



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations



OFFICE OF EVALUATION

Country programme evaluation series

Evaluation of FAO's contribution to the

Myanmar Country Programme

TERMS OF REFERENCE

November 2017

COUNTRY PROGRAMME EVALUATION SERIES

Evaluation of FAO's contribution to the Myanmar Country Programme

TERMS OF REFERENCE

**FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS
OFFICE OF EVALUATION**

November 2017

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

Office of Evaluation (OED)

This report is available in electronic format at: <http://www.fao.org/evaluation>

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this information product do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) concerning the legal or development status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The mention of specific companies or products of manufacturers, whether or not these have been patented, does not imply that these have been endorsed or recommended by FAO in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned. The views expressed in this information product are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of FAO.

© FAO 2017

FAO encourages the use, reproduction and dissemination of material in this information product. Except where otherwise indicated, material may be copied, downloaded and printed for private study, research and teaching purposes, or for use in non-commercial products or services, provided that appropriate acknowledgement of FAO as the source and copyright holder is given and that FAO's endorsement of users' views, products or services is not implied in any way.

All requests for translation and adaptation rights, and for resale and other commercial use rights should be made via www.fao.org/contact-us/licence-request or addressed to copyright@fao.org.

For further information on this report, please contact:

Director, Office of Evaluation (OED)
Food and Agriculture Organization
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 1, 00153 Rome
Italy
Email: evaluation@fao.org

Photo credit (cover photos): FAO

Contents

1. Background and Context of the Project/Programme.....	1
2. Evaluation purpose	2
3. Brief overview of Myanmar	3
4. FAO in Myanmar	4
4.1 The Country Office	4
4.2 Overview of FAO's field programme.....	4
5. Evaluation scope	6
6. Evaluation objective and key questions.....	7
6.1 Evaluation Questions.....	7
7. Methodology.....	9
8. Process	11
8.1 Preparatory phase	11
8.2 Main evaluation phase.....	11
8.3 Drafting and dissemination of the report	11
9. Roles and responsibilities	13
10. Evaluation team composition and profile	14
11. Evaluation products (deliverables).....	15
12. Evaluation timeframe.....	16
13. List of Annexes	17

1. Background and Context of the Project/ Programme

- 1 The FAO Office of Evaluation (OED) has been conducting country programme evaluations since 2005 to provide accountability to member countries, national governments and development partners, and draw lessons and suggestions for programme improvement. Myanmar was selected as one of the countries in which to carry out a Country Programme Evaluation (CPE) in 2016. The main factors that led the FAO Office of Evaluation (OED) and Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (RAP) to select Myanmar are: i) the imminent end of Myanmar's Country Programming Framework (CPF) in 2016, and ii) the coincident termination of the assignment of the FAO Country Representative.
- 2 Since February 2016 Myanmar has a new democratic Government, with a non-military president. In this changing environment the CPE should contribute to support the new FAO Country Representative and the Government in identifying the future strategic direction of FAO programme in the country. The Terms of Reference (ToR) for the evaluation are the result of a preparatory phase, consisting of: a desk review of existing documentation, a preliminary analysis of FAO's portfolio of work in Myanmar, a contextual analysis and scoping interviews with FAO staff at the country, regional levels and in headquarters. The ToR also benefited from discussions held during the inception mission carried out in December 2015. The evaluation team consulted with a wide range of stakeholders, including government officials, donors, United Nations agencies, and international non-governmental organizations (NGOs).
- 3 The emphasis of the CPE will be on evaluating themes and issues important to the FAO Programme in Myanmar. Individual projects will mostly not be evaluated in detail.
- 4 This ToR will be the guiding document for the Evaluation Team and will be shared with counterparts in Myanmar, FAO staff in FAO Myanmar Country Office, FAO's Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (RAP) and FAO headquarters. Their purpose is to provide a description of the FAO Programme in Myanmar, identify key areas of work undertaken over the past five years, define the scope of the evaluation and outline the evaluation work plan. A set of overarching evaluation questions has been developed to further sharpen the objective and inform the methodology to be employed at different stages of this evaluation. The methodology and the evaluation tools will be further developed by the team over the course of the evaluation.

