ASM-00391 - Quality Assurance - Design

Procedure Year: 2023

Overall Project Risk Categorization: Highly Satisfactory

Procedure Status: Approved

Procedure Name: ASM-00391

Procedure Department: CO - Tonga - Cty Pgmm

Procedure Type: Design

Decision:

QA Summary/Project Board Comments:

RELATED PROJECTS(1)

NAME	DEPARTMENT	STATUS	ATLAS PROJECT NUMBER	START DATE	END DATE
01000677	CO - Tonga - Cty Pgmm	Draft		1/1/2024	12/31/2030

RELATED SESPS(1)

PARENT PROCEDURE	PROCEDURE TYPE	PROCEDURE YEAR
ASM-01725	SESP (Social and Environmental Screening Procedure)	2023

APPROVAL HISTORY

STEP NAME	DATE	STATUS	ASSIGNED TO
Submitted for Approval	2023-12-14 00:07:14	Approved	Yemesrach Assefa WORKIE
Approval Request Submitted	2023-12-14 00:04:54	Started	Merewalesi Laveti

Identified Risks & Treatments

Category: 5. Reputational

Risk Significance: Substantial

Risk Significance: Substantial

Sub-Category: 5.5. Stakeholder management

Event:

Restricted access to resources and traditional livelihoods

Causes:

Closure of specific areas rehabilitation and planting of mangroves, seagrass beds and coral reefs

Impact:

Project stakeholders deprived of access to traditional livelihoods and resources

RELATED TREATMENTS(1)

ACTIVITIES FOR TREATMENT	EXPECTED EFFECT	TIME PLAN FOR COMPLETE	STATUS	COMMENTS
Assessment: Two scoped ESIAs (one for each intervention site) will be conducted for Outputs 1.2 (implementation of restoration plans in Fanga'uta Lagoon Marine Reserve) and 1.5 (on- the-ground interventions in Vava'u to support marine biodiversity conservation) including an assessment of the impacts on local livelihoods from the restriction of access to areas under rehabilitation. The Gender Assessment, developed during project design, will also inform the Restoration Plans, ensuring that the challenges and adaptation needs of vulnerable groups are duly captured. Management: An ESMP will be developed for each intervention area (Fanga'uta Lagoon and Vava'u) as an outcome of the scope ESIAs. If considered necessary based on the outcomes of the local livelihoods assessment, a Livelihoods Action Plan (LAP) will be developed to articulate measures needed for the restriction of access and any other impacts on natural resources use that could have an effect on local livelihoods. A participatory approach detailed in the Stakeholder Engagement Plan will be	Assessment of impact and mitigation measures to avoid negative impacts on project stockholder and the environment	12/31/2024	Not Started	

RELATED TREATMENTS(1)

ACTIVITIES FOR TREATMENT	EXPECTED EFFECT	TIME PLAN FOR COMPLETE	STATUS	COMMENT
applied to ensure that the project will avoid producing inequitable or discriminatory adverse impacts on affected populations, especially the most vulnerable, among them, women, those living in poverty and/or marginalized. To compensate for any restrictions imposed on traditional mangrove use, the project proposes to designate Specially Managed Mangrove Areas across the Fanga'uta Lagoon catchment and establishes Community Management Committees inclusive of gender and social diversity to oversee restrictions on use and participate on decision making. Additionally, a Grievance Redress Mechanism for the Project will be established.				

Category: 3. Operational

Risk Significance: Moderate

Risk Significance: Moderate

Sub-Category: 3.8. Capacities of the partners

Event:

There is risk of ineffective environmental and social management of project activities

Causes:

As a result of limited capacities of project partners, competing mandates and poor coordination

Impact:

Which will result in over weak governance structures

RELATED TREATMENTS(1)

