received training on mobile technology and usage of mobile applications Baseline:0 Target: **200**	Indicator 1.3.2: Number of women who have received training on mobile technology and usage of mobile applications (UNFPA) Baseline: 0 Target: **80**
		Output Indicator 1.3.3: Development of vocational training package to support women in the WGCs Baseline: nil Target: 1	**Indicator is taken out**

		Output Indicator 1.3.5: \# of women with increased capacity to utilise ICT to support access to information including legal advice and services. Baseline: 0 Target: **200**	Indicator 1.3.5: \# of women with increased capacity to utilise ICT to support access to information including legal advice and services (UNFPA). Baseline: 0 Target: **80**
		Output Indicator 1.3.6: \# of users accessing the online forum Baseline: 0 Target: 700	**Indicator is taken out**
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 vulnerable groups, including survivors of GBV	Same as original	Output Indicator 2.1.3: \# of TOT, ROL Foundation courses, Legal Skills or specialized legal courses delivered by the ROLC Baseline: 0 Target: 6 specialized legal courses 2 TOT 5 Foundations Trainings	Indicator 2.1.3: \# of TOT, ROL Foundation courses, Legal Skills or specialized legal courses delivered by the ROLC (UNDP) Baseline: 0 Target: 6 specialized legal courses **1** TOT or Advanced Foundation course 5 Foundations Trainings
		Output 2.1.4: **\# of functioning paralegal committees mechanisms established** in target communities Baseline: 0 Target: **15**	Indicator 2.1.4: **\# of paralegals trained** in target communities (UNDP) Baseline: 0 Target: **300**

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 Baseline: 0 Target: 100

		Output Indicator 2.2.4: # of mobile training sessions delivered to community **representatives on rule of law, social cohesion and conflict sensitivity** Baseline: 0 Target: 15 sessions; 450 community representatives trained	Indicator 2.2.4: # of mobile training sessions delivered to community (UNDP) Baseline: 0 Target: 15 sessions; 450 community representatives trained
Output 3.1 Strengthened relationships between Rakhine women and national civil society and networks	Same as original	Output Indicator 3.1.3: # of coordination forums utilizing the virtual platform to include women from Rakhine State Baseline: 0 Target: 3	**Indicator is taken out**
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	Same as original	Output Indicator 3.3.2: **Number of women** who report increased participation in decision making processes in their homes or communities Baseline: nil Target: **50**	Indicator 3.3.2: **% of women** who report increased participation in decision making processes (UNFPA) Baseline: 0 Target: **25%**
		Indicator 3.3.3: # of Community Forums, Legal Discussions and related outreach activities organized **by RoLC** Baseline: 0 Target: **15**	Indicator 3.3.3: # of Community Forums, Legal Discussions and related outreach activities organized (UNDP) Baseline: 0 Target: **10**

ANNEX 5 – Bibliography of sources consulted

UNDP

- UNDP Country Programme Document for Myanmar (2018-2022)
- Rakhine Programme Document, UNDP and UN Women, 2018
- Access to Justice and Informal Justice Systems Research Rakhine State, UNDP, 2017
- Conflict Sensitivity and Gender Responsiveness Review, 30 June 2018
- SARL Project Document, UNDP, 5 November 2018
- SARL Field Monitoring Reports, UNDP, 2019
- Interim Reports, RoL Centres Programme in Rakhine, IDLO, 2018 and 2019
- Quarterly Reports, Access to Justice in Rakhine, LCM, 2018 and 2019
- Quarterly Report, Provision of Legal Awareness and Legal Services in Rakhine State in the Programmatic Area of Land, Housing, and Property Rights, LCM, 2019

UNFPA

- UNFPA Country Programme Document for Myanmar (2018-2022)
- UNFPA PBF Work Plan and Budget
- A rapid evaluation of a GBV prevention program piloted in Rakhine State, IRC, June 2017
- Quarterly reports, IRC, 2018 and 2019
- ICT Assessment Report, IRC, 2019
- Tech Literacy for Rakhine Women Inception Report, KKT
- Digital Literacy Training User Testing Report, KKT, February 2019
- Digital Literacy ToT Training Report, KKT, 2019
- Digital Literacy Training & Story Telling, SARAMA Project, Pre-survey report, KKT, September 2019
- Digital Literacy Training Program, Final Report, KKT, 2019
- Digital Literacy & Story Telling Project M&E Report, KKT
- Strategy and Action plan for GBV sub-sector, Multi-sectoral Prevention and Response to Gender-Based Violence (GBV) in Humanitarian settings in Myanmar, December 2013

UNDP and UNFPA

- PBF Project Document, 2018
- PBF Project Progress Report, June 2018
- PBF Project Progress Report, December 2018
- PBF Project Note to the File, 19 July 2019
- PBF Project Final Report, 2019

- Myanmar Laws and CEDAW, Gender Equality Network, January 2013

ANNEX 6: TERMS OF REFERENCE

Location:	Yangon, Myanmar
Type of Contract:	Individual Contractor – International
Assignment title:	**International evaluation consultant**
Project:	PBF - Overcoming barriers to strengthen the voices of all women in Rakhine State for social cohesion and peace
Implemented by:	UNDP and UNFPA
Languages required:	English for international consultant English and Myanmar for national consultant
Duration of Contract:	30 working days

BACKGROUND

Project background and the objectives

This Terms of Reference (ToR) outlines the conduct of the Final Independent Evaluation (FIE) of the UNDP-UNFPA Project, by a team of senior independent and external expert consultants (one international and one national). The project aimed to have the "Social and structural barriers that prevent women's participation and voices both in the formal peace process and in bottom up peacebuilding processes addressed through fostering social cohesion between communities in Rakhine."

The project has been designed within a women peace and security rights-based framework (Protection, Participation and Prevention pillars of SCR1325) to address the social and structural barriers that prevent women's participation and voices both in the formal peace process and in bottom up peacebuilding processes through fostering social cohesion between communities in Rakhine, with three outcomes:

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;

Outcome 2: Values, skills, and knowledge of local communities and justice actors to provide gender and conflict sensitive mediation and resolutions, enhanced; and

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

Project location: Rakhine State is the second poorest state in Myanmar. It is situated in Western Myanmar and comprises of 4 Districts and 17 Townships. Its population is estimated at 3,188,807. The State has a diverse ethnic composition, with the ethnic Rakhine comprising the majority. Muslims make-up between 30-35% of the total population. Of the Muslims, a significant number self-identify as Rohingya, though they are not one of the constitutionally recognized ethnic groups nor recognized as citizens of Myanmar.