2. Evaluation purpose

- 5 The purpose of the evaluation is to contribute to better orient FAO's programme in Myanmar, making it more relevant to the needs of the country. It will provide accountability to the Government and non-government partners, communities and resource partners in the country, as well as all member countries. It seeks to draw lessons and make recommendations that will be useful for FAO's future engagement in the country.
- 6 In particular, it will assess the achievements of the FAO Myanmar Programme at strategic, technical and operational level and will also identify potential areas for future interventions in line with FAO's comparative advantage.
- 7 The main audience for the evaluation, to which most of the lessons and recommendations will be addressed are the FAO Representative, its staff and the Government of the Republic of the Union of Myanmar.
- 8 Other important users of the evaluation are the FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (RAP) and FAO as a whole, including other country offices and divisions at headquarters. Further users of the evaluation will be FAO partners within the broader development community, including resource partners, Myanmar agricultural producers, private sector stakeholders, United Nations agencies and civil society operating in FAO's areas of work. Universities, and in particular the University of Myanmar and national research institutes could be other potential users of the evaluation.
- 9 Since the adoption of the Paris Declaration on aid effectiveness, the international community has given increasing attention to country ownership of the development process. In this spirit, the evaluation will ensure on the participation of national partners, in particular the Government, to enhance the appropriation of the evaluation results by the relevant national institutions and promote their use at the national level. To this end, the Office of Evaluation (OED) envisions the creation of a Consultative Group involving national partners operating in FAO's areas of work.¹

¹ Specific ToRs have been developed for this Group.

3. Brief overview of Myanmar

- 10 Myanmar is the largest country in the continental Southeast Asia with one of the lowest population densities. Myanmar remained relatively poor due to its inward-looking policies and international isolation from the 1960s until recently.
- 11 Myanmar's economy has been growing rapidly for the past two decades. During 1999-2008, the average gross domestic product (GDP) growth rate was 12.4 percent, 9.5 percent average growth in agricultural gross domestic product² and rapid increases in natural gas, oil, mineral and gemstone exploitation. The country's GDP was estimated at USD 56.8 billion in Fiscal Year 2013/14. Per capita GDP estimate at around USD 1 105 is one of the lowest in East Asia and the Pacific and places Myanmar as a low middle-income country in the World Bank's classification.
- 12 The United Nations Development Programme's (UNDP's) human development indicators for Myanmar in 2014 result in a composite Human Development Index (HDI) value of 0.536.³ This is in the low human development category positioning the country at 148 out of 188.⁴
- 13 Myanmar is also one of the countries at highest risk of natural disasters in South East Asia, with recurrent floods affecting the coastal area of the country. Protracted crises, such as inter-communal violence and conflict have displaced more than 240 000 people since 2011.
- 14 Myanmar is going through significant transformation from an agricultural to industry and service-oriented economy. Although the share of agriculture sector significantly decreased in the last decade, agriculture is critical to the livelihoods of the rural people, comprising 72 percent of the population and for the overall reduction of poverty and food insecurity in Myanmar.
- 15 Overall future trends of the agricultural sector are strongly linked to the future of the food crop subsector (primarily rice production). The crop sector dominates the agriculture sector, contributing almost 72 percent of agricultural GDP.
- 16 The country is currently going through an important democratic transition and undergoing profound transformation politically, economically and in its governance structure.

2 Asian Development Bank (ADB), *Key Indicators for Asia and the Pacific 2014*.

3 The HDI is a summary measure for assessing long-term progress in three basic dimensions of human development: a long and healthy life, access to knowledge and a decent standard of living.

4 http://hdr.undp.org/sites/all/themes/hdr_theme/country-notes/MMR.pdf

4. FAO in Myanmar

4.1 The Country Office

- 17 FAO and the Government of the Republic of the Union of Myanmar share a long history of cooperation since Myanmar became a member state in 1947. FAO currently has an official status of representation in the country. The country host agreement was signed in October 1977 and FAO Representation in Myanmar was established in 1978. Currently the country office has 82 filled staff posts⁵ composed of national project personnel, local consultants and other non-staff (PSA). As of September 2016 there were 38 national project personnel and 11 PSA holders working within TCP and TF projects. in place. The FAO Representative changed during the evaluation period. The current FAO Representative was appointed in September 2016.

