



WWF Myanmar and Germany

Evaluation of the Project “Stewards of natural resources - strengthening livelihoods for communities in the Tanintharyi Region, Myanmar”

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Looking for a Team of Consultants for Project Terminal Evaluation

Project/Program Name(s)	Stewards of natural resources - strengthening livelihoods for communities in the Tanintharyi Region, Myanmar
Project/Program Location(s)	Myanmar, Tanintharyi Region
Project/Program Reference Number(s)	P1862; PjDB Number: MM201900-3004; WWF DE Project No: 20142972
Names of Project/Program Executants (WWF Office, name of project/program manager)	WWF Myanmar, Forest Programme Manager
Project/Program Duration (from start year)	01 February 2017 – 31 December 2020 (ongoing application for no-cost-extension (NCE) until 30 April 2021)
Period to Be Evaluated	01 February 2017 – 31 October 2020 (with NCE: 31 December 2020)
Project/Program Budget Sources and Amounts (for period to be evaluated)	896,645 EUR
Names of Implementing Partners (if relevant)	ECCDI, KESAN, WWF Myanmar

1. PROJECT OVERVIEW

1.1 Starting situation

Majority of the inhabitants in the Tanintharyi Landscape Corridor belong to the Karen ethnic group with low income level and farming as their main source of income. The Karen ethnic group was among those severely persecuted by the Military Regime of Myanmar during the last decades. Communities depend heavily on intact forests for their daily livelihoods (food, commodities etc.). Some of the key concerns cited by the target communities include forest loss, low farm productivity, low water supply and quality and land grabbing. The lack of proper land use planning associated with weak forest governance has compounded deforestation and forest degradation. The lack of tenure security makes communities not only vulnerable to land grabbing but also prevents them to invest in sustainable forest management and income opportunities. Amidst these challenges, the new political development in Myanmar offers opportunities for political participation and improving natural resources governance.

In preparing the project proposal WWF MM conducted in 2015 a survey of people’s attitude and perception of natural resources and in 2016 a livelihood assessment. A feasibility study evaluated the project concept and validated the project concept with representatives of the target group and key offices of the government and Karen National Union (KNU).

1.2 Project concept

The livelihood of 10 communities in the Banchaung and Tanintharyi watersheds within the Tanintharyi Region is improved through their strengthened access and management rights as well as enhanced capacities in and enabled structures for sustainable natural resources management. This shall be achieved through a participatory developed sustainable forest landscape vision developed by representatives of communities, regional government agencies and the Karen National Union (KNU).



The vision shall guide these stakeholders in sustainable development and land use planning. Through a participatory developed and on 300 ha piloted forest restoration plan, degraded areas important for the communities' livelihoods will be restored and hence livelihood options improved and vulnerability to climate change related risks reduced. Through the application of land tenure and natural resources access rights further conversion of forests and land grabbing shall be prevented and ecosystem services (e.g. water quality, medicinal plants etc.) protected. Productivity of small-holder farmers shall be improved through improvement of agricultural and agro-forestry practices, establishment of producer groups and access to markets and micro-finance schemes. This shall lead to higher and more sustainable incomes.

Impact

Local communities are recognised by government agencies and KNU as stewards of natural resources in the Tanintharyi Landscape Corridor and are actively managing and maintaining the forest ecosystem and its services for future generations.

Outcome	Indicators	
	Baseline	Target Situation
The livelihood of 10 communities within the Tanintharyi Landscape Corridor is improved through their strengthened access and management rights as well as enhanced capacities in and enabled structures for sustainable NRM.	➤ Communities have no forum to voice their needs, concerns and interests with regard to regional development plans. ➤ Communities have no tenure security. Unsustainable practices (i.e. establishment of mono-cultural farms) are used as means against legal and illegal land grabbing. ➤ Government or KNU extension services are very limited if non-existent. Agroforestry techniques are outdated and match no longer the current demographic trend (growth of 3%, return of refugees). ➤ In Myanmar, non-governmental organisations have neither sufficient capacity to develop and	➤ 20 Representatives of 10 communities are politically empowered to participate in multi-stakeholder fora on the sustainable forest landscape vision by 2020. ➤ Approx. 500 hectares in the process of community land and access tenure application by 2020. ➤ Household income of participating households increased by 10% through enhanced agroforestry techniques and formation of producer groups by 2020. (Baseline will be established in 2017). ➤ 60 community and government representatives are capacitated in sustainable landscape management and sustainable agroforestry. ➤ By 2020, a national and a local NGO are capacitated to develop and implement a landscape-based approach to sustainable natural resource management and to replicate



