Design & Appraisal Stage Quality Assurance Report

Form Status: Approved

Overall Rating:	Exemplary
Decision:	Approve: The project is of sufficient quality to continue as planned. Any management actions must be addressed in a timely manner.
Portfolio/Project Number:	00126230
Portfolio/Project Title:	Integrated management of production landscapes to delive
Portfolio/Project Date:	2022-02-01 / 2027-01-31

Strategic **Quality Rating: Exemplary**

1. Does the project specify how it will contribute to higher level change through linkage to the programme's Theory of Change?

- (●) *3: The project is clearly linked to the programme's theory of change. It has an explicit change pathway that explains how the project will contribute to outcome level change and why the project's strategy will likely lead to this change. This analysis is backed by credible evidence of what works effectively in this context and includes assumptions and risks.*
- ( ) 2: The project is clearly linked to the programme's theory of change. It has a change pathway that explains how the project will contribute to outcome-level change and why the project strategy will likely lead to this change.
- ( ) 1: The project document may describe in generic terms how the project will contribute to development results, without an explicit link to the programme's theory of change.

Evidence:

The project has a clearly defined theory of change s upported by credible evidence. The project´s Theor y of Change is grounded in the principles of integrat ed management of land and water resources in Beli ze. It highlights the importance of an integrated appr oach to management when working within productio n landscapes. Traditional programme investments fo cus on resource management within Belize's PA ma nagement. The expanded scope of this project allow s for the management of human environment interfa ces allowing the country to be better able to mainstr eam biodiversity conservation and sustainable land/ water management into production landscapes, sup porting sustainable economic development.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	TheoryofChange_GEF6_12432_101 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/TheoryofChange_GEF6_12432_101.pdf)	ismirla.andrade@undp.org	3/10/2022 6:22:00 PM

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

- *3: The project responds to at least one of the development settings as specified in the Strategic Plan[1] and adapts at least one Signature Solution[2]. The project's RRF includes all the relevant SP output indicators. (all must be true)*
- 2: The project responds to at least one of the development settings as specified in the Strategic Plan[4]. The project's RRF includes at least one SP output indicator, if relevant. (both must be true)
- 1: The project responds to a partner's identified need, but this need falls outside of 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 development settings found within UNDP strategic Plan direction (Accelerating st ructural transformation fir sustinable Development) a s well as adopted the use of UNDP signature solutio n- Promoting nature-based solutions for a sustainabl e planet. The Project also contributes to the strengt hening of effective, inclusive and accountable gover nance by strengthening the governance architecture for resource management.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

3. Is the project linked to the programme outputs? (i.e., UNDAF Results Group Workplan/CPD, RPD or Strategic Plan IRRF for global projects/strategic interventions not part of a programme)

- (●) *Yes*
- ( ) No

Evidence:

The project is linked to the Country Programme Doc ument for Belize (2022- 2026), MSDCF Outcome 6: Caribbean countries manage natural resources and ecosystems strengthening their resilience and enha ncing the resilience and prosperity of the people and communities that depend on them. STRATEGIC PL AN OUTCOME: 1. Structural transformation acceler ated, particularly green, inclusive and digital transitio ns.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	UNDP-RBLAC-BLZCPD2022-2026-EN_12432_103 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/UNDP-RBLAC-BLZCPD2022-2026-EN_12432_103.pdf)	ismirla.andrade@undp.org	3/10/2022 6:39:00 PM

Relevant **Quality Rating: Exemplary**

4. Do the project target groups leave furthest behind?

- (●) *3: The target groups are clearly specified, prioritising discriminated, and marginalized groups left furthest behind, identified through a rigorous process based on evidence.*
- ( ) 2: The target groups are clearly specified, prioritizing groups left furthest behind.
- ( ) 1: The target groups are not clearly specified.