FAO's Country Programming Framework

- 18 The **Country Programming Framework (2012–2016)** of Myanmar included following seven "**CPF priority areas**": 1: Increased agricultural production to enhance food security; 2: Improved food safety and quality; 3: Sustainable management of natural resources and the environment; 4: Land use and land management; 5: Human resource development and institutional capacity building; 6: Rural livelihoods improvement; and 7: Preparedness for and mitigation of disasters and climate change. Each of these priority areas or outcomes is linked to outputs for a total of 38 outputs covered by completed, ongoing and pipeline projects.
- 19 The CPF went through a mid-term review during the last quarter of 2015. The CPF Mid-term Review (CPF MTR) confirmed the overall structure and validity of the CPF, but recommended to drop four out of the 38 outputs, thus bringing the total number of outputs to 34.
- 20 The evaluation preparatory phase carried out by the Office of Evaluation (OED) revealed that the current structure of the CPF with its 34 outputs doesn't represent the optimal evaluation framework for the CPE. It was also observed that several projects and areas of interventions implemented between 2011 and 2016 were not included under the current CPF. It was therefore decided to reorganize the seven **CPF priority areas**, into five **reconstructed outcomes** listed under the evaluation scope. The reconstructed outcomes will be discussed and validated during the inception workshop of the main evaluation mission.

4.2 Overview of FAO's field programme

- 21 The FAO field programme during 2011-2016, lacks a clear and solid Theory of Change supporting the identified "**CPF priority areas**" or outcomes.
- 22 The sectoral analysis of the country portfolio reveals that country-level funding for i) Agriculture and Rural Development; and ii) Livestock Production and Animal Health (including development, emergency and relief interventions) represent 91 percent of overall country level funding, while Fisheries and Forestry represent only 1 percent and 7 percent of overall country-level funding.
- 23 Further analysis confirms the importance of the emergency and relief response, justifying Myanmar's presence as a focus country for FAO Strategic Objective 5, "**Increase the resilience of livelihoods for threats and crises**". This area contributes to almost 30 percent of the country and regional-level funding.
- 24 Preliminary analysis carried out at field level revealed the potential importance of sectors that were only partially addressed under the current CPF, such as land tenure, extension and nutrition.

⁵ Based on staff list in September 2016.

- 25 The project portfolio in Myanmar included a total of 152 projects. 78 projects were included under the evaluation portfolio analysis. This number excludes Telefood projects and TCP facilities. The projects can be subdivided into 40 national, 1 inter-regional, 31 regional, and 6 global projects. The largest value per geographic coverage is the global-funding (USD 99 061 526) followed by regional-level funding (USD 51 239, 231) and then by country-level funding (USD 38, 492 019).

Table 1: Value (USD) of the selected 78 projects per sector

Sector	Country	Interregional	Regional	Global	Grand Total
Agriculture and Rural Development	11 898 139	6 293 651	20 051 609	800 000	39 043 399
Emergency	11 539 801			12 745 571	24 285 372
Fisheries and Aquaculture	448 000		12 127 099		12 575 099
Forestry & Multi-sectoral including forestry	2 838 267			85 515 955	88 354 222
Livestock Production and Animal Health	11 767 812		19 060 523		30,828,335
Grand Total	38 492 019	6293 651	51 239 231	99 061 526	195 086 427

- 26 In terms of fund mechanism projects are funded under: (1) Technical Cooperation Programme - TCP (15 Country level and 12 Regional Level); (2) Office for the Special Relief Operations - OSRO (15 Country level and 4 Regional Level) and (3) Government Cooperative Programme - GCP (4 Country level and 12 Regional Level).
- 27 In terms of value (USD), GCP with 17 projects contributed to 43 percent and OSRO with 21 projects contributed 30 percent of overall Country-Interregional-Regional-level funded projects.⁶