The conflict in Rakhine State is complex, with centre-periphery tensions and inter-communal conflict. It is fuelled by experiences of disenfranchisement and discrimination; chronic poverty and competition over natural and economic resources. These tensions primarily affect relations between the majority ethnic Rakhine and minority Muslim, and specifically those who identify themselves as Rohingya, communities. The tensions also extend to those between national government and ethnic Rakhine interests which are partially rooted in historic legacies as well as tensions associated with local versus central control and revenue sharing of resources. In the past three years, inter-communal tensions and conflict between ethnic Rakhine and Muslim communities have resulted in a number of serious waves of violence (2012, 2014, 2016 and most recently in August 2017). These bouts of violence resulted in loss of life, destruction of livelihoods and public assets, and displacement: in 2012 approximately 140,000 people were displaced of whom only 20,000 have been returned or relocated; nearly 70,000 people and then a further exodus of approximately 313,000 people crossed into Bangladesh from October 2016 and August 2017 respectively after violence erupted as a result of a coordinated attack on dozens of police posts and an army by Rohingya insurgents.

These spates of violence have impacted upon the Muslim community and women in particular who are the majority community in northern Rakhine state. Combined with widespread acceptance of gender inequality,

normalization of gender based violence and extensive socio- cultural norms and structural barriers, the space and capacity for women's participation, including in local peace process and social cohesion activities, is limited. This is evident upon analysis of women's political representation and civic participation. No female parliamentarians were elected to the Rakhine State Parliament in 2015, and only three were elected from Rakhine State constituencies to the Union Parliament in Naypyitaw. There are currently no female administrators (i.e. Village Tract, Township or District Administrators) in the state, though women do sometimes hold more junior civil service positions. This is also emphasized in the 2015 -2016 Myanmar Demographic Health Survey (MDHS) which identifies Rakhine as the state where Myanmar women experience the highest levels of spousal violence and the second highest levels of physical violence and sexual violence in the country.

The lack of participation and normalization of gender based violence is compounded by a weak justice system, 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 further undermines the government's ability to uphold the rule of law and protect and uphold human rights for the traditionally vulnerable and disadvantaged groups including women. Women's access to justice, particularly in rural areas, is also limited and this is also corroborated by the lack of cases which are managed and resolved by the justice system. Widespread distrust of the state justice system among minority communities, corruption and gender bias, the high-cost of legal fees, lengthy trial delays and language barriers for non-Myanmar speakers are factors which deter survivors from seeking redress through the formal state justice system[13]. To compound the lack of access to justice, non-formal mechanisms adhere to patriarchal norms. Furthermore, women's access to formal justice may also be perceived as an action in opposition to their ethnic identity.

Target beneficiaries: Rakhine citizens, in particular women and other vulnerable groups, including ethnic minorities.
Partners:
Government: Office of the Attorney General (UAGO), Office of the Supreme Court of the Union (OSCU), Ministry of Social Welfare, Relief and Resettlement (MoSWRR), Rakhine State Government (RSG), Ministry of Health and Sports (MoHS), Ministry of Home Affairs (MoHA)
National NGOs and networks: Alliance for Gender in the Peace Process (AGIPP), Shalom, Legal Clinic Myanmar (LCM), Rule of Law Centres, Arakan Bar Council, Thazin Legal Aid Initiative, Centre for Diversity and National Harmony (CDNH), AFXB, Chin Committee for Emergency Response and Rehabilitation, Ministry of Ethnic Affairs
International Organizations and firms:
International Rescue Committee (IRC), Peace and Development Initiative (PDI), Legal Clinic Myanmar (LCM), Thazin Legal Aid, International Legal Foundation (ILF), International Development Law Organization (IDLO) and Koe Koe Tech (KKT).

Resources and timeframe: total budget of USD 1,865,408 over 18 months

Purpose of the work
Purpose of evaluation: The PBF project document outlines that "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". The outcome of the evaluation will inform the planning and implementation of future peacebuilding activities in Rakhine, and/or Myanmar more generally. The UN's PBF Guidelines (2018) outline the concept and rationale for final evaluations.[14] Several key elements of this FIE, 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.

These Terms of Reference (ToRs) refer to the Final Independent Evaluation of the project, by a team of two independent experts/consultants, one international expert as the team leader, and one national expert, both as

---

[11] UNDP Access to Justice Mapping Rakhine, 2016
[12] UNDP Governance Mapping in Rakhine State, 2015
[13] UN Women and Justice Base (2016) 'Voices from the Intersection: Women's Access to Justice in the Plural Legal Systems of Myanmar' 2016.
[14] See UN, Secretary-General's Peacebuilding Fund (PBF): Guidelines, 2018, http://www.unpbf.org/application-guidelines/

Individual Contractors.

BASIC PROJECT INFORMATION	
Project title	Overcoming barriers to strengthen the voices of all women in Rakhine State for social cohesion and peace
Atlas ID	106011 (UNDP) and UJA64 (UNFPA)
MPTF ID and link	PBF/IRF-242 – 00109888 http://mptf.undp.org/factsheet/project/00109888
Country	Myanmar
Region	South-East Asia
Date project document signed	1 April 2018 by Resident Coordinator
Project dates	1 April 2018
	30 September 2019
Project expenditure at the time of evaluation	1,220,386 (Provisional)
Funding source	Peacebuilding Fund (PBF)
Implementing party[1]	UNDP and UNFPA

EVALUATION CRITERIA AND KEY GUIDING QUESTIONS[15]
Project evaluation sample questions

1. **Relevance**
- To what extent does the project contribute to gender equality, the empowerment of women and the human rights-based approach?
- To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to political, legal, economic, institutional, etc., changes in the country?