Evidence:

Reference the PRODOC. A stakeholder analysis was carried out to identify the key stakeholders for the project based on their respective interests and power positions vis-a vis their communities, production capacities, governance structure, academic focus, public mandates or national policy directives. This analysis established the stakeholder's power/importance, is defined as the participants degree of influence as well as the actions that they can undertake with directly or indirect influence the outcomes of the project. It further provided the foundation for engagement with persons, groups or entities such as the communities, farmers groups, professional bodies, academia and other agricultural producers in the BRW to aid in the identification of project beneficiaries, in the private sector, and those at the non-governmental and community organization levels, the analysis prioritized farmers, and ranchers in the BRW. The stakeholder analysis subsequently provides a detailed list of both types of stakeholders - collective stakeholders as well as individual stakeholders.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	PIMS6015Belize_ProDocOctober62021MLL_12432_104 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PIMS6015Belize_ProDocOctober62021MLL_12432_104.docx)	ismirla.andrade@undp.org	3/10/2022 8:23:00 PM

5. Have knowledge, good practices, and past lessons learned of UNDP and others informed the project design?

- (●) *3: Knowledge and lessons learned backed by credible evidence from sources such as evaluation, corporate policies/strategies, and/or monitoring have been explicitly used, with appropriate referencing, to justify the approach used by the project.*
- ( ) 2: The project design mentions knowledge and lessons learned backed by evidence/sources but have not been used to justify the approach selected.
- ( ) 1: There is little, or no mention of knowledge and lessons learned informing the project design. Any references made are anecdotal and not backed by evidence.

Evidence:

Project development and design included analysis of ongoing and past interventions identifying the best practices and approaches. Lessons in vertical fund programming have been incorporated in project design. A key example of this is the piloting of decentralized project governance for efficiency. This implementation model have been cited as a recommendation within past projects.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

6. Does UNDP have a clear advantage to engage in the role envisioned by the project vis-à-vis national / regional / global partners and other actors?

- *3: An analysis has been conducted on the role of other partners in the area where the project intends to work, and credible evidence supports the proposed engagement of UNDP and partners through the project, including identification of potential funding partners. It is clear how results achieved by partners will complement the project's intended results and a communication strategy is in place to communicate results and raise visibility vis-à-vis key partners. Options for south-south and triangular cooperation have been considered, as appropriate. (all must be true)*
- 2: Some analysis has been conducted on the role of other partners in the area where the project intends to work, and relatively limited evidence supports the proposed engagement of and division of labour between UNDP and partners through the project, with unclear funding and communications strategies or plans.
- 1: No clear analysis has been conducted on the role of other partners in the area that the project intends to work. There is risk that the project overlaps and/or does not coordinate with partners' interventions in this area. Options for south-south and triangular cooperation have not been considered, despite its potential relevance.

Evidence:

UNDP within the context of this project serves as G EF IA and provides technical backstopping to project implementation. The UNDP Country Office has long since been considered a GEF IA of choice for the co untry of Belize. This is based on UNDP's long standi ng relationship with the Government of Belize as wel l as UNDP's significant accrued experience and kno wledge of natural resource management within the c ountry's context. UNDP also undertook some structu ral changes to increase its transparency and efficien cy as a vertical fund IA.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Principled **Quality Rating: Exemplary**

7. Does the project apply a human rights-based approach?

- *3: The project is guided by human rights and incorporates the principles of accountability, meaningful participation, and non-discrimination in the project's strategy. The project upholds the relevant international and national laws and standards. Any potential adverse impacts on enjoyment of human rights were rigorously identified and assessed as relevant, with appropriate mitigation and management measures incorporated into project design and budget. (all must be true)*
- 2: The project is guided by human rights by prioritizing accountability, meaningful participation and non-discrimination. Potential adverse impacts on enjoyment of human rights were identified and assessed as relevant, and appropriate mitigation and management measures incorporated into the project design and budget. (both must be true)
- 1: No evidence that the project is guided by human rights. Limited or no evidence that potential adverse impacts on enjoyment of human rights were considered.

Evidence:

The project is guided by a human right based approach in programming and development. The project directly empowers right holders in the persons of farmers, owners of production lands, and communities so that they are the principal facilitators and decision makers for the mainstreaming of biodiversity conservation and sustainable land management (SLM) objectives in the production landscapes which they inhabit in the BRW. In addition, the project provides for the equal allocation and disbursement of monetary and non-monetary benefits to all stakeholders. The project has created and strengthens multiple spaces and opportunities - governance mechanisms, gender integration and technical assistance, and project monitoring - that increase stakeholder participation and decision-making throughout its implementation.

