

Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

Form Status: Approved

Overall Rating:	Satisfactory
Decision:	
Portfolio/Project Number:	00091122
Portfolio/Project Title:	Climate change adaptation and food security
Portfolio/Project Date:	2017-10-15 / 2020-12-31

Strategic

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

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:

1. Value Chain Analysis: Initially, the project design only considered agriculture-related livelihood development. However, based on the value chain analysis undertaken by the project and to take a more holistic approach to climate change adaptation and resilience building, the project components were later revised to include non-agricultural value chains.
2. Post-COVID Recovery - Given the effect of the pandemic on the micro-enterprises established by the project, the project undertook a post-COVID economic impact assessment and provided recommendations to ensure the sustainability of the enterprises.

In this way, the project was proactive in analyzing contextual changes and using them to further the project and its objectives.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	PostCovidImpactAssessmentReport_6133_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PostCovidImpactAssessmentReport_6133_301.docx)	devmini.withanachchi@undp.org	10/22/2020 5:29:00 AM
2	NEDARecomendationReportforValueChainDevelopment_6133_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/NEDARecomendationReportforValueChainDevelopment_6133_301.docx)	devmini.withanachchi@undp.org	10/22/2020 5:29:00 AM

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 responds to the Strategic Plan. Below are the SP output indicators included in the project's RRF;

- 1.1.2.1 Number and proportion of people accessing basic services disaggregated by target groups- Poor, Women,
- 1.1.2.1.B. Number and proportion of people accessing basic services disaggregated by target group- Women, and,
- 1.4.1.1.C Number of micros, small and medium-sized enterprises utilizing supplier development platforms for inclusive and sustainable value chains - improve productivity or value-added processing.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	CCAP2-CRPT2018-2019_6133_302 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CCAP2-CRPT2018-2019_6133_302.docx)	devmini.withanachchi@undp.org	10/23/2020 7:47:00 AM

Relevant**Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

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:

1. Vulnerability Assessment - The project initially conducted a vulnerability assessment to identify climate vulnerability hotspots using three vulnerability criteria considering both social and environmental aspects. The areas that had a higher vulnerability to the effects of climate change were eventually selected to be the project sites.

2. In consultation with the community, the project undertook an assessment to identify the most appropriate livelihood options to build community resilience against climate change.

3. In collaboration with the National Enterprise Development Agency, the livelihood development options proposed by the communities were assessed through a value chain analysis, and the most appropriate value chains for resilience building were identified and implemented.

Project interventions have been carried out based on the above assessments, which helped to ensure targeting of the most vulnerable groups.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	TrainingonProjectCycleManagementDevelopmentofCommunityProjectProposals_6133_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/TrainingonProjectCycleManagementDevelopmentofCommunityProjectProposals_6133_303.pdf)	devmini.withanachchi@undp.org	10/22/2020 5:32:00 AM
2	VulnerabilityAssessmentReport_6133_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/VulnerabilityAssessmentReport_6133_303.pdf)	devmini.withanachchi@undp.org	10/22/2020 5:32:00 AM

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:

1. The project created 3 Training Manuals on Minor Tank Construction Supervision, Minor tank Operations and Maintenance, and Minor Tank Ecosystem Development. These manuals were the basis for the minor tank rehabilitation activities conducted on the ground with farmer organizations. These training manuals have also been handed over to the line agencies within the project sites for their development planning and use.
2. Sustainability Plans for Community Enterprises - The project assessed micro-enterprises under 5 themes in November 2019 and identified their barriers to sustainability. Based on these findings, recommendations were made and implemented before project closure to ensure the sustainability of enterprises after project closure. The recommendations centered around improving market access, improving financial management systems of the micro-enterprises, and further assistance on capacity building.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	FarmerTrainingManual1_6133_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FarmerTrainingManual1_6133_304.pdf)	devmini.withanachchi@undp.org	10/22/2020 5:33:00 AM
2	FarmerTrainingManual2_6133_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FarmerTrainingManual2_6133_304.pdf)	devmini.withanachchi@undp.org	10/22/2020 5:34:00 AM
3	FarmerTrainingManual3_6133_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FarmerTrainingManual3_6133_304.pdf)	devmini.withanachchi@undp.org	10/22/2020 5:34:00 AM
4	SustainabilityPlanforCommunityEnterprises_6133_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SustainabilityPlanforCommunityEnterprises_6133_304.pdf)	devmini.withanachchi@undp.org	10/22/2020 5:34:00 AM

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:

1. The project developed 3 policy briefs on the subjects, Gender & Climate Change, Climate Advisory Services and Sustainable Food Systems, informed by the project interventions, their success, case studies and gaps in the said interventions. These policy briefs advocate for holistic policy changes in terms of climate change adaptation and food security based on the lessons learned from the project.