2. **Effectiveness**
- To what extent were the project outputs achieved?
- What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving intended outputs and outcomes?
- What factors contributed to effectiveness or ineffectiveness?
- In which areas does the project have the greatest achievements? Why and what have been the supporting factors? How can the project build on or expand these achievements?
- In which areas does the project have the fewest achievements? What have been the constraining factors and why? How can or could they be overcome?
- What, if any, alternative strategies would have been more effective in achieving the project's objectives?
- Are the projects objectives and outputs clear, practical and feasible within its frame?

---

[1] *It is the entity that has overall responsibility for implementation of the project (award), effective use of resources and delivery of outputs in the signed project document and workplan.*

[15] Based on OECD DAC Guidelines on Evaluating Peacebuilding Activities http://www.oecd.org/dac/conflict-fragility-resilience/publications/4312151e.pdf, to ensure that the evaluation assesses whether the project has addressed the driver(s) of conflict, the validity of the theory of change, and peacebuilding outcomes in result of the project. This document also provides useful guidance on how to evaluate in peacebuilding contexts:
https://www.cdacollaborative.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/02/PB-DME-Training-Package-final.pdf

- 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. **Sustainability**
- To what extent will financial and economic resources be available to sustain the benefits achieved by the project?
- Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outputs and the project's contributions to country programme outputs and outcomes?
- Do the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits?
- What is the risk that the level of stakeholders' ownership will be sufficient to allow for the project benefits to be sustained?
- To what extent do mechanisms, procedures and policies exist to allow primary stakeholders to carry forward the results attained on gender equality, empowerment of women, human rights and human development?
- To what extent do stakeholders support the project's long-term objectives?
- To what extent are lessons learned being documented by the project team on a continual basis and shared with appropriate parties who could learn from the project?
- To what extent do interventions have well-designed and well-planned exit strategies?
- What could be done to strengthen exit strategies and sustainability?

METHODOLOGY
Methodological approaches may include some or all of the following:
- Evaluation should employ a combination of both qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods and instruments.
- **Document review of all relevant documentation.** This would include a review of inter alia:
  - Project document (contribution agreement).
  - Theory of change and results framework.
  - Programme and project quality assurance reports.
  - Annual workplans. o Activity designs.
  - Consolidated quarterly and annual reports.
  - Results-oriented monitoring report.
  - Highlights of project board meetings.
  - Technical/ financial monitoring reports.
- **Semi-structured interviews** with key stakeholders including key government counterparts, donor community members, representatives of key civil society organizations, UN members and implementing partners:
  - **Development of evaluation questions** around relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability and designed for different stakeholders to be interviewed.
  - Key informant and focus group discussions with men and women, beneficiaries and stakeholders.
  - All interviews should be undertaken in full confidence and anonymity. The final evaluation report should not assign specific comments to individuals.
- **Surveys and questionnaires** including participants in development programmes, UN members and/or surveys and questionnaires involving other stakeholders at strategic and programmatic levels.
- **Field visits** and on-site validation of key tangible outputs and interventions.
- The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach that ensures close engagement with the evaluation managers, implementing partners and direct beneficiaries.
- **Other methods** such as outcome mapping, observational visits, group discussions, etc.
- **Data review and analysis** of monitoring and other data sources and methods.
  - Ensure maximum validity, reliability of data (quality) and promote use; the evaluation team will ensure triangulation of the various data sources.

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:
The FIE team will review the $1,865,408 project as a whole, including UNDP and UNFPA activities.

FIE team selection: UNDP and UNFPA will conduct the application and selection processes for the FIE team, based on these ToRs, and UNDP rules. The team will be contracted as individual consultants either on Individual Contracts or on Reimbursable Loan Agreements (RLA) issued by UNDP.

FIE team composition: The FIE team will be composed of a team of one International and one National Evaluator. The International Evaluator will act as the Team Leader and should have experience in evaluating projects on rule of law, justice and peacebuilding, and good understanding of the Myanmar context. The National Evaluator should have knowledge of the Myanmar political context and access to justice issues, as well as native-speaker Myanmar language skills.

Both team members need fluency in English. During the inception period, the availability and quality of baseline data will be assessed, and a decision taken whether it needs to be augmented, and how. The proposed team composition and / or expertise needed and available to the team are:
1.   *Team leader:* rule of law, justice and peacebuilding evaluation expert with comparative knowledge of other peacebuilding initiatives in conflict-affected and active conflict settings, a good understanding of gender related issues including gender-based violence;
2.   *National Expert*: expertise in the development and peacebuilding challenges in Rakhine and its conflict dynamics; fluency in Myanmar required, and in an ethnic language preferable. The national expert should ideally have experience in interpretation in meetings with government officials.

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

Expected Outputs and Deliverables
The evaluation team will produce:
  • an Inception Report and plan for the evaluation; (10-15 pages). The inception report should be submitted after the desk review and should be produced before the evaluation starts (before any formal evaluation interviews, survey distribution or field visits) and prior to the country visit in the case of international evaluators. It should detail the evaluators' understanding of what is being evaluated and why, showing how each evaluation question will be answered by way of: proposed methods/tools; proposed sources of data; and data collection and analysis procedures. The inception report should include proposed schedule of tasks, activities and deliverables, designating a team member with the lead responsibility for each task or product and content structure of final report. The inception report provides the programme unit and the evaluators with an opportunity to verify that they share the same understanding about the evaluation and clarify any misunderstanding at the outset.
  • a full draft report for review, and;
  • a Final Report, with a separate Executive Summary.

All reports will be in English. The team will organise a validation workshop with partners to test the team's assumptions, findings, and recommendations. The report should utilise high quality infographics and other means of communicating data and findings. Final editing is the responsibility of the evaluation team. PBF's final evaluation reports are publicly available.