Planned state and community-led measures are expected to contribute to delivery multiple global environmental benefits and are reflective of framework principles on human rights and the environment; as the project is designed to be inclusive and features prominently local peoples in ensuring a safe, clean healthy and sustainable environment which offers communities protection from environmental harm and supports that they fairly and equitably share the benefits realized from the resources.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

8. Does the project use gender analysis in the project design?

- (●) *3: A participatory gender analysis has been conducted and results from this gender analysis inform the development challenge, strategy and expected results sections of the project document. Outputs and indicators of the results framework include explicit references to gender equality, and specific indicators measure and monitor results to ensure women are fully benefitting from the project. (all must be true)*
- ( ) 2: A basic gender analysis has been carried out and results from this analysis are scattered (i.e., fragmented and not consistent) across the development challenge and strategy sections of the project document. The results framework may include some gender sensitive outputs and/or activities but gender inequalities are not consistently integrated across each output. (all must be true)
- ( ) 1: The project design may or may not mention information and/or data on the differential impact of the project's development situation on gender relations, women and men, but the gender inequalities have not been clearly identified and reflected in the project document.

Evidence:

The project conducted a full gender analysis, informi ng project development activities. This gender analy sis was utilized by project development experts to el aborated a Gender Action Plan which is to be utilize d as a guide to ensure gender inclusion/ considerati ons in activity/ workpackage design and implementa tion.

It should be noted that this project represents on of t he first E&E portfolio initiatives which includes in its budgeting support to capacities for the monitoring of advances against the gender action plan and ensuri ng gender targets are met.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	FinalGenderAnalysis11.30.2018_WTABLES_12432_108 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FinalGenderAnalysis11.30.2018_WTABLES_12432_108.pdf)	ismirla.andrade@undp.org	3/10/2022 10:29:00 PM

9. Did the project support the resilience and sustainability of societies and/or ecosystems?

- (●) *3: Credible evidence that the project addresses sustainability and resilience dimensions of development challenges, which are integrated in the project strategy and design. The project reflects the interconnections between the social, economic and environmental dimensions of sustainable development. Relevant shocks, hazards and adverse social and environmental impacts have been identified and rigorously assessed with appropriate management and mitigation measures incorporated into project design and budget. (all must be true)*
- ( ) 2: The project design integrates sustainability and resilience dimensions of development challenges. Relevant shocks, hazards and adverse social and environmental impacts have been identified and assessed, and relevant management and mitigation measures incorporated into project design and budget. (both must be true)
- ( ) 1: Sustainability and resilience dimensions and impacts were not adequately considered.

Evidence:

The Project supports resilience building actions in re sponse to climate change and SLM considerations. Targeting of small farmers and community groups a s beneficiaries contribute to economic resilience buil ding for Belize's rural populations.
Based on the finding of the Social and Environment al Screening Procedure (SESP), the project has bee n assessed as “moderate” risk. The project activitie s are designed ensuring minimal or no risks of adver se social or environmental impacts. The risk assess ment and risk mitigation measures considered durin g the final project design, includes the adoption of pr oject approaches which allows for greater localizatio n of programmed actions i.e. greater involvement of communities in introduced sustainable production an d conservation features and watershed managemen t arrangements. Risks are fully incorporated into UN DP’s Risk Log and risk monitoring mechanisms and dedicated project personnel will be assigned to moni tor and manage associated safeguards.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	PIMS6015BelizeBDProdlandsAnnexESESP_12432_109 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PIMS6015BelizeBDProdlandsAnnexESESP_12432_109.pdf)	ismirla.andrade@undp.org	3/10/2022 10:39:00 PM

10. Has the Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) been conducted to identify potential social and environmental impacts and risks? The SESP is not required for projects in which UNDP is Administrative Agent only and/or projects comprised solely of reports, coordination of events, trainings, workshops, meetings, conferences and/or communication materials and information dissemination. [if yes, upload the completed checklist. If SESP is not required, provide the reason for the exemption in the evidence section.]