	implement a landscape-based approach to sustainable natural resources management nor the necessary knowledge of innovative agricultural and agroforestry methods in this regard.	and disseminate innovative agricultural and agroforestry practices.
Outputs	Indicators	
	Baseline	Target Situation
1. Participatory sustainable forest landscape vision for the Tanintharyi Landscape Corridor is developed and forest restoration piloted	➤ No sustainable forest landscape vision in place in the target area ➤ No restoration sites in place	➤ Sustainable forest landscape vision agreed upon by regional government, KNU and communities by 2020 ➤ Approx. 300 hectares degraded forest are under restoration in cooperation with 3 villages and local authorities by 2020
2. Land tenure and natural resources use rights of 10 communities are identified and submitted for official recognition	➤ Unclear land tenure and natural resources use rights for communities ➤ No law enforcement mechanism for illegal use of natural resources	➤ Legal instruments identified and documents for official recognition of land tenure and natural resources use rights submitted by 10 communities with a population of approx. 7,280 persons (approx. 50% women) by 2020 ➤ 5 community patrols established and patrol regularly by 2020
3. Economic opportunities based on sustainable NRM for local communities are strengthened	➤ No community-based enterprises based on sustainable NRM are in place ➤ Limited access to markets and finance for communities ➤ Limited application of sustainable agricultural and agro-forestry practices	➤ At least 5 producer groups with a female quota of at least 30% based on sustainable NRM are operational by 2019 ➤ At least 5 producer groups with a female quota of at least 30% have access to markets and finance by 2019 ➤ At least 5 demonstration plots (0.5 Ha each) established, demonstrating sustainable agricultural and agro-forestry practices by 2018

Due to the complex political framework conditions, approaches had to be adapted during the project period. This can be traced in project documents such as reports, change requests and monitoring data which will be made available to the evaluator.

2. EVALUATION PURPOSE, USE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE

The evaluation shall assess the progress in project implementation and achievements of the project as of 31st of December 2020 against the project concept (=project proposal) taking into consideration the changes in approach and adaptive management. The evaluation shall be based on a desk review, stakeholder interviews and a field trip to the project region. A focus shall be put on the target group's perception and observations. The evaluation shall assess and develop recommendations based on the criteria and guiding questions below (see 3). Further details to process, timing and deliverables can be found under 6 and 7.

The purpose of the evaluation is

- To assess quantitatively and qualitatively the project's achievement against the intended outcome and outputs
- To assess the project's relevance, coherence, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and (structural/ economic, social, ecological) sustainability
- To assess the capacity development of the project executing organisations and target group organisations
- To identify internal and external factors (e.g. political, climate, social, structural) contributing towards/ avoiding the achievement of outcome and outputs
- To assess how under adaptive management old and new approaches differ, what are their respective advantages and disadvantages with regard to the OECD DAC criteria
- To identify quantitatively and qualitatively other, particularly longer-term and unexpected effects on the direct and indirect target groups
- To develop strong and clear recommendations on good practices, lessons learned and how to overcome gaps and risks
- To develop strong and clear recommendations for an effective, efficient and sustainable implementation of the landscape vision and management plan as well as the governance mechanism necessary for it
- To draw key lessons learned to contribute to organisational learning and enhancing WWF's, ECCDI's and KESAN's capacities.