6 Global projects were excluded.

5. Evaluation scope

- 28 This evaluation will examine FAO's cooperation with Myanmar for the period between January 2011 and January 2016, in particular results, including outcomes (anticipated, unanticipated, positive, negative, intentional and unintentional) and potential impacts.
- 29 Since the CPE is a programme evaluation, the exercise will not focus on single projects, but rather assess FAO's overall contribution to results to priority areas identified through the preparatory phase.
- 30 The preparatory phase of the CPE, including discussions at country level and portfolio analysis led to the identification of following reconstructed outcomes: 1. Agricultural production to enhance food and nutrition security sustainably increased and rural livelihoods strengthened; (*including CPF Priority Area 1 and 6*) 2: Food safety and quality enhanced (*CPF Priority Area 2*); 3: Sustainable management of land and natural resources enhanced (*CPF Priority Area 3 and 4*); 4: Preparedness for and mitigation of disasters enhanced and resilience improved (*CPF Priority Area 7*).
- 31 *Human resource development and institutional capacity building (CPF Priority Area 5)* will be analysed in the context of the FAO Capacity Development strategy as cross-cutting areas. In addition, *Climate Change (Part of CPF Priority Area 7)* gender and human rights will be assessed.

6. Evaluation objective and key questions

32 The specific objectives of the CPE are to:

- assess the strategic relevance of FAO's interventions in responding to country needs;
- assess FAO's contributions to results identified in the CPF;
- identify good practices as well as causes of successes and failures;
- identify gaps in FAO's country programming and potential areas of future work.

6.1 Evaluation Questions

The following questions have been developed to further define the objective of the evaluation. More specific questions will be developed by the team at the beginning of the in-country investigation phase.

Strategic positioning: Are we doing what is needed?

Strategic relevance

- Has FAO been addressing the most acute and structurally important challenges in the areas of FAO's competence?
- Has FAO's programme aligned with relevant national strategies and policies, such as the National Economic and Social Development Plan 2011-12 – 2015-16 (NESDP) and the National Strategy on Rural Development and Poverty Alleviation (NSPARD)?
- Has FAO's programme aligned with the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)? Are FAO's activities designed to achieve its Outcomes and, ultimately, the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)?
- To what extent has FAO's programme in Myanmar been in line with and supportive of FAO's Strategic Framework?
- Has FAO responded appropriately to needs as they arise as a consequence of natural or man-induced emergencies?

Comparative advantage

- What role has FAO played vis-à-vis the Government?
- What was FAO's role vis-à-vis other development actors (civil society, the private sector and other international development partners)?
- Is FAO providing the right technical expertise with regard to country level support?

Partnership and Coordination

- How did FAO engage in partnerships and to what extent were these partnerships complementary and synergetic?
- To what extent has FAO supported the coordination of actors working in the rural development and food security sector?
- To what extent has FAO contributed to influence the position and decisions of partners (Government and others) in relation to food and nutrition security and has it had a role as convenor?

Normative values

- Have normative values of the United Nations, particularly supporting the poor, marginalized, disadvantaged and affected populations been embedded into FAO's programme and how?
- To what extent has FAO taken into account gender and human rights in the design of its programme and during the implementation?

Programme contribution: Are we making a difference?

For each CPF outcome

- i. Agricultural production to enhance food and nutrition security sustainably increased and rural livelihoods strengthened;
- ii. Food safety and quality enhanced;
- iii. Sustainable management of land and natural resources enhanced;
- iv. Preparedness for and mitigation of disasters enhanced and resilience improved.

Programme relevance

- In developing capacity at country level, and in providing policy and technical advice, has FAO supported the key actors and provided the appropriate technical contents?
- In direct support, has FAO targeted the poorest and most vulnerable households and responded to their needs, including women, indigenous populations and young people?
- How does FAO identify beneficiaries and other stakeholders' needs? Is the development of projects based on a sound and well-grounded analysis?
- To what extent did FAO respond to changing needs and priorities of target beneficiaries?

Programme impact and effectiveness

- What changes can be observed that are attributable to FAO's interventions (e.g. behavioural changes; institutional changes; policy changes; technical adaptations; tangible benefits)?
- To what extent have these changes contributed to progress towards key priority areas of FAO intervention based on the CPF?
- To what extent has FAO succeeded in introducing innovative technologies and approaches in its areas of interventions?
- Have approaches and technologies introduced by FAO been adopted by other partners or contributed to stimulate change in areas beyond FAO direct intervention?

Sustainability of results

- Did FAO interventions have appropriate exit strategies? To what extent were these strategies followed during FAO programme execution and how did they contribute to long-term sustainability of programme results?
- To what extent are results owned by the government, beneficiaries at community level and other stakeholders? To what extent have the changes that were generated been sustainable?
- Have livelihoods of beneficiaries at community level been affected by results on the medium- and long-term and how?