2. Other UNDP projects have adapted the project's Green Supply Chain model and are planning to expand the model within their project sites. The Green Supply Chain model is an agricultural supply chain model that's greener, has reduced emissions and impact on the environment, toxin-free at all stages of the supply chain and are certified by globally accepted certification bodies to add value and encourage ethical consumption.

In this way, UNDP, in collaboration with WFP and the Ministry of Environment, has concrete plans to scale up the project. A concept note has been prepared to be submitted to the Adaptation Fund to initiate the next phase of project development, which will build on the work and lessons from this project.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	WFP_AFPPre-ConceptRegionalSriLanka-India_6133_305 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/WFP_AFPPre-ConceptRegionalSriLanka-India_6133_305.pdf)	devmini.withanachchi@undp.org	10/22/2020 5:35:00 AM
2	GenderPolicyBrief_28pages_6133_305 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/GenderPolicyBrief_28pages_6133_305.pdf)	devmini.withanachchi@undp.org	10/26/2020 2:00:00 PM
3	PB_ClimateAdvisoryServices_24_6133_305 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PB_ClimateAdvisoryServices_24_6133_305.pdf)	devmini.withanachchi@undp.org	10/26/2020 2:01:00 PM
4	PB_ClimateSmartTools_28_6133_305 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PB_ClimateSmartTools_28_6133_305.pdf)	devmini.withanachchi@undp.org	10/26/2020 2:01:00 PM
5	PB_ecosystembasedadaptation_32_6133_305 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PB_ecosystembasedadaptation_32_6133_305.pdf)	devmini.withanachchi@undp.org	10/26/2020 2:01:00 PM
6	PolicyBrief_SFS_32pages_6133_305 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PolicyBrief_SFS_32pages_6133_305.pdf)	devmini.withanachchi@undp.org	10/26/2020 2:01:00 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:

Based on field observations and recommendations of technical advisors, project interventions were designed to address the needs of women and further empower them. The project has taken special consideration to include women in micro-enterprises, the project has supported their capacity development in terms of entrepreneurial skills, financial management skills, and other upskilling necessary for specific value chains. Further, the project conducted a gender assessment and identified structural gender barriers such as the lack of access to productive resources, lack of mobility, and lack of access to positions of decision-making and power. The project then addressed these issues by providing women beneficiaries with non-traditional income generation opportunities via the micro-enterprises, while the exposure to innovation and access to capacity building in terms of marketing skills, financial management, entrepreneurial skills have elevated these beneficiaries to positions of leadership within their communities. The case study titled "Women's Economic Empowerment For Climate Resilience" in the "Gender & Climate Change" policy brief includes evidence of how the micro-enterprises established by the project positively affected the income level of these women beneficiaries (Please refer to the policy brief attached above in Question 5).

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	ProjectGenderReview_6133_306 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ProjectGenderReview_6133_306.docx)	devmini.withanachchi@undp.org	10/22/2020 5:36:00 AM
2	SurveyResultsonWomensParticipationandIncomeIncrease_6133_306 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SurveyResultsonWomensParticipationandIncomeIncrease_6133_306.xlsx)	devmini.withanachchi@undp.org	10/22/2020 5:36:00 AM

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:

The project conducted a SESP at the initial stage of the project and the project was consequently categorized as a low-risk project. Further, during project implementation, the project has not come across any major social or environmental risk issues. The only Potential risks identified were the exclusion of potential stakeholders from participating in the decision-making process, the duty bearers lacking the capacity to meet project obligations, potentially exacerbating conflicts or risk of violence among affected communities, production/harvesting of fish, and the project potentially generating waste. However, none of these potential risks materialized during project implementation and all project activities were implemented with care to avoid the aforementioned risks from materializing.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	SESP_CCAP_6133_307 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SESP_CCAP_6133_307.docx)	devmini.withanachchi@undp.org	10/22/2020 5:36:00 AM

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:

