

Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

Form Status: Approved

Overall Rating: Highly Satisfactory

Decision:

Portfolio/Project Number: 00077733

Portfolio/Project Title: GEF - Enhance Protected Area System in Sulawesi (EPASS)

Portfolio/Project Date: 2014-08-20 / 2021-03-31

Strategic

Quality Rating: Exemplary

1. Did the project pro-actively identified changes to the external environment and incorporated them into the project strategy?

- ☒ 3: The project team identified relevant changes in the external environment that may present new opportunities or threats to the project's ability to achieve its objectives, assumptions were tested to determine if the project's strategy was valid. There is some evidence that the project board considered the implications, and documented the changes needed to the project in response. (all must be true)
- ☐ 2: The project team identified relevant changes in the external environment that may present new opportunities or threats to the project's ability to achieve its objectives. There is some evidence that the project board discussed this, but relevant changes did not fully integrate in the project. (both must be true)
- ☐ 1: The project team considered relevant changes in the external environment since implementation began, but there is no evidence that the project team considered these changes to the project as a result.

Evidence:

The project has identified relevant changes during the implementation including the risks that may hinder the project. The project board have taken responsibility to address the issues and provided strategies to achieve the targets.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Req4ExtMoFtoUNDPIndonesiaE-PASS_7469_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Req4ExtMoFtoUNDPIndonesiaE-PASS_7469_301.pdf)	anton.probiyantono@undp.org	2/24/2021 11:24:00 PM
2	S.706PerpanjanganEPASSKLHK_7469_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/S.706PerpanjanganEPASSKLHK_7469_301.pdf)	anton.probiyantono@undp.org	2/24/2021 11:24:00 PM
3	EPASSPBM2019UnofficialTranslation_7469_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/EPASSPBM2019UnofficialTranslation_7469_301.doc)	anton.probiyantono@undp.org	2/24/2021 11:24:00 PM
4	Req4ExtKLHK-BAPPENAS-MoF_7469_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Req4ExtKLHK-BAPPENAS-MoF_7469_301.pdf)	anton.probiyantono@undp.org	2/24/2021 11:23:00 PM
5	S585HasilProjectBoardMeetingEPASS2019_7469_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/S585HasilProjectBoardMeetingEPASS2019_7469_301.pdf)	anton.probiyantono@undp.org	2/24/2021 11:21:00 PM
6	UnofficialinterpretationE-PASSExtension2019_7469_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/UnofficialinterpretationE-PASSExtension2019_7469_301.doc)	anton.probiyantono@undp.org	2/24/2021 11:25:00 PM

2. Was the project aligned with the thematic focus of the Strategic Plan?

- ☒ 3: *The project responded to at least one of the development settings as specified in the Strategic Plan (SP) and adopted at least one Signature Solution .The project's RRF included all the relevant SP output indicators. (all must be true)*
- ☐ 2: The project responded to at least one of the developments settings¹ as specified in the Strategic Plan. The project's RRF included at least one SP output indicator, if relevant. (both must be true)
- ☐ 1: While the project may have responded to a partner's identified need, 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 contributed to UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD), covering 2016-2020: CPD Outcome 3. By 2020, Indonesia is sustainably managing its natural resources, on land and at sea, with increased resilience to the effects of climate change, disasters, and other shocks. CPD Output 3.3. National/local governments have improved policies, systems, and partnerships with non-state actors to protect biodiversity and endangered species.

EPASS project contributed to Signature Solution: Promote nature-based solutions for a sustainable planet.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	4392EPASSProdocv18Feb2015Final-Signed prodoc_7469_302 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/4392EPASSProdocv18Feb2015Final-Signedprodoc_7469_302.pdf)	anton.probiyantono@undp.org	2/26/2021 4:22:00 AM
2	SignedFINALEPASSMidTermReviewReport2018_7469_302 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SignedFINALEPASSMidTermReviewReport2018_7469_302.pdf)	anton.probiyantono@undp.org	2/26/2021 4:31:00 AM
3	PAR_2020_02_EPASS-Dec2020_7469_302 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PAR_2020_02_EPASS-Dec2020_7469_302.docx)	muhammad.afianto@undp.org	2/26/2021 12:12:00 PM

