Design & Appraisal Stage Quality Assurance Report

Form Status: Approved

Overall Rating:	Highly Satisfactory
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:	00128336
Portfolio/Project Title:	BIH Biodiversity Protected Areas
Portfolio/Project Date:	2022-07-01 / 2027-06-30

Strategic	**Quality Rating:** **Highly Satisfactory**

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 Theory of Change, which is clearly li nked to higher level change essentially linked to the Outcome 1 of the Country Programme Document 20 21-2025: Outcome 1. By 2025, people benefit from r esilient, inclusive and sustainable growth ensured by the convergence of economic development, and ma nagement of environment and cultural resources. Fo r evidence, please refer to the uploaded Project doc ument, 2.4 Barriers and Theory of Change and Anne x 3: Project Theory of Change diagram.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	PRODOC_PIMS6439_BiHPA_17Jan2022_Revised_17Feb20221_12753_101 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PRODOC_PIMS6439_BiHPA_17Jan2022_Revised_17Feb20221_12753_101.docx)	amra.zorlak@undp.org	4/19/2022 10:39:00 AM

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 Outcome 1. of the UNDP Strategic Plan 2022-2025, and Signature Solution 4. There is at least one IRRF indicator, to the Project substantially contributes: 4.1.2 Natural resources that are managed under a sustainable use, conservation, access, and benefit-sharing regime.

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:

As evident from the Project's RRF, the Project directl
y contributes to Outcome 1 of the Country Program
me Document for Bosnia and Herzegovina 2021-20
25: Outcome 1. By 2025, people benefit from resilie
nt, inclusive and sustainable growth ensured by the
convergence of economic development, and manag
ement of environment and cultural resources.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Relevant   **Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory**

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:

> Project document, paragraphs 146/148 specify targe
> t groups and stakeholders, while the Component 1 o
> f the Project defines how it will work for the vulnerabl
> e groups and communities: Contributes to strengthe
> ning PAs resilience to climate change induced threat
> s, through a targeted Climate threat assessment for
> pilot PAs that will include information on climate vuln
> erabilities and exposure of local communities includi
> ng the most vulnerable groups (Output 1.1.) based o
> n which adequate adaptation measures will be devis
> ed and introduced in the PAs management plans (O
> utput 1.2.) and a portfolio of adaptation and resilien
> ce solutions will be developed and supported in sev
> eral pilot PAs (Output 1.3). Innovative restoration of
> critical habitats will include meaningful and inclusive
> methods for community engagement (Output 1.4). T
> his component will generate lessons learned and ad
> aptation measures that could be replicated to other
> PAs whereas the generated knowledge and guidelin
> es will be scaled up to also support biodiversity main
> streaming in production landscapes outside PAs (Ou
> tput 1.5) .

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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 document, 2.2 Key past and ongoing interve
ntions outline what lessons learned and knowledge
generated through previous complementary interven
tions informed project design. One specific Project C
omponent 3. " Knowledge management and Commu
nication" elaborates on how the Project will ensure a
ppropriate systematization of lessons learned, knowl
edge and scalable business models.

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:

As presented in the Annex 12 of the Project docume
nt as well as its Sub-section Project stakeholders an
d target groups.