Use of the evaluation by:

- Direct target group: village leaders, community forest user groups, producer groups, agroforestry technicians, educators etc.
- Indirect target group: Inhabitants of project communities
- Karen Forest Department (KFD) and Regional Forest Department (FD)
- ECCDI
- KESAN
- WWF Myanmar



- WWF Germany
- Engagement Global
- Bundesministerium für wirtschaftliche Zusammenarbeit und Entwicklung (BMZ).

Direct and indirect target groups and intermediaries will use the findings to improve their capacities and overcome identified gaps and risks to effectively cooperate and benefit from (international) cooperation projects to strengthen their access to land and natural resources and their management rights as well as enhance their capacities in and enable structures for sustainable natural resources management and to improve the implementation and governance of the landscape vision and management plan.

The project executing organisations (WWF Myanmar, ECCDI and KESAN) and WWF Germany will use the findings for their organizational learning on project planning, implementation and adaptive management as well as landscape based approaches, land tenure and natural resources use issues, community-based forestry and agroforestry as well as small-scale business development. In addition, they will use them to overcome identified gaps and risks and develop future support to the implementation and governance of the landscape vision and management plan.

The wider CSO community in Tanintharyi, will use the evaluation results, the lessons learned and recommendations of the project evaluation for their respective approaches and interventions in improving the livelihood of communities in the Tanintharyi landscape.

WWF Germany will use the results (= evaluation report) in its reporting lines (Verwendungsnachweis) to Engagement Global and BMZ with regard to the project achievements and lessons learned.

3. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND GUIDING QUESTIONS

The evaluation questions (what you are trying to find out) and what you intend to do with the answers, should inform how the criteria are specifically interpreted and analysed.

CRITERION 1: RELEVANCE and Quality of Design

Relevance is a measure of the extent to which the project represents a necessary, sufficient, and appropriate approach to achieving changes in key factors (e.g. direct and indirect threats, opportunities, stakeholder positions, enabling conditions) necessary to bring about positive changes for communities and their natural environment.

Key Questions to Assess Relevance and Quality of Design

For the project as originally conceived, as well as its future (closing phase; upscaling/ cross-scaling), assess quality of design as well as past and ongoing relevance of decisions and plans with regard to the following factors:

- RQ1.** What is the most significant change the project brought about in terms of livelihood improvement and forest ecosystem management?
- RQ2.** Has the project targeted issues of highest priority? Remain a sustainable forest landscape vision, land and natural resource use rights as well as economic opportunities relevant to issues of highest priority for local communities and in terms of conservation targets?
- RQ3.** Has the project taken the best, most efficient approach to achieve the intended outcome and impact? Is there a clear theory of change be portrayed in clear and logical terms which is also shared by stakeholders including local communities and implementing partners?



RQ4. Has the project been designed adequately?

- Has the timeline been adequate? (Are the financial plan and work plan consistent with each other? Was it realistic to achieve the defined outputs with the resources allocated?)
- Have the planned measures been adequate?
- What recommendations of the feasibility study and the mid-term review proofed to be helpful and which facts were missing (about relevant stakeholders)?

RQ5. Gender: How important is the intervention for the target group and subgroups (e.g. women), and to what extent does it address their needs and interests? To which degree does the project design contribute to gender equity within the project communities and the established processes and structures for a sustainable forest landscape vision, land tenure and natural resources use rights application and economic opportunities based on sustainable NRM?

RQ6. Climate: In as much does the project design contribute to the local communities' adaptation to climate change?

RQ7. Social Safeguards: Does the engagement with local and disadvantaged communities respect WWF Social Policies and international safeguard principles, such as FPIC?

RQ8. Relevance to overarching goals: Does the project make a clearly aligned and meaningful contribution to BMZ priorities and SDG's?

CRITERION 2: COHERENCE AND COORDINATION

The extent to which other interventions (particularly policies) support or undermine the intervention, and vice versa. Includes internal coherence and external coherence: Internal coherence addresses the synergies and interlinkages between the intervention and other interventions carried out by the same institution/government, as well as the consistency of the intervention with the relevant international norms and standards to which that institution/government adheres. External coherence considers the consistency of the intervention with other actors' interventions in the same context. This includes complementarity, harmonisation and co-ordination with others, and the extent to which the intervention is adding value while avoiding duplication of effort.