ACTIVITIES FOR TREATMENT	EXPECTED EFFECT	TIME PLAN FOR COMPLETE	STATUS	COMMENTS
Assessment: The Gender Equality and Social Inclusion (GESI) Action Plan informed project design and activities ensuring that a gender and socially inclusive lens is applied to every project activity and that the challenges and needs of vulnerable groups are duly captured. Management: The Specially Managed Areas governance committees have representation from women and youth making up one third of the committee members. These efforts will assist with closing gender gaps in access to and control over the natural resources of fisheries. Additional management actions include: 1. Training for livelihood/tourism activities for women, youth, and disadvantaged people 2. Support for livelihood activities including equipment, small infrastructure and processing facilities, including women and youth 3. Consultant for capacity assessment and development of 5-year gender sensitive capacity development plan - 4. GAP implementation training for town and district officers - 1. 5.Support for citizen science program, science fairs and annual award scheme for active involvement of women and youth -	Minimise or avoid gender-based or social inequalities	8/31/2028	Not Started	Outputs 1.2 and 1.5 cou lead to the risk of reinforcing gender-bas inequalities, women do not have enough representati in SMA governance committees The GESI builds on th lessons learned fror the participatio of women i Tonga R2R Phase I and captures the needs identified b women to improve the participatio in the proje (e.g., availability designated meeting places).

Category: 1. Social and Environmental

Risk Significance: Moderate

Risk Significance: Moderate

Sub-Category: 1.2. Gender equality and women's empowerment

Event:

There is a risk of gender-based inequalities and social inequalities related to access to natural resources and benefits.

Causes:

As a result women not having enough representation in SMA governance committees

Impact:

Which will result in continued reinforcement of gender-based inequalities and social inequalities

RELATED TREATMENTS(1)

ACTIVITIES FOR TREATMENT	EXPECTED EFFECT	TIME PLAN FOR COMPLETE	STATUS	COMMENT
Management: The project will ensure tailored training and capacity building in SES and environmental and social management, through capacity assessment at the beginning of the project implementation period to strengthen functionality and capability of existing institutional structures.	Strengthened functionality and capacities of existing institutional structures	8/31/2028	Not Started	

Risk Significance: Moderate

Sub-Category: 1.4. Biodiversity conservation and sustainable natural resource management

Event:

There is risk to project stakeholder and local ecosystem for the duration on the project

Causes:

As a result of implementation of the restoration plans and the alternative livelihoods that will be identified during the implementation phase

Impact:

Will result in adverse impact on the local ecosystems, as well as pose occupational and community safety risks.

RELATED TREATMENTS(1)

ACTIVITIES FOR TREATMENT	EXPECTED EFFECT	TIME PLAN FOR COMPLETE	STATUS	COMMENT
Assessment: The scoped ESIAs to be conducted upon definition of the restoration plans will inform the assessment of impacts and risks and the definition of management measures. Management The implementation of the restoration plans will follow an Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP), as an output of the scoped ESIAs, to avoid, mitigate and compensate impacts and risks. Alternative livelihoods will be identified and implemented in close consultation with communities and informed by a Livelihoods Action Plan and consultant livelihoods reports.	Avoid, mitigate and compensate impacts and risks	8/31/2028	Not Started	Outputs 1.2 and 1.5 could lead to the risk c adverse impacts on local ecosystems.

Category: 1. Social and Environmental

Risk Significance: Moderate

Risk Significance: Moderate

Sub-Category: 1.2. Gender equality and women's empowerment

Event:

There is a risk of gender-based inequalities and social inequalities related to access to natural resources and benefits.

Causes:

As a result women not having enough representation in SMA governance committees

Impact:

Which will result in continued reinforcement of gender-based inequalities and social inequalities

RELATED TREATMENTS(1)

ACTIVITIES FOR TREATMENT	EXPECTED EFFECT	TIME PLAN FOR COMPLETE	STATUS	COMMENT
Management: The project will ensure tailored training and capacity building in SES and environmental and social management, through capacity assessment at the beginning of the project implementation period to strengthen functionality and capability of existing institutional structures.	Strengthened functionality and capacities of existing institutional structures	8/31/2028	Not Started	

Risk Significance: Moderate

Sub-Category: 1.4. Biodiversity conservation and sustainable natural resource management

Event:

There is risk to project stakeholder and local ecosystem for the duration on the project

Causes:

As a result of implementation of the restoration plans and the alternative livelihoods that will be identified during the implementation phase

Impact:

Will result in adverse impact on the local ecosystems, as well as pose occupational and community safety risks.