Programme coherence and synergies

- Did FAO strategically use its resources? Has FAO focused on activities that will lead to achieve the best results vis-à-vis its resources?
- To what extent has FAO headquarters and Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (RAP) represented an added value, particularly in terms of technical support? Has FAO's knowledge base (normative products, guidelines, publications, etc.) been used at country level?
- To what extent is FAO's programming coherent (in terms of the interventions). Is the CPF an appropriate framework? How were the CPF priorities identified?
- To what extent have emergency and development interventions been integrated? To what extent have emergency interventions integrated long-term perspectives, and to what extent do development interventions account for recurrent crises (disaster risk reduction, resilience)?

Cross-cutting issues

- To what extent has FAO's programme integrated cross-cutting issues at different levels (policy, project design and implementation) and according to different sectors of intervention?
 - Gender equality and other equity issues
 - Capacity development

7. Methodology

- 33 The evaluation should adhere to the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms and Standards⁷ and be in line with the Office of Evaluation (OED) Manual and methodological guidelines and practices.
- 34 The evaluation questions identified above will be contextualized and addressed further by defining sub-questions according to the priority areas, different types of activities/projects and stakeholders. These sub-questions will be developed by the evaluation team during the preparations for the in-country mission. Questions and critical issues identified during the inception mission will also be further developed to answer the question "**Strategic positioning: Are we doing what is needed?**", the evaluation team will revise background documentation and conduct semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions with key informants. FAO and non-FAO informants were identified through a stakeholder mapping exercise carried out with the Country Office.
- 35 The focus of this analysis will be to assess the past and current needs by group of stakeholders (i.e. government, communities, vulnerable groups; civil society, development partners, etc.) and whether the programme responded to them and was able to adapt to changing priorities. It will also be assessed whether FAO explicitly and intentionally identified and assessed these needs, prior to its programmatic intervention.
- 36 Protocols for the semi-structured interviews will be developed by the team before the main evaluation mission and during the first week of the mission. In addition, workshops targeting different groups of stakeholders will be organized to identify issues, lessons learned and potential areas for future interventions. Facilitation techniques, developed by the evaluation team at the beginning of the main mission, will be employed during the workshops. Information from different sources will be validated through triangulation.
- 37 To assess the section **Programme contribution: Are we making a difference?** the evaluation team will use "Outcome Harvesting" to assess changes that have taken place in a determined area of work, region or target group, and then determine FAO's specific contribution to these changes. This section will benefit also from a number of separate inputs to the identified priority areas. These are:
- 1 a dedicated case study carried out in the Rakhine State to assess emergency intervention in the Region (**contributing to CPF outcome 5**);
 - 2 the Evaluation of the Emergency Centre for Transboundary Animal Disease (ECTAD), case study of Myanmar (**CPF outcome 5**);
 - 3 the cluster evaluation of the Environmental Sustainable Food Security Programme (ESFSP) (**CPF Outcome 1 and 3**);
 - 4 the Evaluation of the Farm Forest Facility Programme (**CPF Outcome 1 and 3**);
 - 5 the project evaluation of the National Action Plan for Poverty Alleviation and Rural Development (NAPA) 9 (**CPF Outcome 1 to 4**);
 - 6 the evaluation of the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure, Myanmar case study (**CPF outcome 1 to 4**);
 - 7 the Final Evaluation of the Bay of Bengal Large Marine Ecosystem, contributing to (**CPF outcome 1 and 3**).
- 38 Additional field work will be conducted during the evaluation main mission to meet direct beneficiaries at community level for all priority areas identified. The focus will be in assessing changes on their lives and livelihoods that FAO interventions contributed to achieve. As far as possible, under constraints, the team will assess short- and long-term impacts. Project sites for field visits will be selected in consultation with the Country Office. During site visits the team will prioritize the use of tools and approaches fostering beneficiaries'

7 <http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/21>

active participation. The team will also meet with non-beneficiary households to explore targeting issues and spillover effects. Communities will be identified in relation to the relevance of the intervention, its scope and its geographical location.