Key Questions on Coherence and Coordination

- CC1.** Is the project complementary and uses synergies with other projects and interventions in the region which target SDGs 1, 5, 13, 15 and 16? How is coordination taking place?
- CC2.** Do the chosen forms of cooperation in project implementation assure an adequate coordination with other stakeholders?
- CC3.** How have the planned cooperation partnerships evolved?
- CC4.** Have other, non-planned cooperations emerged? Could synergies be used?
- CC5.** Have other organisations built up similar structures as planned in the project? If yes, were these rather complementary or competing? Have they favoured or disturbed the implementation of the project?



CRITERION 3: EFFICIENCY

Efficiency is a measure of the relationship between outputs (i.e. the products or services of an intervention) and inputs (i.e. the resources that it uses).

Key Questions for the evaluation

- Efic1.** Use of time: Are there thorough, well founded work plans being implemented according to plan, monitored, and adapted as necessary?
- Efic2.** Human resources: Are human resources of implementing partners appropriate, adequate, and efficiently organized and operating effectively (e.g., include considerations of capacity needs and gaps, communications, division and clarity of roles and responsibilities, processes for evaluation and improvement)?
- Efic3.** Monitoring of efficiency, effectiveness, impact: Have adequate steps been taken to ensure regular reflection on efficiency, effectiveness, and impact by the target group and implementing partners? How can this been improved?

CRITERION 4: EFFECTIVENESS

Effectiveness is a measure of the extent to which the intervention's intended outcomes—its specific objectives or intermediate results—have been achieved. Focus shall be lied on the perspective and observation of the local communities.

Key Questions for the evaluation

- Efct1. Planned result versus achievement:** Focusing on the outcome, outputs and their indicators what has and has not been achieved? Which differing results have been achieved?
Please indicate quantitatively and qualitatively.
- Efct2. Factors affecting effectiveness:** Which approaches have been effective and which have not? What anticipated and unanticipated factors have promoted or impeded the project's achievement? What are internal and external factors (e.g. political, climate, social, structural) contributing towards/ avoiding the achievement of outcome and outputs? How are the working relationships with partners and stakeholders (Forest Department, Karen Natonal Union, KFD, local communities)?
- Efct3. Risk Assessment:** Were the original risks and assumptions adequately revisited during the intervention cycle? Were the identified mitigation strategies appropriate and led to positive impact?
- Efct4. Learning:** Identify any exceptional experiences that should be highlighted regarding what worked and didn't work (e.g. case-studies, stories, good practices). What lessons can be taken and applied to improve effectiveness in the coming years?
Are lessons documented and shared in a manner that is promoting joint learning by the implementing organizations and target groups?
- Efct5.** What has the WWF Myanmar contributed to sustainable capacity building, knowledge transfer in partner countries as well as to the improvement of the climate change adaptation of local communities?



CRITERION 5: IMPACT

Impact is a measure of all significant effects of the intervention, positive or negative, expected or unforeseen, on targeted biodiversity/footprint issues – e.g. species, habitats, and ecological processes, ecosystem services, human well being.

Given the relatively short project duration this evaluation will not be able to conduct a rigorous impact assessment. Therefore, the evaluation will provide rough indications on whether or not the project is on the right track to achieve the intended change and will most likely have a lasting positive impact.

Key Questions to Assess Impact

Imp1. Evidence of Change: To what extent are local communities aware, being supported by authorities and take action to manage and maintain forest ecosystems and their services for future generations? Are positive changes occurring which can be related to project activities? Discuss observed changes and present evidence.

Imp2. Contribution: In as much do the target groups attribute the perceived changes to the project activities? What is the likelihood that these changes would have occurred in the absence of the project?

Imp3. Co-benefits/ negative side impacts: What other, particularly longer-term and unexpected effects on the target groups can be attributed to the project? Please indicate quantitatively and qualitatively. What further changes has the project triggered? What are the effects? Are there any observations that give reason to believe that further changes may occur in the future as a result of the project? Which persons or groups outside of the direct target group are interested in the capacities built by the project?