- (●) *Yes*
- ( ) No
- ( ) SESP not required because project consists solely of (Select all exemption criteria that apply)
  - [ ] 1: Preparation and dissemination of reports, documents and communication materials
  - [ ] 2: Organization of an event, workshop, training
  - [ ] 3: Strengthening capacities of partners to participate in international negotiations and conferences
  - [ ] 4: Partnership coordination (including UN coordination) and management of networks
  - [ ] 5: Global/regional projects with no country-level activities(e.g.activities such as knowledge management, inter-governmental processes)
  - [ ] 6: UNDP serves as Administrative Agent
  - [ ] 7: Development Effectiveness projects and Institutional Effectiveness projects

Evidence:

The project conducted a detailed SESP, the SESP development was highly consultative with the result being a rating of moderate risk. The project activities are designed ensuring minimal or no risks of adverse social or environmental impacts. The risk assessment and risk mitigation measures considered during the final project design, includes the adoption of project approaches which allows for greater localization of programmed actions i.e. greater involvement of communities in introduced sustainable production and conservation features and watershed management arrangements. Risks are fully incorporated into UNDP's Risk Log and risk monitoring mechanisms and dedicated project personnel will be assigned to monitor and manage associated safeguards.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Risk Category	Risk Requirements	Document Status	Modified By	Modified On

1	PIMS 6015 Belize BDProdlandsAnnexESESP_12432_110 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAForm Documents/PIMS6015BelizeBDProdlandsAnnexESESP_12432_110.pdf)	Moderate	Human Rights; Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment; Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Natural Resource Management; Climate Change and Disaster Risks; Displacement and Resettlement; Indigenous Peoples; Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency	Draft	ismirla.andrade@undp.org	3/10/2022 10:49:00 PM

Management & Monitoring **Quality Rating: Exemplary**

11. Does the project have a strong results framework?

- ◉ *3: The project's selection of outputs and activities are at an appropriate level. Outputs are accompanied by SMART, results-oriented indicators that measure the key expected development changes, each with credible data sources and populated baselines and targets, including gender sensitive, target group focused, sex-disaggregated indicators where appropriate. (all must be true)*
- ○ 2: The project's selection of outputs and activities are at an appropriate level. Outputs are accompanied by SMART, results-oriented indicators, but baselines, targets and data sources may not yet be fully specified. Some use of target group focused, sex-disaggregated indicators, as appropriate. (all must be true)
- ○ 1: The project's selection of outputs and activities are not at an appropriate level; outputs are not accompanied by SMART, results-oriented indicators that measure the expected change and have not been populated with baselines and targets; data sources are not specified, and/or no gender sensitive, sex-disaggregation of indicators. (if any is true)

Evidence:

Project results framework was developed through a highly consultative process involving national counte rparts/ stakeholders. Once developed the framework was validated with the assistance of national experts who participated in a national validation session. Th e Project RRF also benefited from internal UNDP pe er review processes. Final RRF can be found within the finalized ProDoc.

Review by national counterparts, the involvement of UNDP M&E personnel at the CO and RBLAC level e nsure the application of SMART results oriented indi cators. To the extent possible indicators are disaggr egated allowing for the tracking of gendered results and to provide greater depth to result analysis.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	PRFAgenda_12432_111 (https://intranet.und p.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/P RFAgenda_12432_111.pdf)	ismirla.andrade@undp.org	3/10/2022 10:54:00 PM
2	SignaturePageprfworkshop_12432_111 (http s://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFor mDocuments/SignaturePageprfworkshop_12 432_111.pdf)	ismirla.andrade@undp.org	3/10/2022 10:55:00 PM

12. Is the project's governance mechanism clearly defined in the project document, including composition of the project board?

- *3: The project's governance mechanism is fully defined. Individuals have been specified for each position in the governance mechanism (especially all members of the project board.) Project Board members have agreed on their roles and responsibilities as specified in the terms of reference. The ToR of the project board has been attached to the project document. (all must be true)*
- 2: The project's governance mechanism is defined; specific institutions are noted as holding key governance roles, but individuals may not have been specified yet. The project document lists the most important responsibilities of the project board, project director/manager and quality assurance roles. (all must be true)
- 1: The project's governance mechanism is loosely defined in the project document, only mentioning key roles that will need to be filled at a later date. No information on the responsibilities of key positions in the governance mechanism is provided.