- 39 Synergies of the programme will be assessed through additional key informant interviews and focus group discussions. The CPE will also assess gaps in FAO programming and potential areas of work.
- 40 The evaluation will assess the equitable access to resources, knowledge, services and technical support of vulnerable populations and communities, and include in this analysis gender equity. FAO's contributions to capacity development will be assessed across three dimensions (individual, organizational and enabling environment dimensions).
- 41 The evaluation will adopt a participatory, inclusive and consultative approach, seeking and sharing opinions with stakeholders at different stages throughout the process. Different sources will be used to verify information. Triangulation of information across stakeholders will be a key approach for validating evidence.
- 42 Given the absence of baseline for most of the interventions, an effort will be done to reconstruct a baseline through recall methods and triangulation of the reconstructed baseline with results of individual and key informant interviews, as well as with secondary data, whenever these are available.

8. Process

8.1 Preparatory phase

43 This ToR is the result of the preparatory phase, which included:

- a desk review of existing documentation;
- a *portfolio analysis*, prepared to better understand FAO's priorities and details of its programme in the country, providing an overview of activities and, when possible, of results achieved;
- a *context analysis*, prepared to highlight the country's needs and priorities falling within FAO's areas of work; and
- an *inception mission*, carried out in December 2015 for two weeks to discuss with FAO staff at country and regional levels as well as to engage with the national government and set-up a framework for collaboration with key national counterparts, scope the national research and evaluation capacity to establish collaborations for the evaluation process and discuss evaluation design and activity plans with the relevant programme managers. Interviews were conducted with FAO officers at FAO headquarters and Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (RAP) as well as with external stakeholders to identify key issues for the evaluation and formulate an appropriate evaluation process and related evaluation questions.

8.2 Main evaluation phase

44 The main evaluation phase consists of:

- desk review of existing documentation, and in particular any previous evaluations, monitoring information and monitoring and evaluation studies;
- analysis of all background information including of the preparatory studies conducted, in particular of the programme evaluations and of the impact study for the formulation of more specific evaluation questions. Developing a Theory of Change for the FAO Myanmar Country Programme;
- field visits to project sites to be selected in coordination with the Myanmar Country Team to meet with government staff at provincial and district level, project beneficiaries and beneficiary communities.

45 The main evaluation phase will take place in October 2016; preliminary findings will be presented to the Myanmar Country Team, Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (RAP) the Consultative Group and the Government at the end of this phase.

8.3 Drafting and dissemination of the report

46 The Evaluation Team Leader with the support of the Associate Evaluation Manager, will consolidate team members' contributions to prepare the draft report. The draft report will be circulated to FAO staff and the Consultative Group (see below), who will provide feedback on the findings and conclusions and on the appropriateness of the recommendations, before the finalization of the report.

47 The final draft report will be presented to the national government counterparts, development partners, implementing partners and other national and regional stakeholders in order to validate the overall conclusions reached by the team, build consensus on the way forward, promote ownership of the evaluation results and maximise their use. The FAO Representative in consultation with the Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (RAP) ADG and with inputs from the Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (RAP) and relevant units at headquarters will be responsible for coordinating the management response to the report and its recommendations.

- 48 Wide dissemination of the report to maximize the impact of the evaluation results will be ensured by the Office of Evaluation (OED), with the FAO Country Office. The final report and FAO's management response are public documents and will be broadly disseminated both internally and externally (see below).⁸

⁸ The Office of Evaluation (OED) posts all reports on its website. The FAO representative is responsible for distributing the report to all key stakeholders at the country level after its finalization.

