Implementation Stage Quality Assurance Report

Form Status: Approved	
Overall Rating:	Inadequate
Decision:	Take urgent action: The project has significant issues that require urgent management attention, or the project may be cancelled. If the Social and Environmental Standards criterion is Inadequate, the project may be cancelled.
Portfolio/Project Number:	00117353
Portfolio/Project Title:	Managing Together (GEF VI)
Portfolio/Project Date:	2021-01-01 / 2024-01-31

1. Is the project pro-actively identifying changes to the external environment and incorporating them into the project strategy?

○ 3: The project team has identified relevant changes in the external environment that may present new opportunities or threats to the project's ability to achieve its objectives and the assumptions have been tested to determine if the project's strategy is still valid. There is evidence that the project board has considered the implications, and documented any changes needed to the project in response. (all must be true)

○ 2: The project team has identified relevant changes in the external environment that may present new opportunities or threats to the project's ability to achieve its objectives. There is some evidence that the project board discussed this, but relevant changes may not have been fully integrated in the project. (both must be true)

◉ *1: The project team may have considered relevant changes in the external environment since implementation began, but there is no evidence that the project team has considered changes to the project as a result.*

Evidence:

The Project team may have considered changes in the external environment. As an example, Covid 19 pandemic and the economic recession have created a drastic change in the external environment. As per the Project Team, they have considered this as an opportunity to advance the field implementation, especially the assistance that the project can provide to the agricultural communities in the landscape. The team has expedited and proactively reached its beneficiaries to engage them in ecological agriculture practices while understanding the key threats to biodiversity from agriculture in the past and starting to adopt sustainable methods. But they have not initiated any programmes on tourism or forestry which are key sectors of the project.

The Project Board had not discussed the changes and there is no evidence on how these changes in the external environment were used to revise the work plans originally agreed upon.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	MTPFarmerDataBase_Sheet_14969_201 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MTPFarmerDataBase_Sheet_14969_201.xlsx)	ramitha.wijethunga@undp.org	12/19/2022 7:35:00 AM
2	Procurementupdateasat24.11.2022_14969_201 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Procurementupdateasat24.11.2022_14969_201.xlsx)	ramitha.wijethunga@undp.org	12/19/2022 7:35:00 AM
3	MinutesoftheNSCMeeting2ofGEF6MTProject_08032022_14969_201 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MinutesoftheNSCMeeting2ofGEF6MTProject_08032022_14969_201.docx)	ramitha.wijethunga@undp.org	12/19/2022 8:38:00 AM

2. Is the project aligned with the UNDP Strategic Plan?

○ 3: The project responds at least one of the development settings[3] as specified in the Strategic Plan (SP) and adopts at least one Signature Solution[4] and the project's RRF includes at all the relevant SP output indicators. (all must be true)

◉ *2: The project responds to one of the three areas of development work[1] as specified in the Strategic Plan. The project's RRF includes at least one SP output indicator, if relevant. (both must be true)*

○ 1: While the project may respond to a partner's identified need, this need falls outside the UNDP Strategic Plan. Also select this option if none of the relevant SP indicators are included in the RRF.

Evidence:

The project responds to the outcome 03 of the strategic plan on "Building resilience to crises and shocks, in order to safeguard development gains. resilience building". The project RRF includes one indicator from the strategic plan.

IRRF indicators relevant to this project are as follows;
1.3.1 Number of people accessing basic services
4.1.2 Natural resources that are managed under sustainable use, conservation, access and benefit sharing regime.
4.2.1 Number of people directly benefitting from mechanisms for biodiversity, water, oceans, and climate solutions4. funded by public and/or private sector resources:
5.2.3 Volume of investment leveraged to support green recovery (in US dollars

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Annex_A_Results_Framework_2390_102_14969_202 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Annex_A_Results_Framework_2390_102_14969_202.docx)	ramitha.wijethunga@undp.org	12/19/2022 8:46:00 AM
2	GEFVIRRF_2390_102_14969_202 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/GEFVIRRF_2390_102_14969_202.docx)	ramitha.wijethunga@undp.org	12/19/2022 8:46:00 AM

Relevant   **Quality Rating: Needs Improvement**

3. Are the project's targeted groups being systematically engaged, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized, to ensure the project remains relevant for them?

○ 3: Systematic and structured feedback has been collected over the past two years from a representative sample of beneficiaries, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized, as part of the project's monitoring system. Representatives from the targeted groups are active members of the project's governance mechanism (i.e., the project board or equivalent) and there is credible evidence that their feedback informs project decision making. (all must be true)

○ 2: Targeted groups have been engaged in implementation and monitoring, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized. Beneficiary feedback, which may be anecdotal, has been collected over the past year to ensure the project is addressing local priorities. This information has been used to inform project decision making. (all must be true)

◉ *1: Some beneficiary feedback may have been collected over the past year, but this information has not been used to inform project decision making. This option is also selected if no beneficiary feedback has been collected.*

○ Not Applicable

Evidence:

The project has no established clear mechanism to engage target groups and consult them about the project activities. In the Project Document it has been clearly defined the stakeholder engagement processes but the management has not been able to implement the provisions in the Project Document.