International best practices from the PBF's evaluation methodology will be applied to the final evaluation. ERG members will make other documents available and the team will ensure arrangements to protect sensitive documents. A detailed evaluation methodology will be proposed by the evaluation team in its inception report,

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

Institutional Arrangement

<u>Evaluation Reference Group</u>: In order to maximize the credibility, relevance and utility of the evaluation process and the resulting report, the PBF ensures the participation of key stakeholders through different ways including the establishment of an ERG. The Peace and Development Adviser, UN Resident Coordinator's Office will be Secretary of the ERG, in partnership with UNDP and UNFPA. The ERG, an advisory body, will provide a sounding board for the FIE team while protecting its independence. The ERG will support the conduct of the evaluation, including to: provide feedback to the evaluation team on the inception report; participate in the final report validation; provide comments on the draft; ensure distribution of the final report, and; initiate implementation of its recommendations.

The following arrangements will also guide the FIE team's work:
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 leader, the ERG Secretary, the UNDP and UNFPA evaluation focal points, and the Chief of Governance and Sustaining Peace Unit.
3. The UNDP and UNFPA evaluation focal points will be responsible for facilitating data availability to the FIE and data collection in Myanmar, including scheduling and logistics, to plan and coordinate assignment-related travel.
4. The team will otherwise work independently.
5. Other arrangements including consulting days per team member and schedule of payments will be defined in individual contracts.

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

Duration of the Work

1. The estimated duration of the assignment is 30 working days. The evaluation, report and executive summary must be completed by the agreed deadline as mentioned below.
2. The tentative key stages of evaluation include:

- **Phase 1 - Team selection and contracting**: From 15 November – 3 December 2019
- **Phase 2 - Desk review and inception report with plan**: From 16 - 20 2019 (5 days)
- **Phase 3 - Data collection in Myanmar**: From 6 – 17 January 2019 (10 days)
- **Phase 4 - Draft and finalization of report and executive summary in coordination with the ERG**:
From 20 January to 7 February 2019 (15 days)

Duty Station
The consultants will be based in Yangon with a field trip to Rakhine subject to the security and travel authorizations from the government. The assignment as presently envisaged will require about five days of travel to the selected project sites.

EVALUATION ETHICS

"This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation'. The consultant must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The consultant must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses with the express authorization of UNDP and partners."

REQUIRED SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE

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

Educational Qualifications:

- Master's degree or equivalent in law, development studies, political science, international relations, peace, conflict or other related fields

Experience

- A minimum of 10 years of working experience in one or more of the following areas: rule of law, (women's) access to justice and peacebuilding
- Considerable (minimum five years) experience working on development and peacebuilding issues in a complex setting (conflict-affected or in transition to democracy)
- Strong understanding of gender equality and gender-based violence issues in Southeast or South Asia
- Proven experience in conducting access to justice and peacebuilding related evaluations in similar contexts
- Work experience in South East Asia and in Myanmar on (women's) access to justice, conflict, and transition to democracy would be an asset.
- Excellent writing and reporting skills

Language requirements

High degree of fluency in English is required

Price Proposal and Schedule of Payments

The consultant should send a financial proposal based on a **Lump Sum Amount**. The total amount quoted shall be all inclusive and include all costs required to perform the deliverables identified in the TOR, including professional fee, travel costs, living allowance (if any work is to be done outside the IC´s duty station) and any other applicable costs to be incurred by the IC in completing the assignment. The contract price will be output-based regardless of extension of the specified duration. Payments will be made upon completion of the deliverables/outputs and as per below percentages:

> **Deliverable 1: Desk Review and Inception Report (including evaluation plan) produced, submitted to and cleared by UNDP:** 25% of total contract amount
> **Deliverable 2: Draft Evaluation Report submitted to UNDP for review and comments:** 40% of total contract amount
> **Deliverable 3: Final Evaluation Report incorporating comments received from UNDP and stakeholders endorsed by UNDP:** 35% of total contract amount

Evaluation Method and Criteria

Individual consultants will be evaluated based on the *cumulative analysis* methodology.

The award of the contract shall be made to the individual consultant whose offer has been evaluated and determined as a) responsive/compliant/acceptable; and b) having received the highest score out of set of weighted technical criteria (70%). and financial criteria (30%). Financial score shall be computed as a ratio of the proposal being evaluated and the lowest priced proposal received by UNDP for the assignment.

Technical Criteria for Evaluation (Maximum 100 points):
> **Criteria 1:** Education – 15 points
> **Criteria 2:** Experience in conducting access to justice and peacebuilding related evaluations - 30 Points
> **Criteria 3:** Good understanding of Myanmar's/ Rakhine's conflict and transition; other thematic expertise relevant to the project highly preferable – 30 points
> **Criteria 4:** Proposed methodology to undertake the assignment – 25 Points

Only candidates obtaining a minimum of 70 points (70% of the total technical points) would be considered for the Financial Evaluation.

Documentation required
Interested individual consultants must submit the following documents/information to demonstrate their

qualifications. Please group them into **one (1) single PDF document** as the application only allows to upload maximum one document:

- **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the template provided in Annex II.
- **Personal CV or** P11, indicating all past experience from similar projects, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the Candidate and at least three (3) professional references.
- **Technical proposal**, including a) a brief description of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment; and b) a methodology, on how they will approach and complete the assignment.
- **Financial proposal**, as per template provided in Annex II. Note: National consultants must quote prices in *Myanmar Kyats*.

Incomplete proposals will not be considered.

Annexes
- Annex I - Individual IC General Terms and Conditions
- Annex II – Offeror's Letter to UNDP Confirming Interest and Availability for the Individual IC, including Financial Proposal Template

For any clarification regarding this assignment please write to mmr.procurement@undp.org

Prepared by:

Thomas Crick
Project Manager

Reviewed by:

Joerg Stahlhut
Team Leader, Governance and Sustainable Peace Unit

Approved by:

Dawn Del Rio
Deputy Resident Representative
UNDP

ANNEX 7: EVALUATION TEAM CVs

JOANNA LOUISE BROOKS - CURRICULUM VITAE

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

SUMMARY OF QUALIFICATIONS

- Areas of expertise: Democratic governance, with expertise in rule of law, access to justice and human rights in particular civil and political rights for women, minorities and vulnerable groups. Experienced in international human rights framework and standards; human rights based approach; programme/outcome/impact/midterm evaluations; quantitative and qualitative analysis; capacity-building; programme development; M&E; RBM; political economy analysis and theory of change; institutional building and capacity development.