9. Roles and responsibilities

- 49 **Office of Evaluation (OED):** The Office of Evaluation (OED) is responsible for managing the evaluation and leading the team through the designated Evaluation Team Leader/Manager. During the preparatory phase, the Evaluation Manager supported by the Associate Evaluation Manager is responsible for drafting the ToR for the evaluation, selecting team members, and drafting individual ToR. In the main evaluation phase, the Evaluation Manager will oversee and guide the evaluation team, especially during the launch. Towards the end of the evaluation, the Evaluation Manager will facilitate discussions during the analysis of findings, conclusions and recommendations. The Office of Evaluation (OED), in collaboration with the Consultative Group and FAO Myanmar, will promote the dissemination of the report.
- 50 **Evaluation team:** The evaluation team will be responsible for collecting data and analysing evidence to develop findings, conclusions and recommendations under their areas of responsibility. For this purpose, the Associate Evaluation Manager will assist in coordinating the team. The team members will have shared responsibility for participating in the evaluation process, as well as directly carrying out specific parts of the evaluation related to their sector expertise in Myanmar. This includes policy, institutional and community level, identifying the reasons for observed successes/failures and produce evidence based on findings and lessons learned to allow the FAO Myanmar team and FAO management to improve the design and implementation of its interventions, and to inform decision about FAO's future strategic partnership with Myanmar.⁹ Team members will participate in the initial briefing sessions delivered by the Office of Evaluation (OED), and through group discussions will contribute to the refinement of the methodology and preparation of the evaluation tools. At the beginning of the main evaluation phase, each team member will carry out a desk review of documents in their area of work. During the evaluation phase, team members will conduct individual and group interviews with internal and external stakeholders, participate in field visits to project sites, participate in the analysis session and at the initial stakeholder debriefing, contribute written inputs to the evaluation report and support the Evaluation Manager in the consolidation of the inputs and the preparation of the draft report. Once the draft report is circulated and the comments received, the team members will provide advice on the integration of comments received from the Consultative Group and FAO staff.
- 51 **FAO Country Office:** The FAO country team will review and provide comments on the ToRs, assist the Office of Evaluation (OED) in mapping FAO's stakeholders in the country, review and comment on the evaluation programme and advise on the identification of locations for the field visits. They will ensure that the team has access to all relevant available documentation, be available for prioritize scheduled, agreed meetings and discussions with the evaluation team, provide possible administrative and logistical support to the evaluation, and provide comments to the draft report. FAO country team, in consultation and with the support of the Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (RAP) and with inputs from relevant units at headquarters, is responsible for leading and coordinating the preparation of the management response, and after one year of preparing the follow-up report informing on progress in the implementation of the evaluation's recommendations.
- 52 **FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (RAP) and FAO headquarters divisions:** Relevant FAO divisions and FAO staff involved in the country programme will also provide their comments to the draft ToRs and later to the draft report, ensure time for meetings with team members and provide information and documentation upon request.
- 53 **Consultative Group:** The Consultative Group will be an integral part of the process to improve the relevance and use of the evaluation. The Consultative Group will help guide the evaluation, providing advice at key stages throughout the process. In particular, the group will be asked to: i) provide comments on the ToR; ii) assume an advisory role for the evaluation team during the main mission to refine the methodology and, if needed, facilitate meetings with national government officials at the central and decentralized levels; iii) provide comments on the draft report for the finalization of the report; and iv) ensure the promotion and use of evaluation results through dissemination within the government and amongst external stakeholders.¹⁰

9 Specific ToRs were designed for the IC role in this evaluation.

10 Refer to Annex 1.

10. Evaluation team composition and profile

- 54 **Livestock and Animal Health:** The expert will assess the work of FAO in livestock and animal health based on evidence and lessons learned; and provide forward looking recommendations in this sector. The expert will also develop a case study for the evaluation of the Emergency Centre for Transboundary Animal Disease (ECTAD) that will contribute to the evaluation of the Emergency Prevention System for Animal Health (EMPRES) and the CPE.
- 55 **Fisheries and Aquaculture:** The expert will assess the work of FAO in fisheries and aquaculture based on evidence and lessons learned; and provide forward looking recommendations in this sector.
- 56 **Land Tenure:** The expert will assess the work of FAO in Land Tenure based on evidence and lessons learned; and provide forward looking recommendations in this sector. He will also develop a case study for the evaluation of the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure.
- 57 **Agriculture, Rural Development, Crop Production and Extension:** The expert will have technical responsibility for assessing the performance and results of work of these closely interlinked areas. He will provide a forward looking perspective on how to enhance FAO's work in these areas.
- 58 **Agricultural Policy:** The expert will lead the evaluation of the National Action Plan for Poverty Alleviation and Rural Development (NAPA) and assess the agricultural policy interventions of FAO in Myanmar.
- 59 **Gender, Natural Resource Management and Climate Change:** The expert will look at the work of FAO related to Natural Resource Management and assess Climate Change and Gender as a cross-cutting theme, throughout FAO programme.