As per the project team, the project has adapted a unique criterion to select beneficiaries for the project activities. The conventional beneficiary selection practice in Sri Lanka is to provide priority to low-income groups. In the Managing Together project, together with these income criteria, land-based criteria such as degraded levels, pollution levels, environmental sensitiveness, etc. have been used as criteria. This approach led to selecting the most suitable beneficiary group with minimum grievances of host communities and administrative agencies as per the project team. Currently, the project is undertaking a comprehensive baseline survey on selected beneficiaries to collect data on their economic status as well as the current environmental conservation requirements at their own land parcel level. This shows that some beneficiary feedbacks have collected but there was no evidence for using such feedback for decision making processes.
Even though the project team has communicated that a grievance redress mechanism is in place, evidence was not available

Management Response:

1. Request the main implementing partner (Ministry of Environment) and the Responsible Party (IUCN) to establish a clear, effective stakeholder consultation mechanism including a Grievance Redress Mechanism
2. Request the MoE and IUCN to ensure the implementation of the stakeholder consultation plan & Grievance Redress Mechanism and report the progress in PIR 2023 and Project Board meetings.
3. UNDP to highlight the importance of the stakeholder consultation mechanism at the Project Board Meetings.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	CopyofSelectionCriteriaFormat_14969_203 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CopyofSelectionCriteriaFormat_14969_203.xlsx)	ramitha.wijethunga@undp.org	12/19/2022 7:44:00 AM
2	EllawewaGNcluster_14969_203 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/EllawewaGNcluster_14969_203.pdf)	ramitha.wijethunga@undp.org	12/19/2022 7:45:00 AM
3	BTOR-MTMonitoringmission2022Q4_14969_203 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/BTOR-MTMonitoringmission2022Q4_14969_203.doc)	ramitha.wijethunga@undp.org	12/19/2022 7:45:00 AM

4. Is the project generating knowledge and lessons learned (i.e., what has worked and what has not) and has this knowledge informed management decisions to ensure the continued relevance of the project towards its stated objectives, the quality of its outputs and the management of risk?

○ 3: Knowledge and lessons learned from internal or external sources (gained, for example, from Peer Assists, After Action Reviews or Lessons Learned Workshops) backed by credible evidence from evaluation, corporate policies/strategies, analysis and monitoring have been discussed in project board meetings and reflected in the minutes. There is clear evidence that changes were made to the project to ensure its continued relevance. (both must be true)

○ 2: Knowledge and lessons learned backed by relatively limited evidence, drawn mainly from within the project, have been considered by the project team. There is some evidence that changes were made to the project as a result to ensure its continued relevance. (both must be true)

◉ *1: There is limited or no evidence that knowledge and lessons learned have been collected by the project team. There is little or no evidence that this has informed project decision making.*

Evidence:

There is limited evidence for collecting analyzing and using the knowledge and lessons from the project implementation. Such lessons were not shared with the National Project Steering Committee and there are no evidence for revising the Annual /Quarterly Work Plans based on the knowledge and lessons.

Management Response:

1. Request the main implementing partner (Ministry of Environment) and the Responsible Party (IUCN) to establish an effective knowledge management mechanism that will benefit informed decision making related to the project implementation and monitoring.
2. Request the MoE and IUCN to ensure that they will monitor the progress of the knowledge management mechanism and report the progress in PIR 2023 and Project Board meetings.
3. UNDP to highlight the importance of the knowledge management mechanism at the Project Board Meetings.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	MahakanadarawaBiodiversityProfile_ffmt09_11_2022_14969_204 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MahakanadarawaBiodiversityProfile_ffmt09_11_2022_14969_204.pdf)	ramitha.wijethunga@undp.org	12/19/2022 7:53:00 AM
2	TL02_TechnicalRecommendationfortheDairyProject_CF27072022_14969_204 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/TL02_TechnicalRecommendationfortheDairyProject_CF27072022_14969_204.docx)	ramitha.wijethunga@undp.org	12/19/2022 7:54:00 AM

5. Is the project sufficiently at scale, or is there potential to scale up in the future, to meaningfully contribute to development change?

○ 3: There is credible evidence that the project is reaching a sufficient number of beneficiaries (either directly through significant coverage of target groups, or indirectly, through policy change) to meaningfully contribute to development change.

◉ *2: While the project is currently not at scale, there are explicit plans in place to scale up the project in the future (e.g. by extending its coverage or using project results to advocate for policy change).*

○ 1: The project is not at scale, and there are no plans currently to scale up the project in the future.