RELATED TREATMENTS(1)

ACTIVITIES FOR TREATMENT	EXPECTED EFFECT	TIME PLAN FOR COMPLETE	STATUS	COMMENT
Assessment: The scoped ESIAs to be conducted upon definition of the restoration plans will inform the assessment of impacts and risks and the definition of management measures. Management The implementation of the restoration plans will follow an Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP), as an output of the scoped ESIAs, to avoid, mitigate and compensate impacts and risks. Alternative livelihoods	Avoid, mitigate and compensate impacts and risks	8/31/2028	Not Started	Outputs 1.2 and 1.5 could lead to the risk c adverse impacts on local ecosystems.

RELATED TREATMENTS(1)				
ACTIVITIES FOR TREATMENT	EXPECTED EFFECT	TIME PLAN FOR COMPLETE	STATUS	COMMENT
will be identified and implemented in close consultation with communities and informed by a Livelihoods Action Plan and consultant livelihoods reports.				

QA Questionnaire:

Strategic Status: Complete Quality Rating: 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.

*Note: Projects not contributing to a programme must have a project-specific Theory of Change. See alternative question under the information icon for these cases.
*Note: Risk management must be done for criteria with score of 1.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

Yes, the project is fully aligned with the following SDG goals:

Climate Change, Disaster Resilience, and Environmental Protection (Outcome 1): By 2024 People and ecosystems in the Pacific are more resilient to the impacts of climate change, climate variability, and disasters and environmental protection is strengthened.

The project is also aligned with the UNDP strategic plan for the Environment: Putting nature and the environment at the heart of national economies and planning, helping governments protect, manage, and value their natural assets. The project has a clear theory of change.

Evidence: Please see the project document page 1 for CPD linkages, page 35 for Theory of change (Figure-02)

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 and adapts at least one Signature Solution. 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. 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.

*Note: Risk management must be done for criteria with score of 1.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The project aligns with the UNDP strategic plan for the Environment: Putting nature and the environment at the heart of national economies and planning, helping governments protect, manage, and value their natural assets. The project has a clear theory of change.

Evidence: Please see the project document page 1 for CPD linkages

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

- (●) YES
- ( ) NO

*Note: Project QA cannot be approved by Project QA Approver when the response is "No".

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

Yes, the project is contributing to the following country outcomes (UNDAF/CPD, RPD, GPD):
CPD: Climate Change, Disaster Resilience, and Environmental Protection (Outcome 1): People and ecosystems in the Pacific are more resilient to the impacts of climate change, climate variability, and disasters, and environmental protection is strengthened.
Strategic Plan: Putting nature and the environment at the heart of national economies and Planning; helping governments protect, manage, and value their natural assets.

Evidence: Please see the attached project IRRF and Project document page#1

Relevant Status: Complete Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory

4. Does the project identify target groups , and particularly those marginalized, vulnerable and left further behind (LNOB)

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

*Note: Risk management must be done for criteria with score of 1. Projects that build institutional capacity should still identify targeted groups to justify support.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

Yes, during the project design and formulation stage community consultation was properly done to ensure written agreements are achieved with landowners and community management committees. A participatory approach detailed in the Stakeholder Engagement Plan will be applied to ensure that the project will avoid producing inequitable or discriminatory adverse impacts on affected populations, especially the most vulnerable, among them women, those living in poverty, and/or marginalized. To compensate for any restrictions imposed on traditional mangrove use, the project proposes to designate Specially Managed Mangrove Areas across the Fanga'uta Lagoon catchment and establishes Community Management Committees inclusive of gender and social diversity to oversee restrictions on use and participate in decision-making. Additionally, a Grievance Redress Mechanism for the Project will be established.

The Project also developed a preliminary Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP) (see Annex 8 of the ProDoc), to ensure that all groups of people, including those who are marginalized and underrepresented, participate in and benefit from the Project, including their contributions to assess potential social and environmental impacts and the development of adequate management measures. As necessary, the Stakeholder Engagement Plan will be updated during Project implementation based on project experience and lessons learned.

Evidences: Please see the attached project SEP as annex 8 and project document page#35

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.