In general, the project deploys multi-stakeholders pa
rticipatory mechanisms that increases accountabilit
y. Good examples of participatory mechanisms are
demonstrated within the framework of the Comprehe
nsive Stakeholders Engagement Plan and under the
Output 1.2 through the Process Framework, that will
facilitate consultations with the local communities in
order to avoid any potential risk of limitations of the
access to natural resources resulting from the projec
t's supported PAs management plans and a stricter/i
mproved enforcement of environmental regulations
and PAs zoning. The project's innovative restoration
activities (Output 1.4) will be implemented together
with the local communities and local authorities, fost
ering participation and replication of generated know
ledge and experience (Output 1.5) and further prom
otion of the network of BiH PAs through partnerships
with other initiatives and PAs branding (Output 2.5).
Other project activities are leveraging stakeholders'
engagement for improved PA financing and increase
d accountability of duty-bearers to secure more reso
urces towards PAs financing under different govern
mental grant programmes Output 2.4). The project
promotes a greater accountability of the private sect
or, through the promotion of sustainable concession
models in Sujetska National Park (Output 2.3). The
project will further promote stakeholders' accountabil
ity through facilitating active local community engag
ement including rural poor, actively promoting partici
pation of women, youth and disadvantaged groups.
These are all major project milestones, implemented
with embedded mechanisms for meaningful particip
ation of all the stakeholders affected, particularly tho
se at risk of being left behind.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Annex12_ComprehensiveStakeholderEngag ementPlan_12753_106 (https://intranet.undp. org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Ann ex12_ComprehensiveStakeholderEngageme ntPlan_12753_106.docx)	amra.zorlak@undp.org	4/19/2022 4:10:00 PM

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:

In line with UNDP's human-rights based approach, the project directly empowers right holders in the persons of public authorities/ duty bearers, SMEs, small holders, owners of production lands, and communities so that they are the principal facilitators and decision makers for restoration and sustainable use of PAs biodiversity resources on which local livelihood resilience depend.

The project fully support's UNDP's commitment to human-rights based approach, and supports the universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all, but particularly in the case of this project, for the people living in/around the targeted protected areas landscape. The project does this broadly by supporting the sustainable use of natural resources, including innovative wetland restoration techniques to secure the ecological integrity of critical habitats, access to and sustainable use of wetlands, reforestation around agricultural land- with environmental and socio-economic benefits for the rural communities, including the rural poor, in the project's targeted landscape. In addition, the project will ensure and support the human rights principles of participation, inclusion and non-discrimination. The project is aligned with the new UNDP CPD 2021-2025, which is supporting sustainable and inclusive growth, with benefits that are more widely and fairly shared, leveraging and integrating the environment and economic development sectors towards a low carbon economy, environment protection and resilience. The project's components are linked and will facilitate targeted measures for ecosystems and livelihoods resilience in the targeted PAs and surrounding geographies.

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:

As evidenced by the Project document, Annex 13: Gender Analysis and Gender Action Plan, the participatory gender analysis have been conducted for the project design. The Gender Action Plan was developed to ensure that the future project is gender-responsive in its implementation. The Gender Action Plan was prepared as a result of close consultations with local communities in the target municipalities to identify gender mainstreaming opportunities for the project design. Based on the Gender Assessment and Gender Action Plan, the project intervention strategy and workplans were designed to identify and integrate the different needs, constraints, contributions and priorities of women, men, girls and boys.
The most important gender considerations related to women underrepresentation in the decision making over natural resource use and as entrepreneurs in the tourism business, have been taken into account in the project design to facilitate measures that are likely to improve gender quality and women's empowerment. The Project's RRF contains gender sensitive indicators.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Annex13_GenderAnalysisandGenderActionPlan_12753_108 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Annex13_GenderAnalysisandGenderActionPlan_12753_108.docx)	amra.zorlak@undp.org	4/19/2022 4:12:00 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:

There is strong evidence throughout the Project document, it Theory of Change and Strategy that the envisaged intervention integrates support to resilience, social, economic and environmental dimensions of sustainable development. For example, the project objective is to achieve practical improvement in management of protected area estate of BiH, providing for better biodiversity status through strengthened resilience of key biodiversity values to climate change impact and increased revenues to protected areas from sustainable recreation. The project is called to reduce the gap between the current capacities of protected areas (PAs) with their increasing vulnerability to emerging threats, on the one hand, and the growing needs to preserve and sustainably maintain the biological and ecosystem diversity that is among the top five in Europe, on the other. The project will aim to reduce newly emerging threats to the key biodiversity values, and provide for sustainable management options and increased funding for PAs.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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:

Exceptionally detailed SESP screening undertaken for the Project design. Potential socio-economic risks of moderate significance identified in various areas.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Risk Category	Risk Requirements	Document Status	Modified By	Modified On
1	Annex5.SESP_12753_110 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Annex5.SESP_12753_110.docx)	Low	Human Rights; Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment; Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Natural Resource Management; Climate Change and Disaster Risks	Final	amra.zorlak@undp.org	4/19/2022 12:29:00 PM

Management & Monitoring   Quality Rating: **Highly Satisfactory**

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:

> The Project-s Results Framework is in the format of the Project Document for projects financed by the various GEF Trust Funds and it comprises all prescribed elements. For evidence, please refer to Project document, Section IV. Results framework.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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:

> Project document, Section VI. Governance and management arrangements, Subsection Roles and responsibilities of the project's governance mechanism defines the roles and composition of the Project Board.

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:

> Annex 6 of the Project document outlines a standard UNDP Risk Register with all required details. In addition, the Project document contains also a subsection "Risks to project success and the mitigation measures" and brief elaboration on the Social and environmental risks and safeguards

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Efficient   **Quality Rating: Exemplary**

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:

> iv) Sharing resources or coordinating delivery with other projects

---

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:

> Detailed budget is outlined in the Project document. In addition, financial analysis have been conducted for the project design, providing financial baselines of the subject of concern.

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:

> As outlined in the Project document, Project Budget, all project costs are covered through its budet.

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:

> There is evidence that the Project has undertaken broad consultations in its design, involving relevant stakeholders representing relevant line ministries, representative of protected areas management, local governments. At least three consultative meetings were held on September/November 2020 representatives. Example list of participants and Agenda uploaded as evidence.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Listofparticipants_BIHGEF7BD_2ndstakeholdersintromeeting_12753_117 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Listofparticipants_BIHGEF7BD_2ndstakeholdersintromeeting_12753_117.xlsx)	amra.zorlak@undp.org	4/19/2022 3:12:00 PM
2	GEF7BDPPG_Agenda_Zoom_09112020_12753_117 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/GEF7BDPPG_Agenda_Zoom_09112020_12753_117.pdf)	amra.zorlak@undp.org	4/19/2022 3:14:00 PM

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:

> The Project has detailed Monitoring and Evaluation plan which outlines requered processes and actions.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	LPAC_BIHGEF7_PABD_FINAL2804_ENG_signed_12753_118 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/LPAC_BIHGEF7_PABD_FINAL2804_ENG_signed_12753_118.pdf)	amra.zorlak@undp.org	4/28/2022 11:38:00 AM
2	UNDP_GEF7BD_LPAC_ENG_20220420final_12753_118 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/UNDP_GEF7BD_LPAC_ENG_20220420final_12753_118.pdf)	amra.zorlak@undp.org	4/28/2022 11:39:00 AM

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 Project is scored GEN2.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Sustainability & National Ownership　　　　**Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory**

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:

> In design of the Project, UNDP engaged a broad range of partners and stakeholders. Evidence is enclosed under the Question 17.

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:

> The Project is implemented through Direct Implementation Modality.

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:

> Although the Project document outlines a clear stakeholder engagement strategy which promises engagement of all relevant stakeholders and represented institutions, this Project will be implemented through Direct Implementation Modality, therefore UNDP systems will be used for procurement, monitoring, evaluation and other relevant processes.

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:

Under the Subsection 3.5 Innovativeness, sustainabi
lity and potential for scaling up, the Project presents
its plans for transition after the project lifespan. For
example, to provide sustainability and up-scale to th
e species management instruments targeting a wide
r landscape around the protected areas, the Project
will work with sectoral stakeholders responsible for r
esource use practices that are not imposed or mana
ged by PAs.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

QA Summary/LPAC Comments

The Project is designed in line with UNDP Programming Standards. LPAC minutes are available under the Q 17.