Evidence:

Currently the cumulative project delivery is around 10%. But there are plans to accelerate the project and achieve the scale anticipated through the project design.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	CopyofAWP2023UNDPFormat-Draft1_14969_205 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CopyofAWP2023UNDPFormat-Draft1_14969_205.xlsx)	ramitha.wijethunga@undp.org	12/19/2022 7:58:00 AM
2	BTOR-MTMonitoringmission2022Q4_14969_205 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/BTOR-MTMonitoringmission2022Q4_14969_205.doc)	ramitha.wijethunga@undp.org	12/19/2022 8:07:00 AM

Principled   **Quality Rating: Inadequate**

6. Are the project's measures (through outputs, activities, indicators) to address gender inequalities and empower women relevant and producing the intended effect? If not, evidence-based adjustments and changes have been made.

○ 3: The project team has systematically gathered data and evidence through project monitoring on the relevance of the measures to address gender inequalities and empower women. Analysis of data and evidence were used to inform adjustments and changes, as appropriate. (both must be true)

○ 2: The project team has some data and evidence on the relevance of the measures to address gender inequalities and empower women. There is evidence that at least some adjustments were made, as appropriate. (both must be true)

● *1: The project team has limited or no evidence on the relevance of measures to address gender inequalities and empowering women. No evidence of adjustments and/or changes made. This option should also be selected if the project has no measures to address gender inequalities and empower women relevant to the project results and activities.*

Evidence:

The project design has very clear Gender Analysis and Action Plan which will facilitate addressing inequalities and lead to empowering women through the project implementation process. But the project team has not been able to implement the provisions stipulated in the Project Document and the Annexures. Data collection mechanism related to indicator number 2 under the project objective has been established. However, the field implementation team requires guidance on integrating gender-related information when capturing the baseline and progress information.

Management Response:

1. Request the main implementing partner (Ministry of Environment) and the Responsible Party (IUCN) to update, implement, monitor and report on the Gender Action Plan of the project.

2. UNDP to highlight the importance of implementing gender action plan of the project at the Project Board Meetings.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	BTOR-MTMonitoringmission2022Q4_14969_206 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/BTOR-MTMonitoringmission2022Q4_14969_206.doc)	ramitha.wijethunga@undp.org	12/19/2022 8:14:00 AM

7. Are social and environmental impacts and risks being successfully managed and monitored?

○ 3: Social and environmental risks are tracked in the risk log. Appropriate assessments conducted where required (i.e., Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) for Substantial and High risk projects and some level of social and environmental assessment for Moderate risk projects as identified through SESP). Relevant management plan(s) developed for identified risks through consultative process and implemented, resourced, and monitored. Risks effectively managed or mitigated. If there has been a substantive change to the project or change in context that affects risk levels, the SESP is updated to reflect these changes. (all must be true)

○ 2: Social and environmental risks are tracked in the risk log. Appropriate assessments conducted where required (i.e., Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) for Substantial and High risk projects and some level of social and environmental assessment for Moderate risk projects as identified through SESP). Relevant management plan(s) developed, implemented and monitored for identified risks. OR project is categorized as Low risk through the SESP.

◉ *1: Social and environmental risks have not been tracked in the risk log. For projects categorized as High, Substantial, and Moderate Risk there is no evidence that social and environmental assessments have been completed and/or management plans or measures development, implemented or monitored. There have been substantive changes to the project or changes in the context but SESP has not been updated. (any may be true)*

Evidence:

> Social and environmental risks have been tracked using the risk log. The project implementation got delayed due to external environment and internal reasons. Therefore, ESIA was not conducted as many factors were changing in the external environment. As an example, the project was identified as a high risk project due to the fact that it was supposed to work in a geographical area where the government was proposing to establish an elephant corridor and due to that involuntary resettlements were due to happen. But with the economic downturn experiencing in the country, the government has stopped implementation of the elephant corridor. The project is planning to hire a Safeguard Specialist and take relevant actions based on his/ her recommendations.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	ConsultantSafeguardSpecialistTOR-Draft_14969_207 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ConsultantSafeguardSpecialistTOR-Draft_14969_207.docx)	ramitha.wijethunga@undp.org	12/19/2022 8:24:00 AM

8. Are grievance mechanisms available to project-affected people and are grievances (if any) addressed to ensure any perceived harm is effectively mitigated?

○ 3: Project-affected people have been actively informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism (SRM/SECU) and how to access it. If the project is categorized as High, Substantial, or Moderate Risk through the SESP, a project-level grievance mechanism is in place and project affected people informed. If grievances have been received, they are effectively addressed in accordance with SRM Guidance. (all must be true)

○ 2: Project-affected people have been informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism and how to access it. If the project is categorized as Substantial or High Risk through the SESP, a project-level grievance mechanism is in place and project affected people informed. If grievances have been received they are responded to but face challenges in arriving at a resolution.