Evidence:

Reference the PRODOC. The Governance and Management Arrangements highlights the project organizational structure. The project governance mechanism is consistent with Nationally Implemented Projects, with project board members selected to represent beneficiaries as well as expert groups in line with priority stakeholders of interest.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

13. Have the project risks been identified with clear plans stated to manage and mitigate each risk?

- *3: Project risks related to the achievement of results are fully described in the project risk log, based on comprehensive analysis drawing on the programme's theory of change, Social and Environmental Standards and screening, situation analysis, capacity assessments and other analysis such as funding potential and reputational risk. Risks have been identified through a consultative process with key internal and external stakeholders, including consultation with the UNDP Security Office as required. Clear and complete plan in place to manage and mitigate each risk, including security risks, reflected in project budgeting and monitoring plans. (both must be true)*
- 2: Project risks related to the achievement of results are identified in the initial project risk log based on a minimum level of analysis and consultation, with mitigation measures identified for each risk.
- 1: Some risks may be identified in the initial project risk log, but no evidence of consultation or analysis and no clear risk mitigation measures identified. This option is also selected if risks are not clearly identified, no initial risk log is included with the project document and/or no security risk management process has taken place for the project.

Evidence:

Reference the PRODOC - Annex H: UNDP Risk Log .

The risk log was informed by analysis carried out through the SESP application. Individual project components were also assessed as a means of identifying true risk to project success. A risk log captured significant risks identified in the SESP process and presents recommended management actions.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Efficient **Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory**

14. Have specific measures for ensuring cost-efficient use of resources been explicitly mentioned as part of the project design? This can include, for example:
i) Using the theory of change analysis to explore different options of achieving the maximum results with the resources available.
ii) Using a portfolio management approach to improve cost effectiveness through synergies with other interventions.
iii) Through joint operations (e.g., monitoring or procurement) with other partners.
iv) Sharing resources or coordinating delivery with other projects.
v) Using innovative approaches and technologies to reduce the cost of service delivery or other types of interventions.

- (●) *Yes*
- ( ) No

Evidence:

The project is expected to utilize a portfolio manage ment approach as a means of identifying synergies with other related national projects, and in so doing i dentifying and implementing efficiency measures. Li nking the project with the national portfolio allows for the sharing of project overhead costs as well as impr oves coordination and national buy-in of the initiativ e.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

15. Is the budget justified and supported with valid estimates?

- ◉ *3: The project's budget is at the activity level with funding sources, and is specified for the duration of the project period in a multi-year budget. Realistic resource mobilisation plans are in place to fill unfunded components. Costs are supported with valid estimates using benchmarks from similar projects or activities. Cost implications from inflation and foreign exchange exposure have been estimated and incorporated in the budget. Adequate costs for monitoring, evaluation, communications and security have been incorporated.*
- ○ 2: The project's budget is at the activity level with funding sources, when possible, and is specified for the duration of the project in a multi-year budget, but no funding plan is in place. Costs are supported with valid estimates based on prevailing rates.
- ○ 1: The project's budget is not specified at the activity level, and/or may not be captured in a multi-year budget.

Evidence:

At the time of project costing, project developers car ried out a detailed process of identifying associated project activities and the costing of these activities. Project activity budgets were also assessed in consi deration of co-financing obligations. Duration of the project was costed in a multi-year budget. Adequate costs for monitoring, evaluation, communications an d security have been incorporated.

REF PRODOC: Page 56 -XI. TOTAL BUDGET AN D WORK PLAN

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

16. Is the Country Office / Regional Hub / Global Project fully recovering the costs involved with project implementation?

- ○ 3: The budget fully covers all project costs that are attributable to the project, including programme management and development effectiveness services related to strategic country programme planning, quality assurance, pipeline development, policy advocacy services, finance, procurement, human resources, administration, issuance of contracts, security, travel, assets, general services, information and communications based on full costing in accordance with prevailing UNDP policies (i.e., UPL, LPL.)
- ◉ *2: The budget covers significant project costs that are attributable to the project based on prevailing UNDP policies (i.e., UPL, LPL) as relevant.*
- ○ 1: The budget does not adequately cover project costs that are attributable to the project, and UNDP is cross-subsidizing the project.

Evidence:

Considering new guidelines associated with GEF pr ojects, the project was developed to accommodate c osting based on prevailing UNDP policies.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Effective **Quality Rating: Exemplary**

17. Have targeted groups been engaged in the design of the project?

- (●) *3: Credible evidence that all targeted groups, prioritising discriminated and marginalized populations that will be involved in or affected by the project, have been actively engaged in the design of the project. The project has an explicit strategy to identify, engage and ensure the meaningful participation of target groups as stakeholders throughout the project, including through monitoring and decision-making (e.g., representation on the project board, inclusion in samples for evaluations, etc.)*
- ( ) 2: Some evidence that key targeted groups have been consulted in the design of the project.
- ( ) 1: No evidence of engagement with targeted groups during project design.
- ( ) Not Applicable

Evidence:

Project stakeholders have been actively engaged, a Stakeholder Engagement Plan guided both project d evelopment and is expected to guide project implem entation.