UNDP's project is part of a larger WFP-Government-led project. Therefore, UNDP used the same grievance redress mechanisms as the Government, which is led by the Divisional Secretaries of the respective project sites. In each project site, the project established a coordination meeting system that included the UNDP Project Officers, relevant officers from the Divisional Secretariat, and the project beneficiaries that met regularly, where discussions regarding the project including grievances were raised and addressed. Each Divisional Secretariat also had a dedicated officer overlooking the project components, and beneficiaries could use this officer as a point of contact for complaints. Further, complaint boxes were also available within the Divisional Secretariat office premises, where they could submit complaints anonymously, if necessary.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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 project conducted a baseline report at the inception and thereafter, annual donor and indicator reporting was conducted. Further, data was also collected on a quarterly basis using UNDP's Critical Results Pathway Tool.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	CCAP2-CRPT2018-2019_6133_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CCAP2-CRPT2018-2019_6133_309.docx)	devmini.withanachchi@undp.org	10/22/2020 5:37:00 AM
2	Baseline_Walapane19july2017_6133_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Baseline_Walapane19july2017_6133_309.pdf)	devmini.withanachchi@undp.org	10/22/2020 5:41:00 AM
3	Baseline_MedirigiriyareportJuly192017_6133_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Baseline_MedirigiriyareportJuly192017_6133_309.pdf)	devmini.withanachchi@undp.org	10/22/2020 5:41:00 AM
4	MTRreportfinal_6133_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MTRreportfinal_6133_309.pdf)	devmini.withanachchi@undp.org	10/23/2020 7:49:00 AM

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 is a WFP-Government-led project, where WFP and the Ministry of Environment primarily implement the project with financial assistance from the Adaptation Fund. The UNDP components were a part of this larger project. Therefore, UNDP is part of the main Project Board and participated in Board meetings, where the progress of UNDP's components were also reviewed. Regular Project Board Meetings were held to inform the implementation process, and the Closure Project Board Meeting was held in 2020.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	ProgressReviewPresentation_6133_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ProgressReviewPresentation_6133_310.pdf)	devmini.withanachchi@undp.org	10/22/2020 5:42:00 AM
2	Projectboardmeetingminutes_NPSC_final_2020_6133_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Projectboardmeetingminutes_NPSC_final_2020_6133_310.pdf)	devmini.withanachchi@undp.org	10/22/2020 5:42:00 AM

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 project had a risk log, which was monitored on a regular basis. The risk log was maintained on ATL AS. In addition to regular monitoring, risks were also discussed and addressed at Project Board Meetings (please refer to document titled "Minutes of NPSC Meeting of CCA Project 21st Aug 2018" where the risks identified at the Mid Term Review are discussed and the application of effective solutions are agreed upon).

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	MinutesofNPSCMeetingofCCAProject21stAug2018_6133_311 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MinutesofNPSCMeetingofCCAProject21stAug2018_6133_311.pdf)	devmini.withanachchi@undp.org	10/26/2020 7:00:00 AM

Efficient**Quality Rating: 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:

US\$ 1,829,223.00 was allocated for the UNDP components, and the results framework was designed around the available budget and effectively utilized all available funds to achieve the intended results.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	UNDPFinalReportCCAP_6133_312 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/UNDPFinalReportCCAP_6133_312.pdf)	devmini.withanachchi@undp.org	10/22/2020 5:43:00 AM

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 CCAP project was implemented by the Ministry of Environment and initially was stalled due to various reasons. At this stage, UNDP was brought in as an implementing partner to expedite project implementation. UNDP adopted an expedited approach to procuring the necessary inputs to achieve project outputs in a timely manner. For instance, the community enterprises established by the project needed seed funding and systematic technical support to establish themselves as robust enterprises. To address this issue, UNDP explored instruments available within the UNDP system but eventually determined that an appropriate external entity was more suitable to efficiently disburse this seed funding while also additionally supporting the incubation process of the enterprises. The procuring of this entity was done swiftly using UNDP's procurement mechanisms and this was a catalyst in reaching the intended outcomes according to plan. (The partnership request letter outlines how UNDP contributes to the project's implementation. Further, please refer to paragraphs "Need of new strategies to implementation of the project during the extension period" and "Partnership with UNDP to implement the project" of the document titled "4th NPSC Meeting Minutes". (Further evidence of the project's timely delivery are highlighted in the paragraph titled "Closing Remarks by Mr. Anura Dissanayake, Secretary, MMDE" of the document titled "Minutes_NPSC_7".))