◉ *1: Project-affected people not informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism. If grievances have been received they are not responded to. (any may be true)*

Evidence:

Due to the delayed project implementation, the ground level activities have been initiated only in October 2022. The project has been requested to set up their own grievances redress mechanism through IUCN (main implementing partner). As per the field visit report (BTOR) of the UNDP Project Coordinator, there is no proper grievance redress mechanism even though the project has been advised to establish a one several time. Currently ad hoc grievance redress mechanism is in place.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	BTOR-MTMonitoringmission2022Q4_14969_208 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/BTOR-MTMonitoringmission2022Q4_14969_208.doc)	ramitha.wijethunga@undp.org	12/19/2022 8:27:00 AM

Management & Monitoring　　　　　　　　　**Quality Rating: Needs Improvement**

9. Is the project's M&E Plan sufficient and adequately implemented?

○ 3: The project has a comprehensive and costed M&E plan. Baselines, targets and milestones are fully populated. Progress data against indicators in the project's RRF is being reported regularly using credible data sources and collected according to the frequency stated in the Plan, including sex disaggregated data as relevant. Any evaluations conducted, if relevant, fully meet decentralized evaluation standards, including gender UNEG standards. Lessons learned, including during evaluations and/or After Action Reviews, are used to take corrective actions when necessary. (all must be true)

○ 2: The project has a costed M&E Plan, and most baselines and targets are populated. Progress data against indicators in the project's RRF is collected on a regular basis, although there may be some slippage in following the frequency stated in the Plan and data sources are not always reliable. Any evaluations conducted, if relevant, meet most decentralized evaluation standards. Lessons learned have been captured but may not have been used to take corrective actions yet. (all must be true)

⦿ *1: The project has an M&E Plan, but costs are not clearly planned and budgeted for, or are unrealistic. Progress data is not being regularly collected against the indicators in the project's RRF. Evaluations may not meet decentralized evaluation standards. Lessons learned are rarely captured and used. Select this option also if the project does not have an M&E plan.*

Evidence:

As per the Project Implementation Team of IUCN, the project is in the stage of finalizing systems to collect activity-based indicator progress. The project does not have a dedicated monitoring officer but it is expected to mainstream the responsibility of monitoring in the duties of the Learning and Communication Officer. Collecting information to develop content and strategies to share the knowledge that generates from the implementation of activities, will be done by the LCO. This system will be effective to capture progress information in order to develop learning products.

Management Response:

1. Request the main implementing partner (Ministry of Environment) and the Responsible Party (IUCN) to establish a clear, effective field monitoring mechanism that include participatory monitoring techniques as well.
2. UNDP to highlight the importance of the having an effective monitoring mechanism at the Project Board Meetings.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Annex13-UpdatedResultsFramework_14969_209 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Annex13-UpdatedResultsFramework_14969_209.pdf)	ramitha.wijethunga@undp.org	12/19/2022 8:32:00 AM
2	Indicatorsandscorecard_14969_209 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Indicatorsandscorecard_14969_209.docx)	ramitha.wijethunga@undp.org	12/19/2022 8:33:00 AM

10. Is project's governance mechanism (i.e., the project board or equivalent) functioning as intended?

○ 3: The project's governance mechanism is operating well, and is a model for other projects. It has met in the agreed frequency stated in the project document and the minutes of the meetings are on file. There is regular (at least annual) progress reporting to the project board or equivalent on results, risks and opportunities. It is clear that the project board explicitly reviews and uses evidence, including progress data, knowledge, lessons and evaluations, as the basis for informing management decisions (e.g., change in strategy, approach, work plan.) (all must be true to select this option)

◉ *2: The project's governance mechanism has met in the agreed frequency and the minutes of the meeting are on file. A project progress report has been submitted to the project board or equivalent at least once in the past year, covering results, risks and opportunities. (both must be true to select this option)*

○ 1: The project's governance mechanism has not met in the frequency stated in the project document over the past year and/or the project board or equivalent is not functioning as a decision-making body for the project as intended.

Evidence:

Two project board meetings have been conducted, an average of one per year. However, the project is planning to conduct a minimum of 2 project board meetings per year. The project board is called as National Steering Committee Meeting of the Managing Together Project. The NSC is approving the annual work plan and reviews the progress of the project. Major decisions which are beyond the authority of the Project Director will be tabled in the NSC and seek approvals or guidance. The NSC comprised the Secretary of the Ministry of Environment, the Officer in Charge of UNDP, the Officer in Charge of IUCN, senior officers of the key invited government agencies, and the project staff.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	MinutesoftheInauguralPSCMeetingofGEF6MTProject-Final_14969_210 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MinutesoftheInauguralPSCMeetingofGEF6MTProject-Final_14969_210.docx)	ramitha.wijethunga@undp.org	12/19/2022 8:38:00 AM
2	MinutesoftheNSCMeeting2ofGEF6MTProject_08032022_14969_210 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MinutesoftheNSCMeeting2ofGEF6MTProject_08032022_14969_210.docx)	ramitha.wijethunga@undp.org	12/19/2022 8:38:00 AM