- Over 17 years of professional experience including in the provision of policy, analytical and technical advisory support for international development organisations.

- Country experience: Experience in conflict, post-conflict and fragile/transitioning states including Afghanistan, Albania, Bangladesh, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Croatia, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kosovo, Kyrgyzstan, Montenegro, Nepal, Serbia, Tajikistan, United Kingdom, Uzbekistan.

- Post-Graduate Diploma in Professional Legal Skills (Inns of Court School of Law, London 1999), Post Graduate Diploma in Law (College of Law, London 1998), BA (Hons) History 2:1 (with special reference to Eastern Europe) (University of London 1997).

- Personal attributes: excellent analytical and drafting skills, broad publications record, time management and organizational skills, culturally sensitive, team player equally capable of working independently, attention to detail, conscientious, strong inter-personal skills.

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Independent Consultant: Rule of Law, Access to Justice, Human Rights

Justice Sector Reform Expert for Mid-Term Evaulation of Rule of Law Programme – USAID, Serbia, Nov 2019 – Feb 2020, Key Output: Mid-Term Evaluation Report to examine the effective of activities; determine whether the project has achieved planned results; identify gaps in performance against targets; and provide actionable recommendations and ensure that the report is of the higest utlity.

International Expert on Risk Assessment for Kosovo Chamber of Notaries – UNDP Kosovo, Apr 2019 –Oct 2019, Key output: To produce a risk assessment report assessing the risks for corruption, identifying bottlenecks hindering anti-corruption measures in place, and providing recommendations for procedural, legislative and institutional changes with an emphasis on identified entry points for SAEK interventions

International Expert – Programme Development – Civil Registry Reform – 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 – Impact Evaluation and Functional Review: Access to Justice – UNDP Afghanistan, February 2019 – 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 – Programme Development – HELVETAS Swiss Intercooperation, Tajikistan Sept 2018 – 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 – Programme development – UN Women, Albania, Jun 2018 – Oct 2018, Key responsibilities: Provide project development, design and implementation support and implement strategies to raise awareness and advocacy on UN Women's work to potential partners and donors; Develop two projects in the areas of women's leadership and political participation and women's property rights.

International Expert – Conflict Management and Mediation Concept Note Development – HELVETAS Swiss Intercooperation, Jul 2018 – Sept 2018, To develop a Concept Note/Project Document on introducing a system of conflict management and mediation in Tajikistan to improve access to justice

International Expert on Studying Foreign Mechanisms of Appointment, Discipline and Dismissal procedures for Judges – UNDP Uzbekistan, Jun 2018 – Oct 2018, **Key responsibilities:** Conduct analyses to identify the data (quantitative) reflecting current situation in the researched countries; Review and analyze the acting legislation, internal regulations or by-laws (if any) of judicial and/or other bodies to identify procedures related to appointment, re-appointment, promotion of judges, disciplinary actions against judges, etc.; Conduct research of the international standards in this area (in judicial tenures, formation of pool of candidate judges, appointment (re-appointment) of judges, etc.); Identify list of bottlenecks or reforms in the abovementioned procedures of the researched countries which are being discussed or proposed by the judicial sector and other actors in order to further improve the area; prepare and submit analytical report.

International Expert on Risk Assessment for Kosovo Chamber of Advocates – UNDP Kosovo, May 2018 – Jul 2018, Key output: To produce a risk assessment report assessing the risks for corruption, identifying bottlenecks hindering anti-corruption measures in place, and providing recommendations for procedural, legislative and institutional changes with an emphasis on identified entry points for SAEK interventions.

Evaluation Expert, Mid-Term Evaluation Afghanistan Access to Justice Project – UNDP Afghanistan, Apr 2018 – Jun 2018, Key Output: to provide a comprehensive independent assessment of AA2J project performance, context and situation analysis, strategic priorities, implementation strategies and; to provide recommendations on AA2J project design for the next phases in order to improve the project's impact on Afghan communities.

Senior Non-Key Expert, Distance Learning and Knowledge and Information Sharing, British Council Support to the Serbian Judicial Academy Project funded by the EU, Feb 2018 – Mar 2018, Key responsibilities: Assess distance learning tools already in place in the European judicial area, in order to avoid overlapping of services offered and to activate the synergy (EJTN, ERA etc.); Identify distance learning tools to be included in the Serbian Judicial Academy Training Programme in short and medium term.

- **International Consultant: Sustainable Development Goals – UNECE,** Dec 2017 – Aug 2018, Key Output: To develop a Practical Guidance Note on The Relationship Between The UNECE-WHO/Europe Protocol On Water And Health And The Water, Sanitation And Health Related Sustainable Development Goals

- **International Consultant: Political Economy Analysis Expert – ILO,** Sept 2017 – Dec 2017, Key Outputs: To assist in the development of new approaches and tools to respond to requests for advice, technical assistance and knowledge in the area of labour law reform process and policy – effective labour market regulation more broadly and occupational safety and health (OSH) laws and regulations more specifically to develop a Guidance Note of

integrating institutional and context analysis into Labour and OSH law reform processes in conflict, fragile and transitional context.

- **International Consultant: Project Development, Helvetas Swiss Intercooperation,** Jun 2017 – Aug 2017, To develop a concept note, in line with the EU call for proposals on developing civil society capacities and their contributions towards reinforced governance, accountability and inclusive policy-making

- **International Consultant for the Development of a Referral Model on Conflict Related Sexual Violence – UN Women Bosnia and Herzegovina**, Dec 2016 – Apr 2017, Key Output: to develop a report delineating an optimal referral model for comprehensive support services to conflict-related sexual violence survivors in BiH, including analysis of the provision of free legal aid in cases of conflict related sexual violence and recommendations on improving the legal framework related to FLA and provision of FLA for survivors.

- **International Consultant to Facilitate the Update of the Regional Advocacy Paper 2016 – UNDG**, Nov 2016 – Feb 2017, Key Outputs: Regional Advocacy Paper for UNECE, UNFPA, WHO, UNDP, UNHCR, UNICEF, ILO, UN-Women, UNEP, UNESCO, UNIDO, FAO, OHCHR and IAEA working in Europe and Central Asia focused on 14 key development issues/Sustainable Development Goals, in the region in 52 countries.