Relevant**Quality Rating: Exemplary**

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

- ☒ 3: *Systematic and structured feedback was collected over the project duration from a representative sample of beneficiaries, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized, as part of the project's monitoring system. Representatives from the targeted groups were active members of the project's governance mechanism (i.e., the project board or equivalent) and there is credible evidence that their feedback informs project decision making. (all must be true)*
- ☐ 2: Targeted groups were engaged in implementation and monitoring, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized. Beneficiary feedback, which may be anecdotal, was collected regularly to ensure the project addressed local priorities. This information was used to inform project decision making. (all must be true to select this option)
- ☐ 1: Some beneficiary feedback may have been collected, but this information did not inform project decision making. This option should also be selected if no beneficiary feedback was collected
- ☐ Not Applicable

Evidence:

The project was successfully engaged with the local communities through the program the Community Conservation Agreement. The program has been benefited 46 local community groups that mostly is the marginal groups in and around forest areas. The project also maintaining a good relation with related ministries, government agencies at the sub-national level, police, local communities, and indigenous people, Local NGOs, universities and private sector. The project conducted community engagement to protect the conservation areas in Sulawesi. They are people who are living in hard-to-reach/remote communities.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	PAR_2020_02_EPASS-Dec2020_7469_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PAR_2020_02_EPASS-Dec2020_7469_303.docx)	muhammad.afianto@undp.org	2/26/2021 2:17:00 PM
2	2019-GEF-PIR-PIMS4392-GEFID4867_7469_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2019-GEF-PIR-PIMS4392-GEFID4867_7469_303.docx)	muhammad.afianto@undp.org	2/26/2021 2:20:00 PM
3	2020-GEF-PIR-PIMS4392-GEFID4867-EPASSrev_7469_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2020-GEF-PIR-PIMS4392-GEFID4867-EPASSrev_7469_303.docx)	muhammad.afianto@undp.org	2/26/2021 2:19:00 PM

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

- ☒ 3: *Knowledge and lessons learned from internal or external sources (gained, for example, from Peer Assists, After Action Reviews or Lessons Learned Workshops) backed by credible evidence from evaluation, corporate policies/strategies, analysis and monitoring were discussed in project board meetings and reflected in the minutes. There is clear evidence that changes were made to the project to ensure its continued relevance. (both must be true)*
- ☐ 2: Knowledge and lessons learned backed by relatively limited evidence, drawn mainly from within the project, were considered by the project team. There is some evidence that changes were made to the project as a result to ensure its continued relevance. (both must be true)
- ☐ 1: There is limited or no evidence that knowledge and lessons learned were collected by the project team. There is little or no evidence that this informed project decision making.

Evidence:

The project developed a communications strategy in the first year, which has been updated annually and implemented. This included capturing and disseminating lessons learned, and shared with project stakeholders as appropriate.

Moreover, one of the project's outcomes is to be replicable as the barriers it addresses are largely shared by protected areas sub-systems across Indonesia. As a result, the approaches being demonstrated are transferable to strengthen PA management effectiveness. Strengthening of national-level structures at PHKA also have a direct benefit in this regard, as national-level human and institutional capacities are raised. Activities for capturing best practices and local traditional knowledge was used in the project to help promote replicability, including UNDP's Learning and Knowledge Sharing electronic platform.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	FINALVERSIONMTRReportEPASS-OFDRAFTREPORT2_7469_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FINALVERSIONMTRReportEPASS-OFDRAFTREPORT2_7469_304.docx)	muhammad.afianto@undp.org	2/26/2021 2:29:00 PM
2	UNDP-GEFMTRManagementResponseEPASS_PMU_and_Comp2_7469_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/UNDP-GEFMTRManagementResponseEPASS_PMU_and_Comp2_7469_304.docx)	muhammad.afianto@undp.org	2/26/2021 2:30:00 PM
3	TEReportofEPASSProject05Jan21revised_7469_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/TEReportofEPASSProject05Jan21revised_7469_304.docx)	muhammad.afianto@undp.org	2/26/2021 2:31:00 PM
4	EPASSvirtualmeeting30Mar2020_7469_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/EPASSvirtualmeeting30Mar2020_7469_304.docx)	muhammad.afianto@undp.org	2/26/2021 2:34:00 PM

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

- ☒ 3: *There was credible evidence that the project reached sufficient number of beneficiaries (either directly through significant coverage of target groups, or indirectly, through policy change) to meaningfully contribute to development change.*
- ☐ 2: While the project was not considered at scale, there are explicit plans in place to scale up the project in the future (e.g. by extending its coverage or using project results to advocate for policy change).
- ☐ 1: The project was not at scale, and there are no plans to scale up the project in the future.