11. Are risks to the project adequately monitored and managed?

○ 3: The project has actively monitored risks every quarter including consulting with key stakeholders, including security advisors, to identify continuing and emerging risks and to assess if the main assumptions remain valid. There is clear evidence that relevant management plans and mitigating measures are being fully implemented to address each key project risk, and have been updated to reflect the latest risk assessment. (all must be true)

◉ *2: The project has monitored risks every year, as evidenced by an updated risk log. Some updates have been made to management plans and mitigation measures.*

○ 1: The risk log has not been updated as required. There may be some evidence that the project has monitored risks (including security risks or incidents) that may affect the project's achievement of results, but there is no explicit evidence that management actions have been taken to mitigate risks. In the case of a deteriorating security environment, no consultation has occurred with the UNDP Security Office on appropriate measures.

Evidence:

The project was categorized as a high-risk project at the project approval stage. Therefore, UNDP is regularly monitoring the status of the risks and updates the risk log with the participation of the project partners and project team. In 2022, one of the high-risk conditions of the project which is related to the potential involuntary resettlement of the project communities due to the establishment of elephant corridors, have been reviewed. An internal NTF has been drafted mentioning that there is no evidence for this risk and suggested either remove from the risk log or review the rating of the risk level.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	NTF-MTPSESPwork_14969_211 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/NTF-MTPSESPwork_14969_211.pdf)	ramitha.wijethunga@undp.org	12/27/2022 6:15:00 AM

Efficient   **Quality Rating: Needs Improvement**

12. Adequate resources have been mobilized to achieve intended results. If not, management decisions were taken to adjust expected results in the project's results framework.

- ◉ *Yes*
- ○ No

Evidence:

At the beginning of the project implementation, the inception workshop has been conducted. As suggested by the stakeholders and project partners, slight changes have been done for the results framework. As a whole, the project has adequate resources to complete all the interventions within the agreed time period.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Annex13-UpdatedResultsFramework_14969_212 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Annex13-UpdatedResultsFramework_14969_212.pdf)	ramitha.wijethunga@undp.org	12/27/2022 6:18:00 AM
2	PIMS5804_ManagingTogether_Prodoc_6Dec2019_4thRe-submission_21Jan2020_14969_212 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PIMS5804_ManagingTogether_Prodoc_6Dec2019_4thRe-submission_21Jan2020_14969_212.docx)	ramitha.wijethunga@undp.org	12/27/2022 6:20:00 AM

13. Are project inputs procured and delivered on time to efficiently contribute to results?

○ 3: The project has an updated procurement plan. Implementation of the plan is on or ahead of schedule. The project quarterly reviews operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addresses them through appropriate management actions. (all must be true)

○ 2: The project has an updated procurement plan. The project annually reviews operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addresses them through appropriate management actions. (all must be true)

◉ *1: The project does not have an updated procurement plan. The project may or may not have reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner, however management actions have not been taken to address them.*

Evidence:

The project developed quarterly procurement plans especially to submit to the UNDP when requesting cash advances from the implementing partner. However, since there were significant implementation delays from the 2nd quarter of 2022, including procurement delays, regular updates on the procurement plan were being prepared and were followed up on by senior management.

Despite these measures, the cumulative project progress is still around 10% of the total budget (after two years of project implementation), which shows the lack of proper planning and addressing of the issues by the main implementing partner and the responsible party hired to support the project implementation.

Management Response:

1. Request the main implementing partner (Ministry of Environment) and the Responsible Party (IUCN) to develop a procurement plan and update it with actions needed to achieve the full delivery.
2. UNDP to highlight the importance of effective delivery of the outputs according to the agreed timeline including implementation of the procurement plan at the Project Board Meeting

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Procurementupdateasat24.11.2022_14969_213 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Procurementupdateasat24.11.2022_14969_213.xlsx)	ramitha.wijethunga@undp.org	12/27/2022 6:22:00 AM
2	CopyofIUCNProcurementupdateasat07.09.2022_14969_213 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CopyofIUCNProcurementupdateasat07.09.2022_14969_213.xlsx)	ramitha.wijethunga@undp.org	12/27/2022 6:25:00 AM

14. Is there regular monitoring and recording of cost efficiencies taking into account the expected quality of results?

○ 3: There is evidence that the project regularly reviews costs against relevant comparators (e.g., other projects or country offices) or industry benchmarks to ensure the project maximizes results that can be delivered with given resources. The project actively coordinates with other relevant ongoing projects and initiatives (UNDP or other) to ensure complementarity and seek efficiencies wherever possible (e.g. joint activities.) (both must be true)

○ 2: The project monitors its own costs and gives anecdotal examples of cost efficiencies (e.g., spending less to get the same result,) but there is no systematic analysis of costs and no link to the expected quality of results delivered. The project coordinates activities with other projects to achieve cost efficiency gains.