Imp4. Increasing Impact: How might the project and especially the landscape vision and management plan increase its impact and what would be the associated human and financial capacity needs? What capacities have been developed within the target groups and the project implementing organisations?

CRITERION 6: SUSTAINABILITY

Sustainability is a measure of whether the benefits of an intervention are likely to continue after external support has ended. Focus shall be laid on the perspective and observation of the local communities.

Key Questions for the evaluation

Sust1. Evidence for Sustainability: Is there evidence that the following key ingredients are being established or exist to the extent necessary to sustain/ensure the desired long-term positive impacts of the project?

- Motivation, support, ownership and leadership from the different stakeholders (KFD, village leaders, community forest user groups, producer groups, agroforestry technicians, educators etc.) for a sustainable forest landscape vision
- Adequate capacity building for local communities in application and management of land and natural resource use rights and in production as well as marketing of sustainable local products
- Adequate capacity building for government and Karen entities to include communities in planning and investment decisions and networking to promote partnership mechanisms between communities and governments.



Sust2. Risk and Mitigation: What external factors could have a high or medium likelihood of undoing or undermining the future sustainability of project positive impacts? Is the project adequately anticipating and taking measures to mitigate these? Which additional measures could ensure resilience to these?

Sust3. Exit—Phase Out Plan: In as much is the envisioned governance mechanism and implementation of the landscape vision and management plan effective, efficient and sustainable? Which measures should be taken to improve them?

Sust 4 Capacity Building project implementing organisations and target groups: Are capacities and skills of the project executing organisations and target group strengthened with regard to project management and expertise?

4. METHODOLOGY CONSIDERATIONS

The evaluation be based on a mixture of:

- Desk analysis of existing documentation: feasibility study, project proposal, technical and progress reports, monitoring data, baseline reports, mid-term review report and management response etc.
- Field visit to the project site: A field survey shall be conducted in the project villages. Preliminary findings will be presented and discussed with representatives from communities, KNU, local civil society organisations and the implementing organisations (WWF Myanmar, KESAN, ECCDI). If due to government and KNU regulations no field visit is possible online meetings and interviews shall be conducted as possible and detailed guidelines for interviews, focus group discussions and questionnaires shall be prepared in English, Karen and Burmese language, so that input can be gathered by the target groups themselves (e.g. through the community facilitators trained by the project).
- Participatory research methods (interviews, focus group discussions, participatory recommendation screening, world café, the most significant change etc.) to generate observations and perceptions from the target group, implementing partners and other key stakeholders

5. PROFILE OF EVALUATOR(S) AND WWF SUPPORTING RESPONSIBILITIES

The evaluator(s) shall cover the following expertise, knowledge and experiences:

- Experience in evaluation according to OECD-DAC criteria
- Experience applying participatory research methods
- In-depth knowledge of sustainable landscape planning
- Knowledge and diplomatic skills in relation to land ownership and land rights issues in Myanmar and especially the project region
- Knowledge of indigenous rights and the special situation of minorities in Myanmar
- Knowledge of community-based forest management and agroforestry
- Knowledge of biodiversity conservation



- Knowledge in gender
- Knowledge in climate mainstreaming
- Knowledge in social and ecological safeguards
- Fluency in English, Burmese and Karen languages

Primarily, we seek one independent consultant who covers the above mentioned expertise, knowledge and experiences. Shall it not be possible to find one person who covers all of the equally important requirements, we invite a team of independent consultants (2 persons) who jointly cover the above mentioned profile and capability to engage with the various stakeholders. One of the consultants in addition to the technical expertise shall function as lead consultant responsible for the compilation of findings, report writing and communication with the project manager.

The consultants should adhere to the principles for ensuring quality evaluations, as stated in the OECD DAC quality standards¹ and should be independent from the project and its stakeholders.