Evidence:

The project have been working at least in 45 villages around the targeted protected areas in Central Sulawesi, Gorontalo & North Sulawesi provinces. 7 (seven) of 45 villages have been facilitated to develop Community Conservation Agreement (CCA) as a strategy to reduce human threats to the protected areas. More villages are expected to join.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	SignedLoABNIEPASS_7469_305 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SignedLoABNIEPASS_7469_305.pdf)	muhammad.afianto@undp.org	2/26/2021 2:45:00 PM
2	EPASSvirtualmeeting30Mar2020_7469_305 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/EPASSvirtualmeeting30Mar2020_7469_305.docx)	muhammad.afianto@undp.org	2/26/2021 2:35:00 PM
3	MoUFapertaUNSRATWWCT-digital_7469_305 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MoUFapertaUNSRATWWCT-digital_7469_305.pdf)	muhammad.afianto@undp.org	2/26/2021 2:38:00 PM
4	SummaryofAudiencesandMeansofCommunication_7469_305 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SummaryofAudiencesandMeansofCommunication_7469_305.docx)	muhammad.afianto@undp.org	2/26/2021 2:36:00 PM

Principled

Quality Rating: **Satisfactory**

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

- ☐ 3: The project team gathered data and evidence through project monitoring on the relevance of the measures to address gender inequalities and empower women. Analysis of data and evidence were used to inform adjustments and changes, as appropriate. (both must be true)
- ☒ 2: *The project team had some data and evidence on the relevance of the measures to address gender inequalities and empower women. There is evidence that at least some adjustments were made, as appropriate. (both must be true)*
- ☐ 1: The project team had limited or no evidence on the relevance of measures to address gender inequalities and empowering women. No evidence of adjustments and/or changes made. This option should also be selected if the project has no measures to address gender inequalities and empower women relevant to the project results and activities.

Evidence:

Gender Equality means the Micro Capital Grant E-PASS Program provides equal opportunities for women and men to make decisions, participate actively and responsibly in all activities;

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	PAR_2020_02_EPASS-Dec2020_7469_306 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PAR_2020_02_EPASS-Dec2020_7469_306.docx)	muhammad.afianto@undp.org	2/26/2021 3:16:00 PM
2	Final-EPASS-2019-GEF-PIR-PIMS4392-GEFID48671_7469_306 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Final-EPASS-2019-GEF-PIR-PIMS4392-GEFID48671_7469_306.docx)	muhammad.afianto@undp.org	2/26/2021 3:04:00 PM

7. Were social and environmental impacts and risks successfully managed and monitored?

- ☐ 3: Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. Appropriate assessments conducted where required (i.e., Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) for High risk projects and some level of social and environmental assessment for Moderate risk projects as identified through SESP). Relevant management plan(s) developed for identified risks through consultative process and implemented, resourced, and monitored. Risks effectively managed or mitigated. If there is a substantive change to the project or change in context that affects risk levels, the SESP was updated to reflect these changes. (all must be true)
- ☒ 2: *Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. Appropriate assessments conducted where required (i.e., Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) for High risk projects and some level of social and environmental assessment for Moderate risk projects as identified through SESP). Relevant management plan(s) developed, implemented and monitored for identified risks. OR project was categorized as Low risk through the SESP.*
- ☐ 1: Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. For projects categorized as High or Moderate Risk, there was no evidence that social and environmental assessments completed and/or management plans or measures development, implemented or monitored. There are substantive changes to the project or changes in the context but SESP was not updated. (any may be true)

Evidence:

Social and environmental Risk and impact have been monitored by the project. All MTR Management Responses have been updated and mostly are achieved. There is no project activity that created potential impact and risk to the environment and social life during the reporting period (2019/2020).

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	LembarPenilaianMETTTNBNW20191_7469_307 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/LembarPenilaianMETTTNBNW20191_7469_307.xlsx)	muhammad.afianto@undp.org	2/26/2021 2:55:00 PM
2	METT_2019-2TWA_Batuputih_SulawesiUtara_7469_307 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/METT_2019-2TWA_Batuputih_SulawesiUtara_7469_307.xlsx)	muhammad.afianto@undp.org	2/26/2021 2:55:00 PM
3	UNDP-GEFEPASSMTRManagementResponseupdatedDec-2020-fin_7469_307 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/UNDP-GEFEPASSMTRManagementResponseupdatedDec-2020-fin_7469_307.docx)	muhammad.afianto@undp.org	2/26/2021 2:56:00 PM

8. Were grievance mechanisms available to project-affected people and were grievances (if any) addressed to ensure any perceived harm was effectively mitigated?