◉ *1: There is little or no evidence that the project monitors its own costs and is considering ways to save money beyond following standard procurement rules.*

Evidence:

As a result of movement restrictions in 2021 especially due to the measures taken by the government to control the covid-19 spread, the project used and adapted online platforms for planning and progress reviewing and also conducted some training using online platforms. This resulted in saving the project cost allocated for activities. It is expected to utilize this allocation for more community and ground-level work. Due to the price level increase caused by inflation in Sri Lanka in 2022, the price of project-related cost items increased significantly. Therefore, management agreed to review the benefits and alternative options for those high-cost items. For example, due to the high price level of micro irrigation systems, the project has done a scoping review and identified feasible number of systems required. The field missions have found no evidence for collaboration with other projects operating in the region or on the same subject. Project has completed some procurement activities such as hiring IUCN own staff for project related assessments without prior approval from the Implementing Partner or UNDP.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	BTOR-MTMonitoringmission2022Q4_14969_214 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/BTOR-MTMonitoringmission2022Q4_14969_214.doc)	ramitha.wijethunga@undp.org	12/27/2022 6:34:00 AM

Effective   **Quality Rating: Needs Improvement**

15. Is the project is on track to deliver its expected outputs?

- ○ Yes
- ◉ *No*

Evidence:

It is very clear that the project is off-track and will be unable to achieve the expected outputs (even by end of 2022, after two years of project operation, cumulative project progress is around 24% of the total). UNDP Senior Management started having discussions with the IUCN Senior Management to emphasize the importance of expediting work. Still the progress is at sub optima levels.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	MeetingwithUNDPandIUCN-Minutes-04.10.2022_14969_215 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MeetingwithUNDPandIUCN-Minutes-04.10.2022_14969_215.docx)	ramitha.wijethunga@undp.org	12/27/2022 6:39:00 AM
2	MeetingwithUNDPandIUCN-Minutes-Final_14969_215 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MeetingwithUNDPandIUCN-Minutes-Final_14969_215.pdf)	ramitha.wijethunga@undp.org	12/27/2022 6:40:00 AM
3	MinutesoftheMeetingBetweenUNDPandIUCNSeniorManagementonIUCNGEF6Delivery-Final_14969_215 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MinutesoftheMeetingBetweenUNDPandIUCNSeniorManagementonIUCNGEF6Delivery-Final_14969_215.docx)	ramitha.wijethunga@undp.org	12/27/2022 6:40:00 AM

---

16. Have there been regular reviews of the work plan to ensure that the project is on track to achieve the desired results, and to inform course corrections if needed?

○ 3: Quarterly progress data has informed regular reviews of the project work plan to ensure that the activities implemented are most likely to achieve the desired results. There is evidence that data and lessons learned (including from evaluations and/or After Action Reviews) have been used to inform course corrections, as needed. Any necessary budget revisions have been made. (both must be true)

◉ *2: There has been at least one review of the work plan per year to assess if project activities are on track to achieving the desired development results (i.e., outputs.) There may or may not be evidence that data or lessons learned has been used to inform the review(s). Any necessary budget revisions have been made.*

○ 1: While the project team may have reviewed the work plan at least once over the past year to ensure outputs are delivered on time, no link has been made to the delivery of desired development results. Select this option also if no review of the work plan by management has taken place over the past year.

Evidence:

The progress against the work plan is measured by multiple progress review meetings. Some of the me etings are fully dedicated to capturing the progress o f the project and some meetings are conducted to m easure the progress of the overall institutional level.