- **International Expert to draft a concept note for the DFID Leave No girl Behind Funding Window – Helvetas Swiss Intercooperation**, Nov-Dec 2016, Key Outputs: In the framework of DfID's Leave No Girl Behind (LNGB) funding window as part of its Girls' Education Challenge (GEC), to draft a concept note to deliver quality education and skills to the hardest to reach girls in order to improve their overall life chances.

- **International Consultant for the development of an Access to Justice Project Document in Tajikistan** – **UNDP Tajikistan**, Sept 2016 – Oct 2016, Key output: To develop the second phase of an 8 year, SDC funded Access to Justice Project in Tajikistan in line with the HRBA and conflict sensitive programme management, focused on the newly formed government legal aid agency taking over complete control of free legal aid in Tajikistan and the phasing out of NGO-run legal aid centres. Phase II will also pilot new systems of secondary free legal aid, while working with NGOs to assure a smooth transition and to provide new roles for NGOs (i.e., monitoring the new state system). Phase II will furthermore identify and address key constraints on the effectiveness of free legal aid, including constraints on the enforcement of judgments.

- **International Consultant for Foreign Experiences Study on Continuous Education of Judges and Judicial Staff** – **UNDP Uzbekistan**, June 2016 – Sept 2016, Key Responsibilities: Comparative analysis of four judicial training institutes in France, Germany, Japan and Korea together with situation analysis pertaining to provision of judicial training in Uzbekistan, culminating in a Study Report with evidence-based findings and actionable recommendations for the institutional strengthening and capacity development of the Supreme Court, Higher Qualification Commission under the President and the Lawyer's Training Centre.

- **International Consultant for Inclusive Governance Dimensions for Regional Human Development Report (RHDR) on Inequalities – UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub**, Sept 2015 – Apr 2016, Key Outputs: To plan, research, analyse and draft a comprehensive Chapter and other products on Inclusive Governance and Inequalities in the ECIS region within the framework of Sustainable Development Goal 16, focused on inequalities and conflict, inequalities and discrimination and inequalities and corruption.

- **International Human Rights & Justice Sector Reform Expert – Melim-McLeod Consulting,** Sept – Oct 2015, Mid-term Evaluation of the UNDP Strengthening the Rule of Law and Human Rights Programme in Nepal, including design of evaluation methodology, including context and situation analysis.

- **Quality Controller: Support to EU Delegation in Bosnia and Herzegovina in the revision and implementation of antidiscrimination law – B&S Europe**, Aug – Dec 2015**,** To ensure the quality of the outputs under the Support to EU Delegation in Bosnia and Herzegovina in the revision and implementation of antidiscrimination law in line with international standards.

- **Team Leader – Civil Registry Reform, UNDP Tajikistan** Apr – Sep 2015**,** Responsible for developing and drafting an 8-year, SDC funded Civil Registry System Reform Programme in line with the human-rights based approach and

international standards as well as designing the methodology for and conducting a multi-stakeholder Inception Survey to obtain qualitative and quantitative data.

- **International Consultant – Norwegian Refugee Council** Apr – May 2015**,** Responsible for editing the Independent Whole of System Review of Protection in Humanitarian Crises commissioned by the Inter-Agency Standing Committee

- **International Legal Expert – UNDP Bosnia and Herzegovina** Feb – Apr 2015**,** Responsible for devising an engagement strategy in the form of a "Capacity Needs Assessment", for the development of Institutional Referral Mechanisms on provision of support to victims, with particular focus on victims of conflict related sexual violence. Included analysis of the legal aid framework in BiH and the provision of free legal aid for victims at the state and entity level.

- **Deputy Team Leader and Drafting Expert, UNDP Bangladesh** Nov-Dec 2014, Responsible for developing a 5-year Access to Justice and Human Rights for Women Living in Poverty Programme in line with the HRBA and addressing Universal Periodic Review (UPR) and Special Rapporteur recommendations.

- **Team Leader – Political Economy Analysis, UNDP Bangladesh** July – October 2014, Political economy analysis of the justice sector in Bangladesh, including the provision of free legal aid.

- **International Consultant – Rule of Law and Human Rights Communications and Coordination Strategy, UNDP Tajikistan**, August – October 2014, Communication and Coordination Strategy for the Strengthening Rule of Law and Human Rights in Tajikistan project.

- **Human Rights & Justice Programme Development Advisor, UNDP Serbia**, June – Sept 2014, To develop Inception Report on reconciliation initiatives between Serbia and Kosovo, with a particular focus on policy advice regarding reconciliation, equality, non-discrimination, gender mainstreaming and communication and outreach.

- **Team Leader - Access to Justice and Human Rights Project Final Evaluation, UNDP Bangladesh**, June – July 2014, Evaluation Report of the Promoting Access to Justice & Human Rights in Bangladesh (2007-2014) Project; and rationale and recommendations for possible future UNDP support to Ministry of Justice.

- **Facilitator for Brainstorming Session and Programme Development on Access to Justice/Human Rights and Security Programme in Bangladesh, UNDP Bangladesh**, March – April 2014, Act as facilitator and resource person for a brainstorming meeting – including undertaking of situation and problem analysis, stakeholder analysis, results mapping, vision development, roadmap development and ToR development in line with HRBA, RBM and gender mainstreaming.

- **International Consultant: Project Formulation for a Partnership Project on Rule of Law in Uzbekistan**, **UNDP**, Nov – Dec 2013, To analyse lessons learned and conduct country context analysis including UPR process; Compile best practices on implementation/referral to provisions of CEDAW in by civil/economic courts and analyse and develop recommendations for possible direct implementation of provisions of international conventions, in particular CEDAW by courts; Conducting SWOT analysis of state institutions and organizations in justice and rule of law sector; Draft the Results and Resource Framework (RRF) for the proposal on the new results framework for extended partnership; Provide with an updated and detailed baseline analysis, new extended project log-frame and risks management table.

- **International Chief Technical Advisor: Human Rights, Rule of Law, Access to Justice UNDP Serbia**, Feb – Dec 2013. To provide strategic and policy advice, guidance, oversight and expertise related to human rights/judicial reform/access to justice in Serbia, in particular on CEDAW, UNCAT/OPCAT, UNCAC.