- ☐ 3: Project-affected people actively informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism (SRM/SECU) and how to access it. If the project was categorized as High or Moderate Risk through the SESP, a project -level grievance mechanism was in place and project affected people informed. If grievances were received, they were effectively addressed in accordance with SRM Guidance. (all must be true)
- ☒ 2: *Project-affected people informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism and how to access it. If the project was categorized as High Risk through the SESP, a project -level grievance mechanism was in place and project affected people informed. If grievances were received, they were responded to but faced challenges in arriving at a resolution.*
- ☐ 1: Project-affected people was not informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism. If grievances were received, they were not responded to. (any may be true)

Evidence:

Project-level grievance mechanism in the SoP and have been implemented through Community Conservation Agreement Program for 46 community groups.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	RevisiKeduaSOP2018-7Februari2019_7469_308 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/RevisiKeduaSOP2018-7Februari2019_7469_308.pdf)	muhammad.afianto@undp.org	2/26/2021 3:12:00 PM
2	SummaryofAudiencesandMeansofCommunication_7469_308 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SummaryofAudiencesandMeansofCommunication_7469_308.docx)	muhammad.afianto@undp.org	2/26/2021 3:13:00 PM
3	4392EPASSProdocv18Feb2015Final-2_signed_7469_308 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/4392EPASSProdocv18Feb2015Final-2_signed_7469_308.pdf)	muhammad.afianto@undp.org	2/26/2021 3:14:00 PM

Management & Monitoring**Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

9. Was the project's M&E Plan adequately implemented?

- ☒ 3: The project had a comprehensive and costed M&E plan. Baselines, targets and milestones were fully populated. Progress data against indicators in the project's RRF was reported regularly using credible data sources and collected according to the frequency stated in the Plan, including sex disaggregated data as relevant. Any evaluations conducted, if relevant, fully meet decentralized evaluation standards, including gender UNEG standards. Lessons learned, included during evaluations and/or After-Action Reviews, were used to take corrective actions when necessary. (all must be true)
- ☐ 2: The project costed M&E Plan, and most baselines and targets were populated. Progress data against indicators in the project's RRF was collected on a regular basis, although there may be some slippage in following the frequency stated in the Plan and data sources was not always reliable. Any evaluations conducted, if relevant, met most decentralized evaluation standards. Lessons learned were captured but were used to take corrective actions. (all must be true)
- ☐ 1: The project had M&E Plan, but costs were not clearly planned and budgeted for, or were unrealistic. Progress data was not regularly collected against the indicators in the project's RRF. Evaluations did not meet decentralized evaluation standards. Lessons learned were rarely captured and used. Select this option also if the project did not have an M&E plan.

Evidence:

The Mid Term Review (MTR) was submitted. The project received a satisfactory rating from independent consultants.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	SignedFINALEPASSMidTermReviewReport2018_7469_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SignedFINALEPASSMidTermReviewReport2018_7469_309.pdf)	anton.probiyantono@undp.org	2/24/2021 11:30:00 PM
2	UNDP-GEFEPASSMTRManagementResponseupdatedDec-2020-fin_7469_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/UNDP-GEFEPASSMTRManagementResponseupdatedDec-2020-fin_7469_309.docx)	muhammad.afianto@undp.org	2/26/2021 3:17:00 PM
3	TEReportofEPASSProject05Jan21revised_7469_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/TEReportofEPASSProject05Jan21revised_7469_309.docx)	muhammad.afianto@undp.org	2/26/2021 3:18:00 PM

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

- ☐ 3: The project's governance mechanism operated well, and was a model for other projects. It met in the agreed frequency stated in the project document and the minutes of the meetings were all on file. There was regular (at least annual) progress reporting to the project board or equivalent on results, risks and opportunities. It is clear that the project board explicitly reviewed and used evidence, including progress data, knowledge, lessons and evaluations, as the basis for informing management decisions (e.g., change in strategy, approach, work plan.) (all must be true to select this option)
- ☒ 2: *The project's governance mechanism met in the agreed frequency and minutes of the meeting are on file. A project progress report was submitted to the project board or equivalent at least once per year, covering results, risks and opportunities. (both must be true to select this option)*
- ☐ 1: The project's governance mechanism did not meet in the frequency stated in the project document over the past year and/or the project board or equivalent was not functioning as a decision-making body for the project as intended.