Reference PRODOC - Annex F: Stakeholder Engag ement Plan

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

18. Does the project plan for adaptation and course correction if regular monitoring activities, evaluation, and lesson learned demonstrate there are better approaches to achieve the intended results and/or circumstances change during implementation?

- (●) *Yes*
- ( ) No

Evidence:

Project, through End of Stage Reports and project s pot checks allows for the capture of project lessons and the early detection of project issues. These mec hanisms enables true adaptive implementation by th e project.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

19. The gender marker for all project outputs are scored at GEN2 or GEN3, indicating that gender has been fully mainstreamed into all project outputs at a minimum.

- (●) *Yes*
- ( ) No

Evidence:

The PRODOC was scored as a GEN 2. During the PPG, a gender analysis for the prioritized landscape and a detailed Gender Action Plan (included as Ann ex G in the PRODOC) were developed to ensure ge nder mainstreaming in the project; specific gender-b ased indicators will be used for monitoring and a ge nder specialist will be part of the Project Manageme nt Unit (PMU) to facilitate improvements to gender e quality and women's empowerment.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Sustainability & National Ownership **Quality Rating: Exemplary**

20. Have national / regional / global partners led, or proactively engaged in, the design of the project?

- (●) *3: National partners (or regional/global partners for regional and global projects) have full ownership of the project and led the process of the development of the project jointly with UNDP.*
- ( ) 2: The project has been developed by UNDP in close consultation with national / regional / global partners.
- ( ) 1: The project has been developed by UNDP with limited or no engagement with national partners.

Evidence:

The Project Development Process was led by the G overnment of Belize jointly with UNDP. Contents of t he project reflect very closely priority national workp ackages as are presented in national workplans and goals.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

21. Are key institutions and systems identified, and is there a strategy for strengthening specific / comprehensive capacities based on capacity assessments conducted?

- *3: The project has a strategy for strengthening specific capacities of national institutions and/or actors based on a completed capacity assessment. This strategy includes an approach to regularly monitor national capacities using clear indicators and rigorous methods of data collection, and adjust the strategy to strengthen national capacities accordingly.*
- 2: A capacity assessment has been completed. There are plans to develop a strategy to strengthen specific capacities of national institutions and/or actors based on the results of the capacity assessment.
- 1: Capacity assessments have not been carried out.
- Not Applicable

Evidence:

A capacity development plan was prepared to suppo rt the GEF IP. The Action plan is based on findings o f the microassessments applied to the IP.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

22. Is there is a clear strategy embedded in the project specifying how the project will use national systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluations, etc.,) to the extent possible?

- (●) *Yes*
- ( ) No
- ( ) Not Applicable

Evidence:

Reference the PRODOC, under the GOVERNANCE AND MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS and PROJECT MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS specify how the project will be implemented and use the national systems.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

23. Is there a clear transition arrangement / phase-out plan developed with key stakeholders in order to sustain or scale up results (including resource mobilisation and communications strategy)?

- (●) *Yes*
- ( ) No

Evidence:

Reference the PRODOC

The project supports the placement of key elements of programme sustainability, such as establishing co mmunity and national nurseries, as well as supportin g efforts to engage communities in decentralized eff orts for protection. Institutional sustainability will be achieved through the clarification of national govern ment agencies jurisdictions/mandates regarding wat er and watershed management and by promoting int er-agency cooperation and programming, which will lead to increased public and private investment to su pport sustainable production practices. Financial su stainability will be achieved by facilitating access to i ncentives and markets to small- and large-scale pro ducers who adopt environmentally friendly productio n practices. Additional income will be generated, an d productivity will be improved, thereby making it attr active for producers to continue using sustainable pr oduction practices beyond the life of the project.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

QA Summary/LPAC Comments

It is the Assessors findings that the project as was developed presents significant best practices in ensuring inclusiv e design and national ownership. The shift of works to addressing resource management in the production landscap es also provide the opportunity for innovation in implementation as well as supports opportunities for full localization of elements of the project at community levels. The project development process was extensive, with project develo pment informed fully by relevant technical and social analysis of the work area.