- **International Consultant: Mainstreaming ICA into Rule of Law, UNDP Oslo Governance Centre**, Oct – Nov 2013, Finalisation and testing of the Guidance Note on Applying Institutional and Context Analysis to the Rule of Law, now a mandatory requirement of and key learning resource for UNDP's rule of law programming.

- **Team Leader: Drafting a 5-year Rule of Law Strategy for Kosovo, UNDP Kosovo**, Sept 2013, To develop a 5-year rule of law strategy in line with HRBA, aimed at ultimately assisting the Kosovo government to achieve its goals toward European integration.

- **International Consultant to develop a 4 year project proposal for Access to Justice and Human Rights in Tajikistan" UNDP Tajikistan,** Apr 2013 – Oct 2013. Provision of support in drafting a new law on free legal aid as a human right and testing different options/models for a sustainable government supported legal aid system with a focus on women and vulnerable groups, conducting a functional review of the rule of law working groups, develop training modules for notaries and civil registry offices and the Ministry of Justice, advise on the creation of a policy dialogue framework, conduct needs assessment of civil society, analysing UPR process and recommendations, development of a 4 year SDC funded human rights and access to justice programme in line with international standards.

- **Policy Advisor: Human Rights & Justice, UNDP Serbia**, Dec 2012 – Dec 2013, Key responsibilities included to advise, facilitate, analyse and ensure the implementation of a number of human rights/judicial reform/access to justice focused studies, assessments, researches and focus groups in order to provide a set of recommendations that fed into the drafting of the National Judicial Reform Strategy

- **Drafting a Guidance Note on Assessing the Rule of Law using Institutional and Context Analysis,** UNDP Oslo Governance Centre/Bureau for Development Policy, Apr 2012 – Dec 2012, Guidance Note on Assessing the Rule of Law using Institutional and Context Analysis.

- **Team Leader - Rule of Law Outcome Evaluation 2007-2012, UNDP Kosovo**, Sept – Oct 2012, Outcome Evaluation of the Rule of Law Programme 2007-2012 and its contribution to the CPAP outcome to assist Kosovo's rule of law institutions to become more efficient, transparent, gender responsive and accountable by 2015, containing detailed recommendations on areas and activities for future programming**.**

- **Team Leader - For evaluating the work and services of the transformed Judicial Academy of the Republic of Serbia, Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe**, Mar 2012 – Apr 2012, Evaluating the work of the transformed Judicial Academy and analysing the effectiveness of the restructuring process, the entrance exam and initial training, the efficiency of the mentorship programme, identifying further potential areas requiring reform and providing strategic advice and recommendations for further development

- **International Expert: Strengthening Judicial Integrity through Enhanced Access to Justice, UNDP Bratislava Regional Centre**, Oct 2011 – Jan 2012, Conducting a regional study on the capacities of judicial institutions to address the specific needs of persons with disabilities, women and minorities in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kazakhstan, Kosovo, Kyrgyzstan and Serbia including the legal framework and provision of free legal aid.

- **Policy Advisor: National Human Rights Institution/Commissioner for the Protection of Equality,** UNDP Serbia, Jul 2011 – Dec 2011, Provision of high quality policy advice and capacity building support to the Office of the Commissioner for Protection of Equality (CPE)

- **Policy Advisor: Human Rights & Justice, UNDP Serbia**, Apr 2010 – Apr 2011, Provision of policy advice and technical assistance to UNDP Serbia's governance portfolio strategy and the identification and development of new programmes and projects in the governance area.

- **Drafting the Interim Strategy for the Transformation of the Judicial Academy, Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe, Serbia**, Feb – Jun 2010, An Interim Strategy on structuring the new institution including all by-laws and secondary legislation

- **National Human Rights Institution Research and Policy Advisor,** UNDP Serbia**,** Dec 2009 – Feb 2010, National Strategy on the capacity development and institutional strengthening of the Commissioner for the Protection of Equality

- **Programme Advisor: Human Rights & Access to Justice, UNDP Serbia**, Oct 2008 – Apr 2010, Provision of policy advisory services to ensure the continued implementation and future development of UNDP's human rights/access to justice programme

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

- **Independent Expert on Human Rights & Access to Justice, UNDP Bratislava Regional Centre**, Oct 2008 – 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 – Jun 2008, Responsible for all judicial training and research aspects of UNDP's judicial reform and rule of law portfolio, including on free legal aid, anti-discrimination and transitional justice.

- **Project Co-ordinator Judicial Education in Development Turn Guide, UNDP Serbia,** Nov 2004 – Nov 2005, Creating the Judicial Education for Development: Turn Guide, a ground-breaking 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, fYRO Macedonia**, Mar 2001 – Mar 2003, Responsible for the establishment and implementation of four legal rehabilitation projects facilitating the return/reintegration or integration of refugees and IDPs.

- **Researcher, Cripps Sears & Partners, London,** July 2000 – February 2001, Responsible for executive recruitment in the legal and energy sectors.

- **Pupil Barrister, 4, King's Bench Walk, London,** Sept 1999 – Jul 2000, final stage of my qualification as a Barrister and practiced in criminal, personal injury and family law.