*Note: Risk management must be done for criteria with score of 1.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

Yes, during the project design stage, all good practices of the previous projects were considered, and even some activities of the project will further support the good practices. For example, one of the activities (Activity 3.2.5 project document page#133) of the project is to support the citizen science program for locals, including youth, focused on environmental issues, monitoring, and good marine conservation practices." In addition, the project will ensure close linkages with existing and past national and regional projects to build on experiences, learning and best practices and seek efforts for sharing of knowledge management products and expertise.

Evidence: Project document page#133

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.

*Note: Risk management must be done for criteria with score of 1.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

During the design stage of the project, it has clearly identified the role of all partners that will be involved during the implementation of the project. It is also well defined how results of the project will be achieved by UNDP team in consultation with all relevant partners. The communication strategy and stakeholder consultation plan are at place to communicate results and raise visibility through key partners, South-south and triangular cooperation have been considered. For example, during the PPG phase, the Project objectives, and potential activities/interventions were introduced to identified stakeholders, including CMC communities, district and national agencies, and private sector representatives. Output 3.3 (South-South cooperation and exchanges implemented in integrated management of lagoon ecosystems that is most applicable in Pacific SIDS and beyond." Explicitly explains the south-south cooperation under outcome 3 of the project.

Evidence: Project document partnership page#58. For south-south cooperation, see page 82 of the project document.

Principled Status: Complete Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory

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

*Note: Risk management must be done for criteria with score of 1.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

Building on lessons learned from Tonga R2R Phase I, the project recognizes the need to address gender, poverty, and social inequalities as root causes of environmental degradation and as a central component to the project's success and sustainability. With the inclusion of a livelihood subcomponent and in close consultation with communities, the second phase of the project will continue the training and capacity-building initiatives established during Phase I to provide the dual benefit of improving the household economy while also supporting biodiversity and conservation. With the overall objective of conserving biodiversity and building resilience through an integrated participatory and adaptive approach, the project will enhance the availability, accessibility and quality of benefits and services for all, increasing the inclusion of women and youth in decision-making processes that impact their livelihoods and wellbeing.

Project activities will enhance full and effective participation through strengthened institutional arrangements and governance framework that build on the existing Community Management Committees and are inclusive of gender and social diversity. In the SESP of the project, human right has identified as a moderate risk for which the project identified some critical mitigation measurements such as “A Stakeholder Engagement Plan was developed to ensure adequate participation from affected people. The project uses a participatory approach for the definition of key activities and conservation areas. The ESMF includes the details of the Grievance Redress Mechanism to be implemented, which will ensure access to all affected parties.”

Evidence: Project document page 67 and SESP plans

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.

*Note: Risk management must be done for criteria with score of 1.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The project will work towards closing the existing gap identified in previous similar projects and improving gender equality in access to and control over natural resources and household agriculture. Lessons learned during the implementation of Phase I of the Tonga R2R project were incorporated into the project design and Gender Mainstreaming Action Plan. The Action Plan was developed to inform a gender-sensitive approach so that 1) a gender and socially-inclusive perspective is applied to every set of activities; 2) research on gender and social roles in the marine wetlands informs resulting plans and ensures equitable distribution of benefits; and 3) information is collected and shared across gender and social lines. Specific gender mainstreaming actions include the development of gender and socially-sensitive indicators and the collection of gender-disaggregated data for monitoring and evaluating project results (e.g. Number of female committee members in Special Management Areas and the number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender), diversifying sustainable livelihood opportunities specifically for women and youth, and increasing participation of women in training and capacity building activities through connecting with additional established women's groups such as the Tonga Community Development Trust and the Women's Council for Tonga.

Evidence: The gender action plan (Annex 11) and SESP are attached as references to this question.

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.

*Note: Risk management must be done for criteria with score of 1.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The proposed project will mainstream biodiversity conservation into priority sectors through policy development, land-use planning, coordination, and implementation to ensure that land and resource use support production without undermining biodiversity. The project will develop the first land-use spatial plan in Tonga which will guide decision making and land use management and protect cultural heritage sites such as the ancient royal tombs (langi) at Lapaha, ancient Lapita settlement sites such as Vaini and Nukuleka and the pigeon snaring mounds at Popua. The project is consistent with national conservation priorities detailed in key national policies, strategies, and plans. The long-term commitment of the Government of Tonga to protecting its natural marine and coastal endowments provides very positive signs for sustainability of project impact. In addition, Vava'u Environmental Protection Association's focus areas are in alignment with the Tonga R2R Phase II project and demonstrate their technical capacity to provide project replication in Vava'u ensuring biodiversity and conservation, increasing knowledge exchange, and securing sustainable livelihoods.