The following are some progress review meetings h eld by the project.
1. Monthly progress meeting led by the project direct or. Entire project staff representatives from the three key agencies are participating in this meeting.
2. National steering committee which is the supreme decision-making platform gathers bi-annually to appr ove the work plan and review the progress.
3. The senior management of the ministry of an envi ronment comprising the honorable minister, secretar y of the ministry, and directors of the ministry are gat hering weekly under the facilitation of the Director G eneral planning division to review the progress of th e ministry-implemented projects. The Managing Tog ether project is being considered the largest donor-f unded project of the ministry project portfolio of 202 2.
4. UNDP and IUCN Senior Management have regul ar meetings to monitor the progress and identify me chanisms to expedite the project progress since Ma y 2022
Unfortunately, the project teams have not been able to expedite the project progress despite having moni toring meetings regularly and project team was advi sed to accelerate the project implementation.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	ManagingTogetherAugust2908_14969_216 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ManagingTogetherAugust2908_14969_216.pptx)	ramitha.wijethunga@undp.org	12/27/2022 6:45:00 AM
2	MeetingwithUNDPandIUCN-Minutes-Final_14969_216 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MeetingwithUNDPandIUCN-Minutes-Final_14969_216.pdf)	ramitha.wijethunga@undp.org	12/27/2022 6:44:00 AM
3	MinutesoftheMeetingBetweenUNDPandIUCNSeniorManagementonIUCNGEF6Delivery-Final_14969_216 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MinutesoftheMeetingBetweenUNDPandIUCNSeniorManagementonIUCNGEF6Delivery-Final_14969_216.docx)	ramitha.wijethunga@undp.org	12/27/2022 6:44:00 AM
4	2022.10.31MTprogress.pptx-Oct4thweek_14969_216 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2022.10.31MTprogress.pptx-Oct4thweek_14969_216.pptx)	ramitha.wijethunga@undp.org	12/27/2022 6:44:00 AM
5	Secretarymeeting-Oct17toBDS14102022_14969_216 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Secretarymeeting-Oct17toBDS14102022_14969_216.pptx)	ramitha.wijethunga@undp.org	12/27/2022 6:45:00 AM

17. Are targeted groups being systematically identified and engaged, prioritizing the marginalized and excluded, to ensure results are achieved as expected?

○ 3: The project is targeting specific groups and/or geographic areas, identified by using credible data sources on their capacity needs, deprivation and/or exclusion from development opportunities relevant to the project's area of work. There is clear evidence that the targeted groups are being reached as intended. The project has engaged regularly with targeted groups over the past year to assess whether they are benefiting as expected and adjustments were made if necessary to refine targeting. (all must be true)

○ 2: The project is targeting specific groups and/or geographic areas, based on some evidence of their capacity needs, deprivation and/or exclusion from development opportunities relevant to the project's area of work. Some evidence is provided to confirm that project beneficiaries are members of the targeted groups. There has been some engagement with beneficiaries in the past year to assess whether they are benefiting as expected. (all must be true)

◉ *1: The project does not report on specific targeted groups. There is no evidence to confirm that project beneficiaries are deprived and/or excluded from development opportunities relevant to the project area of work. There may have been some engagement with beneficiaries to assess whether they are benefiting as expected, but it has been limited or has not occurred in the past year.*

○ Not Applicable

Evidence:

In order to implement the activities at the ground level, especially with the communities and grass root level organizations, it was essential to select beneficiaries who are living in the identified project landscape. In order to facilitate the selection of beneficiaries, beneficiary selection criteria have been developed in consultation with the administrative authorities at the Divisional and village level and obtained approval from the administrative authorities.

In 2022, the selection of beneficiaries only in 2 clusters (Mahakanadarawa and Thanthirimale clusters) have been completed. While the selection of beneficiaries in other clusters is being carried out, the project has moved with the agriculture sector interventions engage in the communities that have been selected for the two clusters mentioned previously. So, there is no evidence for a uniform and agreeable beneficiary selection criterion applicable for the whole project. Further there is no proper Grievance Redress Mechanism in place. Therefore, it's not possible to determine the degree of engagement the project had with the beneficiaries.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	BeneficiaryLocations_14969_217 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/BeneficiaryLocations_14969_217.pptx)	ramitha.wijethunga@undp.org	12/27/2022 6:57:00 AM
2	CopyofSelectionCriteriaFormat_14969_217 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CopyofSelectionCriteriaFormat_14969_217.xlsx)	ramitha.wijethunga@undp.org	12/27/2022 6:57:00 AM
3	BTOR-MTMonitoringmission2022Q4_14969_217 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/BTOR-MTMonitoringmission2022Q4_14969_217.doc)	ramitha.wijethunga@undp.org	12/27/2022 6:58:00 AM

Sustainability & National Ownership   **Quality Rating: Needs Improvement**

18. Are stakeholders and national partners fully engaged in the decision-making, implementation and monitoring of the project?

○ 3: Only national systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) are used to fully implement and monitor the project. All relevant stakeholders and partners are fully and actively engaged in the process, playing a lead role in project decision-making, implementation and monitoring. (both must be true)

○ 2: National systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) are used to implement and monitor the project, but other support (such as country office support or project systems) may also be used if necessary. All relevant stakeholders and partners are fully and actively engaged in the process, playing an active role in project decision-making, implementation and monitoring. (both must be true)

◉ *1: There is relatively limited or no engagement with national stakeholders and partners in the decision-making, implementation and/or monitoring of the project.*

○ Not Applicable

Evidence:

The project has engaged district and divisional level stakeholders related to agriculture development to a significant level. But it needs improvement at the national and provincial level. Further the project has not been able to effectively engage with the national level stakeholders related to tourism, and forestry. The project has not shared adequate evidence on its engagement with the national stakeholders who could play a key role in the project designing, implementation and monitoring.