WWF Myanmar will provide relevant documents (feasibility study, project proposal, technical and progress reports, monitoring data, baseline reports, mid-term review report and management response etc.) and support at site level to set up meetings, identify key individuals and assist with planning and logistics. The Forest Project Manager and the Senior Forest Project Officer will facilitate all necessary communications and the flow of required information/data, based on the requirements specified by the consultants.

6. EVALUATION PROCESS AND TIMELINE (still tentative based on the

Major Evaluation Tasks/Output	Dates or Deadline with NCE	Who is Responsible
Announcement of Evaluation	Nov 12, 2020	WWF Myanmar
Submission of Offers	Nov 26, 2020	Interested Consultants
Evaluation of Offers and Contracting	Dec 10, 2020	Grace Tena, Aye Myat Thandar, Stefano Zenobi, Moo Soe (KESAN), Kye Sue (ECCDI), Susanne Gotthardt, Endre Erdoedi
Evaluation Concept: methodological approach incl. interview guidelines, FGD structure etc	Dec 16, 2020	Consultants
Rough itinerary	Dec 31, 2020	Grace Tena, Aye Myat Thandar
List of documents to be consulted and persons to be met	Dec 31, 2020	Grace Tena, Aye Myat Thandar, Moo Soe (KESAN), Kye Sue (ECCDI)
Desk Review	Jan 10, 2021	Consultants
Field Trip to project villages	Tentatively: Jan 18-23, 2021	Consultants
Consultation Meeting (KFD, FD, community representatives): present,	Tentatively: Jan 25-28, 2021	Consultants, WWF, ECCDI, KESAN

¹ <https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/qualitystandards.pdf>



consult, revise findings/ recommendations/ conclusions → Depending on government regulations: 4 meetings might be needed		
Draft Report	Feb 14, 2021	Consultants
Feedback to Draft Report	Feb 24, 2021	Grace Tena, Aye Myat Thandar, Moo Soe (KESAN), Kye Sue (ECCDI), Stefano Zenobi, Susanne Gotthardt, Endre Erdoedi
Final Evaluation Report and P- resentation	Feb 28, 2021	Consultants

7. DELIVERABLES AND QUANTITY STRUCTURE

1. Evaluation Concept: methodological participatory approach incl. interview guidelines, FGD structure etc (1 day per consultant)
2. Desk Review (1 day per consultant)
3. Field Trip (6 days if international consultant, 5 days if national consultant)
4. Consultation Meetings with presentation of preliminary findings adjusted to the different target groups (up to 4 days per consultant)
5. Draft Report (2 days per consultant)
6. Final Evaluation Report incl. summary in Burmese and Karen and PPT presentation with key findings and recommendations in Burmese and Karen (1 day lead consultant).



ANNEX A. Report Instructions

Part A: REPORT TEMPLATE

The following provides a basic outline for an evaluation report.

Title Page

- ♦ Report title, project title, and contract number (if appropriate), Date of report, Authors and their affiliation, Locator map (if appropriate)

Executive Summary (*between 2 pages*)

- ♦ Principal findings and recommendations, organized by the six core evaluation criteria
- ♦ Summary of lessons learned

Acknowledgements

Table of Contents

List of Acronyms and Abbreviations

Body of the report (no more than 15 pages)

A. Introduction (max 2 pages)

- Concise description of the project
- Purpose, objectives, and intended utilization of the evaluation (reference and attach the ToR as an annex)
- Evaluation methodology and rationale for approach (reference and attach as annexes the mission itinerary; names of key informants; a list of consulted documents; and any synthetic tables containing project/programme information utilized in the exercise)
- Composition of the evaluation team, including any specific roles of team members

B. Project Overview (max 2 pages)

- Concise summary of the project history, evolution, purpose, objectives, and strategies to project goals (attach conceptual model, results chain or logical framework and project monitoring system as annexes)
- Essential characteristics: context, underlying rationale, stakeholders and beneficiaries