This has been identified in one of the risks of the project (Risk 3: The implementation of the restoration plans and the alternative livelihoods that will be identified during the implementation phase may have an adverse impact on the local ecosystems, as well as pose occupational and community safety risks) for which a good mitigation measurement have been considered such as (The implementation of the restoration plans will follow an Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) to avoid, mitigate and compensate impacts and risks. Alternative livelihoods will be identified and implemented in close consultation with communities and informed by a Livelihoods Action Plan and consultant livelihoods reports.)

Evidence: please see project document (social and environmental section) and SESP Sustainability section

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 the preparation and dissemination of reports and communication materials; organization of events, workshops, or training; strengthening capacities of partners to participate in international negotiations and conferences; partnership coordination (including UN coordination) and management of networks; and global/regional projects with no country-level activities as well as Development Effectiveness projects and Institutional Effectiveness projects. [If yes, upload the completed checklist. If SESP is not required, Select all exemption criteria that apply.]

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No
- ( ) SESP not required because project consists solely of (Select all exemption criteria that apply)

***Applicable only to option "SESP not required"**

- [ ] 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. knowledge management, inter-governmental processes)
- [ ] 6: UNDP acting as Administrative Agent
- [ ] 7: Development Effectiveness projects and Institutional Effectiveness projects

*Note: Project QA cannot be approved by Project QA Approver when the response is "No".

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

Yes, it is comprehensively completed with all risks identified with mitigation measurements.

Evidence: Please see the attached SESP of the project

Management & Monitoring Status: Complete Quality Rating: 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)

*Note: Risk management must be done for criteria with score of 1.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

Yes, the project developed a comprehensive and strong results framework in which all outputs and activities are identified companies with result-oriented indicators and achievable targets, including gender analyses. The project has also identified mid-term and end of the project target. The project has also developed multi-year budgeting with comprehensive budget notes.

Evidence: Please see project document page#78 for RRF and page#109 for multi-year work planning and budget notes

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.

*Note: Risk management must be done for criteria with score of 1.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

Yes, the project governance mechanism is clearly defined in the project document. For example, in the project document, the roles and responsibilities of everyone are clearly identified. However, ToR for everyone will be identified in the inception phase of the project.

Evidence: Attached project document page#103

13. Have the project risks been identified using the risk assessment tools (Project Quality Assurance, Social and Environmental Screening Procedure, Partner Capacity Assessment Tool, Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfer, Private Sector Due Diligence, etc., if applicable), 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 register, 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 register 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 register, 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.

*Note: Risk management must be done for criteria with score of 1.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

During the design and formulation stage of the project, risks were identified with proper mitigation measurements, and a risk log was prepared based on a comprehensive analysis drawing on the programme's theory of change, Social and Environmental Standards, and screening and situation analysis. The project has also done the HACT assessment as well as the PCAT assessment. There is SESP developed to identify risks with the impact and livelihood of each risk with project mitigation measurements.

Evidence: Attached are the project risk log, SESP and project document.

Efficient Status: Complete Quality Rating: Exemplary

14. Have specific measures for ensuring cost-efficient use of resources been explicitly mentioned as part of the project design?

- (●) Yes
- ( ) No

*Note: Risk management must be done when the response is "No".

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

This project will contribute to national effort to improve environmental management and livelihoods and reduce the negative impact of unsustainable land development, pollution, climate change and unsustainable harvesting on biodiversity and priority ecosystems. The project is complements other past ongoing initiatives such as the Tonga R2R Phase 1 project, SPGP small grants programme, the R2R Regional Programme and the Tonga Pathway to Sustainable Oceans. In full consultation with all project stakeholders, cost-effective and best-value-for-money analyses were done during the project budget preparation.

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.