Evidence:

The project conducted 3 Project Board Meetings during reporting period. There are several technical meeting and field visit to ensure the project implementation on track and project staffs are well capacitate. S K project board also was issued by the head of project.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	4392EPASSProdocv18Feb2015Final-2_signed_7469_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/4392EPASSProdocv18Feb2015Final-2_signed_7469_310.pdf)	muhammad.afianto@undp.org	2/26/2021 3:20:00 PM

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

- ☐ 3: The project monitored risks every quarter and consulted with the key stakeholders, security advisors, to identify continuing and emerging risks to assess if the main assumptions remained valid. There is clear evidence that relevant management plans and mitigating measures were fully implemented to address each key project risk and were updated to reflect the latest risk assessment. (all must be true)
- ☒ 2: *The project monitored risks every year, as evidenced by an updated risk log. Some updates were made to management plans and mitigation measures.*
- ☐ 1: The risk log was not updated as required. There was may be some evidence that the project monitored risks that may affected the project's achievement of results, but there is no explicit evidence that management actions were taken to mitigate risks.

Evidence:

The risks were identified regularly by the project. And it was updated on Atlas and reported in PIR. Moreover, PMU team has conducted spot check to three project locations, mainly aiming to evaluate and follow up the problems regarding to procurement of several offices equipment due to lack of coordination between field offices and procurement division of MoEF. In addition to that, these spot check activities also monitored the preparation for project implementation process in three field offices in Sulawesi (Bogani Nani National Park, Lore Lindu National Park, and Greater Tangkoko Natural Reserve).

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	2020-GEF-PIR-PIMS4392-GEFID4867EPASS_7469_311 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2020-GEF-PIR-PIMS4392-GEFID4867EPASS_7469_311.docx)	anton.probiyantono@undp.org	2/24/2021 11:18:00 PM

Efficient**Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory**

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

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

Evidence:

The resources were distributed as planned in the Annual Workplan

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	KLHK-UNDPSignedAWP2019-EPASS160119_7469_312 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/KLHK-UNDPSignedAWP2019-EPASS160119_7469_312.pdf)	muhammad.afiato@undp.org	2/26/2021 3:22:00 PM
2	UNDPKLHKSignedAWP2020-EPASS_7469_312 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/UNDPKLHKSignedAWP2020-EPASS_7469_312.pdf)	muhammad.afiato@undp.org	2/26/2021 3:22:00 PM
3	PAR_2020_02_EPASS-Dec2020_7469_312 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PAR_2020_02_EPASS-Dec2020_7469_312.docx)	muhammad.afiato@undp.org	2/26/2021 3:23:00 PM
4	2020-GEF-PIR-EPASS-PIMS4392-GEFID48671_7469_312 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2020-GEF-PIR-EPASS-PIMS4392-GEFID48671_7469_312.docx)	muhammad.afiato@undp.org	2/26/2021 3:24:00 PM

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

- ☐ 3: The project had a procurement plan and kept it updated. The project quarterly reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addressed them through appropriate management actions. (all must be true)
- ☒ 2: *The project had updated procurement plan. The project annually reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addressed them through appropriate management actions. (all must be true)*
- ☐ 1: The project did not have an updated procurement plan. The project team may or may not have reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs regularly, however management actions were not taken to address them.

Evidence:

The project has an updated procurement plan on an annual basis.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	UNDPKLHKSignedAWP2020-EPASS_7469_313 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/UNDPKLHKSignedAWP2020-EPASS_7469_313.pdf)	muhammad.afianto@undp.org	2/26/2021 3:36:00 PM
2	PAR_2020_02_EPASS-Dec2020_7469_313 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PAR_2020_02_EPASS-Dec2020_7469_313.docx)	muhammad.afianto@undp.org	2/26/2021 3:34:00 PM
3	KLHK-UNDPSignedAWP2019-EPASS160119_7469_313 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/KLHK-UNDPSignedAWP2019-EPASS160119_7469_313.pdf)	muhammad.afianto@undp.org	2/26/2021 3:36:00 PM
4	2020-GEF-PIR-EPASS-PIMS4392-GEFID48671_7469_313 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2020-GEF-PIR-EPASS-PIMS4392-GEFID48671_7469_313.docx)	muhammad.afianto@undp.org	2/26/2021 3:35:00 PM