C. evaluation Findings and Recommendations (max. 8 pages)

- Findings and recommendations organized by each of the six core evaluation criteria, including sufficient but concise rationale – recommendations should be specific, actionable and numbered.
- Project performance rating tables to provide a quick summary of performance and to facilitate comparison with other projects (see Annex A, Table B)
- Tables, graphics, and other figures to help convey key findings

D. Overall Lessons Learned (max. 2 pages)

- Lessons learned regarding what worked, what didn't work, and why
- Lessons learned with wider relevance, that can be generalized beyond the project

E. Conclusions (max 1 page)

- General summation of key findings and recommendations

Annexes

- ♦ Terms of Reference
- ♦ Evaluation methodology detail
- ♦ Itinerary with key informants
- ♦ Documents consulted
- ♦ Project logical framework/ conceptual model/ list of primary goals and objectives
- ♦ Specific project and monitoring data, as appropriate
- ♦ Summary tables of progress towards outputs, objectives, and goals
- ♦ Summary table of recommendations
- ♦ Evaluation summary tables
- ♦ Maps



WWF-Myanmar
15/C, Than Taman Street,
Dagon Township, Yangon,
Myanmar 11191

Direct: +95-1-229331
Fax: +95-1-2314358
www.wwf.org.mm

Part B.1 Evaluation Summary Tables

Evaluators are to assign the project a rating and score for each criterion as follows:

- **5 – Excellent, 4 – Very Good, 3 – Good, 2 – Fair, 1 – Poor**
- **N/A – Not Applicable**
- **D/I – The criterion was considered, but data were insufficient to assign a rating or score.**

Evaluators also are to provide a brief justification for the rating and score assigned. Identify most notable strengths to build upon as well as highest priority issues or obstacles to overcome. Note that this table should not be a comprehensive summary of findings and recommendations, but an overview only. A more comprehensive presentation should be captured in the evaluation report.

Criteria	Description of Strong Performance	Evaluator Score	Evaluator Brief Justification
Relevance and Quality of Design	1. The project addresses the necessary factors in the specific context to bring about positive changes in human wellbeing and biodiversity conservation (i.e. ecosystems, ecological processes, including associated ecosystem services).		
	2. The project has rigorously applied key design tools including involvement of partners and community members, as appropriate, in the design.		
	3. The project has identified the right opportunities or strategies to respond to key threats.		
Coherence	The project interventions are synergistic with and provide value to other interventions by the same actor in-country. They also are harmonized and consistent with other actors' interventions in the same context.		
Efficiency	1. Most/all project activities have been delivered with efficient use of human & financial resources and with strong value for money.		
	2. Governance and management systems are appropriate, sufficient, and operate efficiently.		
Effectiveness	1. Most/all intended outcomes were attained.		
	2. There is strong evidence indicating that changes can be attributed wholly or largely to the project .		
Impact	1. Most/all goals—stated desired changes in the status of human wellbeing, ecosystems, ecological processes—were realised.		
	2. Project actions have contributed to the perceived changes		
Sustainability	1. Most or all factors for ensuring sustainability of results/impacts are being or have been established.		
	2. Scaling up mechanisms have been put in place with risks and assumptions re-assessed and addressed - as relevant.		



Part B.2 Achievement

WWF-Myanmar
15/C, Than Taman Street,
Dagon Township, Yangon,
Myanmar 11191

Direct: +95-1-229331
Fax: +95-1-2314358
www.wwf.org.mm

The outcome has been achieved as follows (<u>please tick</u>):	Compeletly	Predominantly	Partially	To a rather limited extent	Not reached

Part B.3 Sustainability

		Structural (if relevant)	Economic (if relevant)	Social (if relevant)	Ecological (if relevant)
Level 1	High sustainability: The contribution to the dimensions of sustainability envisaged in the project application was fully achieved or even exceeded (<u>please tick</u>):				
Level 2	Medium sustainability: The contribution to the dimensions of sustainability envisaged in the project application was partially achieved (<u>please tick</u>):				
Level 3	Low sustainability: The contribution to the dimensions of sustainability envisaged in the project application was not or only limited achieved (<u>please tick</u>):				