*Note: Risk management must be done for criteria with score of 1.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The project budget is at activity level wit multi-year budget for the duration of the project. the project total budget and workplan is documented in Section IX of project document. During the formulation and design phase of the project, a comprehensive activity-level budget with funding source was prepared, and a multi-year budget was also prepared. All costs are supported with valid estimates considering the best value for money. However, during the inception workshop AWP for the first year will be revised in consultation with all relevant stakeholders in which again there will be thoroughly assessment of whether to change any cost or estimation due to fluctuations in the market.

Evidence: Attached are the multi-year work plans and project document RRF with the budget notes section.

16. Is the Country Office / Regional / 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.

*Note: Risk management must be done for criteria with score of 1. The budget must be revised to fully reflect the costs of implementation before the project commences.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

Refer to total budget and workplan is documented in Section IX of project document pg. 99 - 104. This project is fully funded by the Global Environment Facility using the CO support to NIM. In this regard, Letter of agreement was prepared in agreement with the IP and the GEF for the UNDP CO support to NIM. The services cost in the LOA were based on the UPL and included in project document budget. The project covers all costs as per the Vertical funded guidelines, which is aligned with the UNDP policies. However, the project will not cover some of the costs, such as the M#E cost of the country office staff for monitoring purposes during the implementation phase. This has been accepted between UNDP and GEF-SEC.

Evidence: Project document muti-year work planning and budget section

Effective Status: Complete Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory

17. Have targeted groups, and particularly those marginalized, vulnerable, and left further behind (LNOB), been engaged in the design of the project?

- (●) 3: Credible evidence that all targeted groups, prioritising discriminated, vulnerable 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

*Note: Risk management must be done for criteria with score of 1.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The Project also developed a preliminary Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP) (see Annex 8 of the ProDoc), to ensure that all groups of people, including those who are marginalized and underrepresented, participate in and benefit from the Project, including their contributions to assess potential social and environmental impacts and the development of adequate management measures. As necessary, the Stakeholder Engagement Plan will be updated during Project implementation based on project experience and lessons learned.

Evidence: Please see the attached project SEP as annex 8 and project document page#35

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

*Note: Risk Management must be done when the response is "No".

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The theory of change is documented in Section II page 18 of the project document. UNDP will work closely with project partners during project implementation to ensure that adaptive management to better approaches to achieve intended results through active monitoring and engement of project stakeholders

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

*Note: Risk management must be done when the response is "No".

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The project is scored as a GEN2. Please refer to project document uploaded as well was annexes 10 - GESI Analysis and action plan and the RFF in section V. During the consultation phase, all lessons learned from the previous projects were reviewed. Mid-term and Terminal evaluations of all previous projects were thoroughly reviewed, and based on these, lessons learned were fully considered during the design and formulation phase of this project.

Evidence: Project consultation report along with mid-term and final evaluation reports

20. Have societal digital risks and opportunities been taken into account when designing the project's approach and have digital or data technology solutions been considered to enhance the efficiency, effectiveness and scalability of project results?

- ○ 3: To the extent possible, societal digital risks and opportunities have been investigated when designing the strategy and Theory of Change, and the potential use of digital or data technologies in project activities has been considered in line with UNDP's digital standards and data principles. (All must be true)
- ◉ 2: Only the potential use of digital or data solutions in project activities has been considered in line with UNDP's digital standards and data principles, but there is no or limited evidence that aspects of inclusive digital societies have been considered in the design of the strategy or Theory of Change.
- ○ 1: Neither societal digital risks and opportunities, nor digital or data technology solutions were specifically considered in the project design or, UNDP's digital standards and data principles are not taken into account when intending to use digital or data technology solutions in project activities.
- ○ Digital considerations are not relevant to this project.

***Applicable only to option "Digital considerations are not relevant"**

- ☐ 1: Societal digital transformation is not a government or contextual priority
- ☐ 2: A non-digital approach yields higher effectiveness and efficiency
- ☐ 3: Other (specify in the "Evidence" section)

*Note: Risk management must be done for criteria with score of 1.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The project will use digital solutions in project activities under Outcome 3. The digital data solution have been considered during the design phase. Below are some examples of the digital solutions consider in the activities of the project:

Sustainability & National Ownership Status: Complete Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory

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

- ◉ 3: National / regional / global partners have full ownership of the country / regional / global 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.