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

- ☒ 3: *There is evidence that the project regularly reviewed costs against relevant comparators (e.g., other projects or country offices) or industry benchmarks to ensure the project maximized results delivered with given resources. The project actively coordinated with other relevant ongoing projects and initiatives (UNDP or other) to ensure complementarity and sought efficiencies wherever possible (e.g. joint activities.) (both must be true)*
- ☐ 2: The project monitored its own costs and gave anecdotal examples of cost efficiencies (e.g., spending less to get the same result,) but there was no systematic analysis of costs and no link to the expected quality of results delivered. The project coordinated activities with other projects to achieve cost efficiency gains.
- ☐ 1: There is little or no evidence that the project monitored its own costs and considered ways to save money beyond following standard procurement rules.

Evidence:

The project actively coordinated with other relevant ongoing projects and initiatives (UNDP or other) to ensure complementarity and sought efficiencies wherever possible. EPASS project has actively collaborated with Sumatran Tiger Project, especially in Sustainability Financing and the development of a Situational Room for online reporting. The project team needs to monitor expenses over the allocated budget for each component and prepare budget revision as necessary.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	UNDPKLHKSignedAWP2020-EPASS_7469_314 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/UNDPKLHKSignedAWP2020-EPASS_7469_314.pdf)	muhammad.afianto@undp.org	2/26/2021 3:27:00 PM
2	PAR_2020_02_EPASS-Dec2020_7469_314 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PAR_2020_02_EPASS-Dec2020_7469_314.docx)	muhammad.afianto@undp.org	2/26/2021 3:28:00 PM
3	KLHK-UNDPSignedAWP2019-EPASS160119_7469_314 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/KLHK-UNDPSignedAWP2019-EPASS160119_7469_314.pdf)	muhammad.afianto@undp.org	2/26/2021 3:27:00 PM
4	2020-GEF-PIR-EPASS-PIMS4392-GEFID48671_7469_314 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2020-GEF-PIR-EPASS-PIMS4392-GEFID48671_7469_314.docx)	muhammad.afianto@undp.org	2/26/2021 3:26:00 PM
5	ProjectAssuranceReportPARversion1.0-TIGER-16DES20191_7469_314 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ProjectAssuranceReportPARversion1.0-TIGER-16DES20191_7469_314.docx)	muhammad.afianto@undp.org	2/26/2021 3:28:00 PM

Effective**Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory**

15. Was the project on track and delivered its expected outputs?

- ☒ Yes
☐ No

Evidence:

Project utilization rate is on track; most of annual targets were achieved. Delay in submission of final outputs are due to review process by Implementing Partner and key experts as well as obtaining feedback from stakeholders at the national and sub-national level.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	UNDPKLHKSignedAWP2020-EPASS_7469_315 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/UNDPKLHKSignedAWP2020-EPASS_7469_315.pdf)	muhammad.afiato@undp.org	2/26/2021 3:37:00 PM
2	KLHK-UNDPSignedAWP2019-EPASS160119_7469_315 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/KLHK-UNDPSignedAWP2019-EPASS160119_7469_315.pdf)	muhammad.afiato@undp.org	2/26/2021 3:37:00 PM
3	2020-GEF-PIR-EPASS-PIMS4392-GEFID48671_7469_315 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2020-GEF-PIR-EPASS-PIMS4392-GEFID48671_7469_315.docx)	muhammad.afiato@undp.org	2/26/2021 3:37:00 PM

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

- ☐ 3: Quarterly progress data informed regular reviews of the project work plan to ensure that the activities implemented were most likely to achieve the desired results. There is evidence that data and lessons learned (including from evaluations /or After-Action Reviews) were used to inform course corrections, as needed. Any necessary budget revisions were made. (both must be true)
- ☒ 2: *There was at least one review of the work plan per year with a view to assessing if project activities were on track to achieving the desired development results (i.e., outputs.) There may or may not be evidence that data or lessons learned were used to inform the review(s). Any necessary budget revisions have been made.*
- ☐ 1: While the project team may have reviewed the work plan at least once over the past year to ensure outputs were delivered on time, no link was made to the delivery of desired development results. Select this option also if no review of the work plan by management took place.