Management Response:

1. Request the main implementing partner (Ministry of Environment) and the Responsible Party (IUCN) to develop a clear, effective stakeholder consultation mechanism and ensure that the plan will be effectively implemented. MoE and IUCN will be requested to share the progress on stakeholder engagement with the Project Board and in PIR 2023.

2. UNDP to highlight the importance of the stakeholder consultation/ partnership development mechanism at the Project Board Meetings.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	BTOR-MTMonitoringmission2022Q4_14969_218 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/BTOR-MTMonitoringmission2022Q4_14969_218.doc)	ramitha.wijethunga@undp.org	12/27/2022 6:59:00 AM

19. There is regular monitoring of changes in capacities and performance of institutions and systems relevant to the project, as needed. The implementation arrangements[5] have been adjusted according to changes in partner capacities.

○ 3: In the past two years, changes in capacities and performance of institutions and systems have been comprehensively assessed/monitored using clear indicators, rigorous methods of data collection and credible data sources including relevant HACT assurance activities. Implementation arrangements have been formally reviewed and adjusted, if needed, in agreement with partners according to changes in partner capacities. (both must be true)

◉ *2: In the past two years, aspects of changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems have been monitored by the project using indicators and reasonably credible data sources including relevant HACT assurance activities. Some adjustment has been made to implementation arrangements if needed to reflect changes in partner capacities. (both must be true)*

○ 1: Some aspects of changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems may have been monitored by the project, however changes to implementation arrangements have not been considered. Also select this option if changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems have not been monitored by the project.

○ Not Applicable

Evidence:

> Due to the limitations experienced by the government in implementation of the project activities, IUCN has been requested to increase the number of activities its responsible for implementation. There were no capacity assessments of the Ministry of Environment or IUCN within last two years but required actions have been taken to assess the capacities and improve implementation arrangements such as conducting financial spot checks.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	CopyofCopyofGEFVIBudget-07.03.2022_14969_219 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CopyofCopyofGEFVIBudget-07.03.2022_14969_219.xlsx)	ramitha.wijethunga@undp.org	12/27/2022 7:03:00 AM
2	Q3IUCNWorkplan_14969_219 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Q3IUCNWorkplan_14969_219.pdf)	ramitha.wijethunga@undp.org	12/27/2022 7:04:00 AM
3	Q3MoEWorkplan_14969_219 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Q3MoEWorkplan_14969_219.pdf)	ramitha.wijethunga@undp.org	12/27/2022 7:04:00 AM
4	Q4IUCNWorkplan_14969_219 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Q4IUCNWorkplan_14969_219.pdf)	ramitha.wijethunga@undp.org	12/27/2022 7:04:00 AM

20. The transition and phase-out arrangements are reviewed regularly and adjusted according to progress (including financial commitments and capacity).

○ 3: The project's governance mechanism has reviewed the project's sustainability plan, including arrangements for transition and phase-out, to ensure the project is on track in meeting the requirements set out by the plan. The plan has been adjusted according to progress as needed. (both must be true)

○ 2: There has been a review of the project's sustainability plan, including arrangements for transition and phase-out, to ensure the project is on track in meeting the requirements set out by the plan.

◉ *1: The project may have a sustainability plan, but there has not been a review of this strategy since it was developed. Also select this option if the project does not have a sustainability strategy.*

Evidence:

The project is experiencing significant delays in implementation of activities and reaching the outputs. The Project Board has never discussed about the sustainability plans / phase out plans.

Management Response:

The project is experiencing significant delays in implementation of activities and reaching the outputs. The Project Board has never discussed about the sustainability plans / phase out plans.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	MinutesoftheNSCMeeting2ofGEF6MTProject _08032022_14969_220 (https://intranet.und p.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Mi nutesoftheNSCMeeting2ofGEF6MTProject_0 8032022_14969_220.docx)	ramitha.wijethunga@undp.org	12/27/2022 7:06:00 AM
2	BTOR-MTMonitoringmission2022Q4_14969_ 220 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQ A/QAFormDocuments/BTOR-MTMonitoring mission2022Q4_14969_220.doc)	ramitha.wijethunga@undp.org	12/27/2022 7:06:00 AM

QA Summary/Project Board Comments

This project is in the second year of implementation. whilst the project has attained some progress in agriculture related ground level work and some initiatives related to knowledge management. But it needs significant improvements in overall strategic development plan formulation, forestry and tourism sector interventions. Further attention requires in updating/ formulating and implementing gender, field monitoring, sustainability and communication related action plans. The project's cumulative delivery is well below target - at around 24%. This project has been classified under the Environment and Social safeguards standards. However, an Environmental and Social Management Plan is yet to be developed. A properly functioning grievance mechanism and stakeholder engagement plan do not exist. The project has already commenced a midterm evaluation. UNDP awaits the findings of this evaluation to put in place measures to bring the project back on track.