11. Evaluation products (deliverables)

- 60 The evaluation will produce the following deliverables:
- a. **Final evaluation report.** The Office of Evaluation (OED) team leader will make sure the draft evaluation report meets the Office of Evaluation's (OED's) quality standards and criteria. The draft evaluation report will then be circulated to the Country Team and afterwards to the Consultative Groups. Comments and suggestions will be included as deemed appropriate by the evaluation team. The report will be prepared in English, with numbered paragraphs, following the Office of Evaluation (OED) template for report writing and include an executive summary. Supporting data, annexes and analysis will be annexed to the report when considered important to complement the main report. Appendices include:
 - i Evaluation Terms of Reference
 - ii Evaluation Matrix
 - iii Final Theory of change of the programme, after consultation and validation with Country Office
- 61 The following evaluation and case studies have been/will be conducted in support of the CPE. They will be separate annexes and will contribute the Final Evaluation report:
- a. Evaluation of the Environmentally Sustainable Food Security Programme (ESFSP), December 2015;
 - b. Evaluation of the National Action Plan for Poverty Alleviation and Rural Development through Agriculture (NAPA), which will contribute to the FAO CPE, December 2016;
 - c. The Rakhine Case Study: Revisiting Emergency Response and Recovery Projects in Disaster and Conflict Affected communities, May 2016;
 - d. The case study on Emergency Centre for Transboundary Animal Disease (ECTAD), December 2016;
 - e. The case study on Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure, December 2016.

12. Evaluation timeframe

- 62 The evaluation was launched in October 2015, with the scoping mission in December 2015 tandem with the ESFSP Evaluation. The Rakhine case study was conducted in May 2016 and the full fledged evaluation mission together with the VGGT and ECTAD case studies, and the NAPA evaluation will take place between October and November 2016.

Task	Dates	Responsibility
Evaluation scoping mission	December 2015	EM and AEM
Team identification and recruitment	August-September 2016	EM and AEM
ToR finalization	September 2016	EM, AEM, Country Office and Consultative Group
Mission organization	September 2016	EM, AEM with Country Office
Reading background documentation	July-September 2016	ET
Travel arrangements	September 2016	EM, AEM and Country Office
Briefing of evaluation team	October 2016	EM and AEM
Mission to RAP, Thailand	October 2016	EM and ET
Main mission to Myanmar	October 2016	ET
First draft for circulation	2nd week January 2017	ET, Country Office and Consultative Group
Final draft for circulation	2nd week February 2017	ET, Country Office and Consultative Group
Validation of the recommendations	4th week February 2017	ET, Country Office and Consultative Group
Final Report	1st Week March 2017	EM, AEM, Country Office and Consultative Group
Stakeholder workshop	March 2017	EM, AEM, Country Office and Consultative Group

13. List of Annexes

- 1 ***ToR of Consultative Group***: Provides guidance notes on the role of the consultative group and membership
- 2 ***Portfolio analysis***: Provides an initial look into the Myanmar project portfolio
- 3 ***Annotated list of relevant projects and Theory of Change***: Provides more detailed information on the project being evaluated.
- 4 ***Key stakeholders and partners (Stakeholder Mapping)*** A list of key stakeholders and other individuals who should be consulted, together with an indication of their affiliation and relevance for the evaluation and their contact information.
- 5 ***Documents to be consulted***: A list of important documents and webpages that are relevant to the CPE and country context.
- 6 ***Evaluation Matrix***: a tool used as a map and reference in planning and conducting an evaluation. It will serve as a useful tool for summarizing and visually presenting the evaluation design and methodology for discussions with stakeholders. It details the evaluation questions that the evaluation will answer; data sources & data collection methods; analysis tools or methods appropriate for each data source & data collection method; and the standard or measure by which each question will be evaluated.
- 7 ***Project evaluation report outline***: Outlines the evaluation report structure.
- 8 ***FAO Strategic Objectives, Results and core functions, 2010-2019***: Outcomes that are related to the strategic objectives - <http://www.fao.org/docrep/meeting/027/mg015e.pdf>



**Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations**

OFFICE OF EVALUATION
www.fao.org/evaluation