Evidence:

The project organized meeting in each quarter to review delivery of project and find solution for any identified bottleneck related with procurement and team work. However, the results of meeting have not yet been documented as lesson learned.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	PAR_2020_02_EPASS-Dec2020_7469_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PAR_2020_02_EPASS-Dec2020_7469_316.docx)	muhammad.afianto@undp.org	2/26/2021 3:57:00 PM
2	Final-EPASS-2019-GEF-PIR-PIMS4392-GEFID48671_7469_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Final-EPASS-2019-GEF-PIR-PIMS4392-GEFID48671_7469_316.docx)	muhammad.afianto@undp.org	2/26/2021 3:58:00 PM

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

- ☒ 3: *The project targeted specific groups and/or geographic areas, identified by using credible data sources on their capacity needs, deprivation and/or exclusion from development opportunities relevant to the project's area of work. There is clear evidence that the targeted groups were reached as intended. The project engaged regularly with targeted groups over the past year to assess whether they benefited as expected and adjustments were made if necessary, to refine targeting. (all must be true)*
- ☐ 2: The project targeted specific groups and/or geographic areas, based on some evidence of their capacity needs, deprivation and/or exclusion from development opportunities relevant to the project's area of work. Some evidence is provided to confirm that project beneficiaries are members of the targeted groups. There was some engagement with beneficiaries in the past year to assess whether they were benefiting as expected. (all must be true)
- ☐ 1: The project did not report on specific targeted groups. There is no evidence to confirm that project beneficiaries are populations have capacity needs or are deprived and/or excluded from development opportunities relevant to the project area of work. There is some engagement with beneficiaries to assess whether they benefited as expected, but it was limited or did not occurred in the past year.
- ☐ Not Applicable

Evidence:

The project has facilitated the development of Community Conservation Agreement (CCA). Its objective is to achieve at least 45 villages working with approx. 900 people beneficiaries.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	PAR_2020_02_EPASS-Dec2020_7469_317 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PAR_2020_02_EPASS-Dec2020_7469_317.docx)	muhammad.afianto@undp.org	2/26/2021 3:41:00 PM
2	EPASS-TEMgtResponse-2Feb2021_7469_317 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/EPASS-TEMgtResponse-2Feb2021_7469_317.docx)	muhammad.afianto@undp.org	2/26/2021 3:43:00 PM
3	2020-GEF-PIR-EPASS-PIMS4392-GEFID48671_7469_317 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2020-GEF-PIR-EPASS-PIMS4392-GEFID48671_7469_317.docx)	muhammad.afianto@undp.org	2/26/2021 3:40:00 PM
4	LaporancapaianEPASSTNBNW02.09.2020copy_7469_317 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/LaporancapaianEPASSTNBNW02.09.2020copy_7469_317.pdf)	muhammad.afianto@undp.org	2/26/2021 3:41:00 PM

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

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

- ☐ 3: Only national systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) were used to fully implement and monitor the project. All relevant stakeholders and partners were fully and actively engaged in the process, playing a lead role in project decision-making, implementation and monitoring. (both must be true)
- ☒ 2: *National systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) were used to implement and monitor the project (such as country office support or project systems) were also used, if necessary. All relevant stakeholders and partners were actively engaged in the process, playing an active role in project decision-making, implementation and monitoring. (both must be true)*
- ☐ 1: There was relatively limited or no engagement with national stakeholders and partners in the decision-making, implementation and/or monitoring of the project.
- ☐ Not Applicable

Evidence:

NIM and COSS as per agreed in Project Document Annex 3.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	4392EPASSProdocv18Feb2015Final-Signed prodoc_7469_318 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/4392EPASSProdocv18Feb2015Final-Signedprodoc_7469_318.pdf)	harti.ningsih@undp.org	2/24/2021 2:16:00 PM

19. Were there regular monitoring of changes in capacities and performance of institutions and systems relevant to the project, as needed, and were the implementation [arrangements](#)⁸ adjusted according to changes in partner capacities?