- **Judge's Clerk/Administrative Assistant, Cambridge County Court,** Feb 1992 – Aug 1999

ACADEMIC BACKGROUND

Post-Graduate Diploma in Professional Legal Skills, Inns of Court School of Law, London, 1999

Post-Graduate Diploma in Law, College of Law, London, 1998

BA (Hons) History (with special reference to Eastern Europe), School of Slavonic and East European Studies, University of London, 1997 (Class: 2:1)

SELECTED PUBLICATIONS 2010 onwards

2019 Risk Assessment for the Kosovo Chamber of Notaries, UNDP Kosovo, Author, https://www.ks.undp.org/content/kosovo/en/home/library/democratic_governance/risk-assessment-for-the-kosovo-chamber-of-notaries.html

2018 Risk Assessment for the Kosovo Chamber of Advocates, UNDP Kosovo, Author, https://www.ks.undp.org/content/kosovo/en/home/library/democratic_governance/corruption-risk-assessment-for-the-bar-association.html

2017 Regional Advocacy Paper, United Nations Development Group, Europe and Central Asia, Drafter and Facilitator, UNDG-R, Europe and Central Asia, 2017 https://undg.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/ECA-Regional-Advocacy-Paper-2017.pdf

2016 Regional Human Development Report, Progress at Risk: Inequalities and Human Development in Eastern Europe, Turkey and Central Asia, Lead Author Chapter 6, Inequalities and Inclusive Governance, UNDP 2016
http://www.eurasia.undp.org/content/rbec/en/home/presscenter/events/2016/regional-human-development-report.html

2014 Volumes I-III of the Judicial Studies Series Co-Author/Editor, UNDP Serbia
http://www.rs.undp.org/content/serbia/en/home/library/democratic_governance/judicial-studies-series/

2013 Regional Study: Strengthening Judicial Integrity through Enhanced Access to Justice, Lead Author, UNDP Bratislava Regional Centre
http://www.undp.org/content/rbec/en/home/library/democratic_governance/strengthening-judicial-integrity-through-enhanced-access-to-just.html

2013 Guidance Note on Assessing the Rule of Law using Institutional and Context Analysis, Author, UNDP Bureau for Development Policy/Oslo Governance Centre, 2013
http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/democratic-governance/access_to_justiceandruleoflaw/guidance-note-on-assessing-the-rule-of-law-using-institutional-a/

Aye Myat Thu – 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
London Metropolitan University, UK

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Senior Consultant (Public Finance Management – Agriculture/Nutrition), 05/2019 - Present
Senior Consultant (Public Finance Management – Education), 8/2018 - Present
GoPA Consultants, Myanmar
- Support to design and implementation of EU Education and Agriculture/Nutrition Sector Reform Contract components for Public Finance Management and Systems Strengthening
- Provide training and advisory support to Ministry of Education, Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Irrigation, and Ministry of Planning and Finance for capacity development related to Government responsibilities in the preparation and management of the EU budget support (monitoring, reporting)
- Contribute to policy dialogue between the Government and the EU around budget processes and public financial management reforms
- Support the EU Delegation analysis of budget processes, PFM reforms, budget transparency and oversight, and of risks related to PFM and macro-economic management

- Assist in development of key documents required for the Education and Agriculture/Nutrition Sector Reform Contracts

Monitoring & Evaluation Consultant, 07/2018 - Present
Cardno, Myanmar
- Support implementation of the *National Education Strategic Plan (NESP) 2016-21* M&E Framework
- Develop planning and M&E procedures and reporting templates
- Provide capacity building to Ministry of Education officials in the development and use of planning and M&E systems and tools to improve the quality of program planning and M&E through training and on-the-job mentoring
- Support the design and delivery of workshops, documentation of outcomes, and collection and analysis of feedback

Consultant, 01/2016 - 03/2016
United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), Myanmar
- Supported the Myanmar National "Standing Order" revision process led by the Ministry of Social Welfare, Relief and Resettlement (MSWRR)
- Conducted situation analysis on "Standing Order" on Disaster Management through desk review and consultation meetings with concerned government officials, development partners and NGOs

- Provided recommendations for addressing the gaps and needs to be addressed by the revised "Standing Order" in order to reflect the changing context in Myanmar as well as developments in national, regional and global disaster management related discussions

Project Officer (Social Sector and Civil Society), 10/2014 - 10/2015
European Union Delegation to Myanmar, Myanmar
- Managed the EU Myanmar's social sector and civil society portfolios
- Served as Fund Board member of the Multi-Donor Trust Fund for Health in Myanmar - Three Millennium Development Goal (3MDG) Fund
- Managed the EU Call for Funding Proposals and assessed concept notes and grant application proposals
- Monitored and evaluated grant-funded projects
- Supported the process for development of the first EU Roadmap for Engagement with Civil Society in Myanmar through consultations with international and national civil society actors which led to the launch of the first EU Roadmap defining priorities, indicators, and actions to be carried out by the EU and Member States to support civil society development in Myanmar
- Acted as focal point for EU higher education support initiatives and Erasmus scholarship programme
- Contributed to the delegation's management reports, press releases, social media and website

Project Manager, 11/2012 - 03/2013
Friedrich Naumann Foundation for Freedom, Thailand and Myanmar
- Provided programme planning and management support to the implementing partner for empowering democratic agents project in Myanmar
- Developed a selection process and evaluated project proposals for sub-granting
- Managed the project mid-term evaluation process
- Provided input to proposals, research reports, and project reports
- Reviewed and proofread information and advocacy tools for promoting human rights and fundamental freedom

Information Management Coordinator, 07/2008 - 07/2011
Local Resource Center (LRC), Myanmar
The LRC is a facility set up by a consortium of International NGOs to support local organizations, communities, and civil society groups in Cyclone Nargis relief, recovery and development efforts.
- Acted as national NGO liaison and ensured timely exchange of information around humanitarian assistance and development issues through participating in and facilitating information meetings and workshops
- Led and implemented the process of developing Myanmar NGOs' Contingency Plan for Disaster Preparedness and Response, resulting in the launch of the first Contingency Plan defining the timeline, preparatory and response actions to be undertaken collectively by Myanmar NGOs in the event of disaster
- Organized and co-facilitated capacity development workshops for civil society organizations
- Supervised the information management team of the LRC
- Contributed to program design and development and participated in the preparation of funding proposals

Assistant Information Officer, 11/2007 - 06/2008
Capacity Building Initiative (CBI), Myanmar
The CBI is a leading organization providing capacity building trainings and consultancy services for the national staff working in the not-for-profit sector.
- Managed the CBI information and resource library for the use of development community
- Organized regular United Nations and NGOs coordination meetings
- Assisted in data collection, production, and dissemination of information materials

SELECTED TRAINING / PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
- Financial Programming and Policies, *IMF,* 2/2019
- Public Financial Management (PFM), *IMF,* 6/2018
- Results-based Management (RBM), *UNICEF,* 4/2018
- Project Management for Development Professional Certification, *APM Group, 7/2016*

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