*Note: Risk management must be done for criteria with score of 1.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The government of Tonga specifically the Department of Environment - MEIDECC have full ownership of the project and have been proactively engaged in the design of the project. The project has been developed in consultation with the national (government and other national stakeholders) regional (BRH and other Cos

projects in the same area) and global partners. To bring the voice of the Kingdom of Tonga to global and regional fora, the project will explore opportunities for meaningful participation in specific events where UNDP could support engagement with the global development discourse on marine conservation issues. The project will furthermore provide opportunities for regional cooperation with countries and other regional partners that are implementing initiatives on integrated marine conservation and management in geopolitical, social and environmental contexts relevant to the proposed project in Tonga. In particular, this would include close collaboration, knowledge sharing and exchange visits with Pacific Small Island Development States (PSIDS) that are implementing similar projects. The GEF 7 project will seek opportunities for collaboration with SPREP, SPC, Global Coral Reef Monitoring Network (GCRMN), Pacific Climate Change Centre (PCIC), Global Ocean Acidification Observing Network (GOA-ON), Pacific Islands Blue Foundation (PIBF), Pacific Island Development Forum (PIDF), International Maritime Organization (IMO), Locally Managed Marine Area (LMMA) Networks and others in the region.

22. 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

*Note: Risk management must be done for criteria with score of 1.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The project has already conducted the HACT and PCAT assessments, while the overall rating was 'moderate' for MEIDECC, three subject areas were rated as 'High" namely (i) program management, on account of the absence of project management guidelines and tools and monitoring and evaluation framework; (ii) organization structure and staffing based on the assessment of weak finance and project management staff training and competency, the lack of staff resources and recruitment process for project staff to be strengthened; and (iii) weak fixed assets management and asset verification.

Accordingly, based on this assessment, support services will be provided by UNDP to MEIDECC for (a) recruitment, selection, contract issuing and management of all international consultants and key PMU staff such as the Project Coordinator, Operation Support Officer and M&E Officer. This will also include contractual services for MTR, TE, Audit and HACT Spot Checks; (b) procurement of goods (exceeding $5,000) and services, and (c) program financial support services, including facilitating direct payments to service providers (including consultants), issuing of EFT/TRFs, deposits, stopping of payment and payment cancellations.

Evidence: Project document page#98, HACT and PCAT assessment report

23. 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

*Note: Risk management must be done when the response is "No".

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

This project is NIM and will use national systems of the Government of Tonga for procurement and monitoring to the extent possible.

24. 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

*Note: Risk management must be done when the response is "No".

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

Project has knowledge management strategy. The project intends to develop a sustainable financing mechanism and communication during implementation. A Sustainability plan/phase out plan could be developed during project implementation. The long-term commitment of the Government of Tonga to protecting its natural marine and coastal endowments provides very positive signs for sustainability of project impact. The Tonga R2R Phase I project has already proven to be sustainable with the Angulate Lagoon governance framework established during Phase I continuing to the present including the regular meetings of the CMC. The Phase II project proposes to strengthen this institutional arrangement and provide capacity building to governance staff. The Phase I project manager was employed by the Department of Environment after the conclusion of Phase I and provides a key sustainability role in project coordination for Phase II. The public awareness programme, the project website and the community initiatives such as mangrove planting and coastal clean-ups have also proved to be sustainable beyond their implementation during Phase I. The estimated government budget allocated to support the continuing implementation of the FLSP will be a minimum of $250,000 per year to cover water quality monitoring and implementation of the land-use spatial plan. This will ensure the financial sustainability of the Tonga R2R Phase II project. VEPA are also providing co-financing to support the proposed activities in Vava'u.

The project is also designed to provide demonstration models for up-scaling in the country. In particular, the capacity building and the development of best practices to control and manage marine resource degradation, sustainable fisheries management, waste management and alternative livelihoods will strongly support up-scaling. Ensuring that activities, impacts and lessons learnt from the demonstration sites are disseminated widely helps generate a bottom-up upscaling.