- ☐ 3: Changes in capacities and performance of national institutions and systems were assessed/monitored using clear indicators, rigorous methods of data collection and credible data sources including relevant HACT assurance activities. Implementation arrangements were formally reviewed and adjusted, if needed, in agreement with partners according to changes in partner capacities. (all must be true)
- ☒ **2: Aspects of changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems were monitored by the project using indicators and reasonably credible data sources including relevant HACT assurance activities. Some adjustment was made to implementation arrangements if needed to reflect changes in partner capacities. (all must be true)**
- ☐ 1: Some aspects of changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems may have been monitored by the project, however changes to implementation arrangements have not been considered. Also select this option if changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems have not been monitored by the project.
- ☐ Not Applicable

Evidence:

There have been several adjustments up to the end of the project. HACT of MoEF has been updated during the MTR and TE. The project also developed the Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	LembarPenilaianMETTTNBNW20191_7469_319 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/LembarPenilaianMETTTNBNW20191_7469_319.xlsx)	muhammad.afianto@undp.org	2/26/2021 3:45:00 PM
2	PenilaianMETTBatuangus_7469_319 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PenilaianMETTBatuangus_7469_319.xlsx)	muhammad.afianto@undp.org	2/26/2021 3:46:00 PM
3	METT_2019-2TWA_Batuputih_SulawesiUtara_7469_319 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/METT_2019-2TWA_Batuputih_SulawesiUtara_7469_319.xlsx)	muhammad.afianto@undp.org	2/26/2021 3:46:00 PM
4	LembarRekomendasiMETTTNLL2019_7469_319 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/LembarRekomendasiMETTTNLL2019_7469_319.docx)	muhammad.afianto@undp.org	2/26/2021 3:46:00 PM

20. Were the transition and phase-out arrangements were reviewed and adjusted according to progress (including financial commitment and capacity).

- ☐ 3: The project's governance mechanism regularly reviewed the project's sustainability plan, including arrangements for transition and phase-out, to ensure the project remained on track in meeting the requirements set out by the plan. The plan was implemented as planned by the end of the project, taking into account any adjustments made during implementation. (both must be true)
- ☒ 2: *There was a review of the project's sustainability plan, including arrangements for transition and phase-out, to ensure the project remained on track in meeting the requirements set out by the plan.*
- ☐ 1: The project may have had a sustainability plan but there was no review of this strategy after it was developed. Also select this option if the project did not have a sustainability strategy.

Evidence:

During the inception, project's workshop and AWP workshop, project sustainability issue has been continuously discussed, and feedback has been received from different key stakeholders. One of them is by ensuring that project activities are always inline, updated and integrated with priority of government, in national as well as local level.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	KLHK-UNDPSignedAWP2019-EPASS160119_7469_320 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/KLHK-UNDPSignedAWP2019-EPASS160119_7469_320.pdf)	muhammad.afianto@undp.org	2/26/2021 3:49:00 PM
2	UNDPKLHKSignedAWP2020-EPASS_7469_320 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/UNDPKLHKSignedAWP2020-EPASS_7469_320.pdf)	muhammad.afianto@undp.org	2/26/2021 3:54:00 PM
3	PAR_2020_02_EPASS-Dec2020_7469_320 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PAR_2020_02_EPASS-Dec2020_7469_320.docx)	muhammad.afianto@undp.org	2/26/2021 3:56:00 PM

QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments

EPASS project has closed its activities on December 31, 2020. In coordination with UNDP CO and BRH, it has been working closely with an international consultant and national consultant to develop draft of Terminal Evaluation (at present, it is still under review of BRH for clearance). Since the evaluation was conducted during the Covid-19 pandemic, the report (draft) was developed through a process of virtual interviews with national and sub-national stakeholders. The report shared its recommendations on (1) the importance of partnership, (2) the importance of formal policy to accommodate the development of agreement between the Government of Indonesia and CBOs, especially it relates to the distribution of funding from central government to CBOs; (3) continued challenges that require stronger public awareness on the importance of biodiversity conservation; (4) stronger CBOs' involvement to support biodiversity conservation; (5) Resort-based management must continue in the fields; (6) micro-grant is able to strengthen local ownership on the importance of biodiversity conservation; (7) local stakeholders (including National Park management) must support the importance of biodiversity conservation; (8) there must be a strategic approach to invite private sector involved in the biodiversity conservation; (9) it is important to upscale and replicate the resort-based management; (10) options for Protected Area (PA) financing must be explored and piloted further in other PAs; (11) it is important to strengthen economic strengthening for local communities (at buffer zones) in order to assure ecological sustainability; (12) it is important for the government to coordinate activities undertaken by any institutions interested in the biodiversity in the fields.