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	4thNPSCMeetingMinutes_6133_313 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/4thNPSCMeetingMinutes_6133_313.pdf)	devmini.withanachchi@undp.org	10/26/2020 6:49:00 AM
2	AssetRegistryCCAP_6133_313 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/AssetRegistryCCAP_6133_313.pdf)	devmini.withanachchi@undp.org	10/23/2020 7:19:00 AM
3	Minutes_NPSC_7_6133_313 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Minutes_NPSC_7_6133_313.pdf)	devmini.withanachchi@undp.org	10/26/2020 6:54:00 AM
4	UNDPPartnershipRequestLetter_6133_313 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/UNDPPartnershipRequestLetter_6133_313.pdf)	devmini.withanachchi@undp.org	10/26/2020 6:58:00 AM

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:

Although the project made attempts to utilize cost-efficient approaches, there's little to no evidence of this.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Effective**Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

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

- ☒ Yes
☐ No

Evidence:

During the project period, UNDP met all planned out put and indicator targets. The project has utilized all allocated funds and UNDP has brought the project to a successful close. The project is currently in the process of completing its terminal evaluation and this will be uploaded when available. (Please also refer to the Final Report of the project which has been uploaded for Question 12)

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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:

Regular progress review meetings were held at various levels (including community level, ministry level, and the UNDP country office level) on a semi-annual basis. These meetings were used to assess project implementation, and, identify and address bottlenecks while making sure the project was on track to deliver its targets.

Please refer to documents titled "Meeting Minutes_Walapane_11th November 2019 and Meeting Minutes & Action Points for CE Development" as evidence of community-level meetings. Please refer to the document titled "Meeting Minutes of the Discussion with GAP Certification Unit of DOA" for evidence of ministry-level meetings.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Minutesofmeeting-CCAPAWP2020_6133_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Minutesofmeeting-CCAPAWP2020_6133_316.pdf)	devmini.withanachchi@undp.org	10/23/2020 7:43:00 AM
2	CCAP_2020AWPAndYear-EndReview-Feb182020_6133_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CCAP_2020AWPAndYear-EndReview-Feb182020_6133_316.ppt)	devmini.withanachchi@undp.org	10/23/2020 7:44:00 AM
3	ProcurementPlan-CCAP2020_6133_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ProcurementPlan-CCAP2020_6133_316.pdf)	devmini.withanachchi@undp.org	10/23/2020 7:44:00 AM
4	ProjectAWP2020-CCAP_6133_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ProjectAWP2020-CCAP_6133_316.pdf)	devmini.withanachchi@undp.org	10/23/2020 7:45:00 AM
5	CoverPage-AWPs2020-CCAP_6133_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CoverPage-AWPs2020-CCAP_6133_316.pdf)	devmini.withanachchi@undp.org	10/23/2020 7:45:00 AM
6	MeetingMinutes_Walapane_11thNovember2019_6133_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MeetingMinutes_Walapane_11thNovember2019_6133_316.docx)	devmini.withanachchi@undp.org	10/26/2020 5:40:00 AM
7	MeetingminutesandactionpointsforWalapaneCEdevelopment16072019_6133_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MeetingminutesandactionpointsforWalapaneCEdevelopment16072019_6133_316.docx)	devmini.withanachchi@undp.org	10/26/2020 5:41:00 AM
8	MeetingminutesofthediscussionwithGAPCertificationUnitofDOA_6133_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MeetingminutesofthediscussionwithGAPCertificationUnitofDOA_6133_316.docx)	devmini.withanachchi@undp.org	10/26/2020 5:45:00 AM

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 conducted a Vulnerability Assessment to identify vulnerability hotspots so that the project benefited the most climate-vulnerable communities (please refer to the Vulnerability Assessment Report uploaded for Question 03). After which, to determine the target beneficiaries, the project created a Beneficiary Selection Criteria Checklist which was administered by the Economic Development Officers in the selected Divisional Secretariat Divisions, from which the most vulnerable beneficiaries were selected to be recipients of project interventions.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	BENEFICIARYSELECTIONCRITERIA_6133_317 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/BENEFICIARYSELECTIONCRITERIA_6133_317.docx)	devmini.withanachchi@undp.org	10/26/2020 5:49:00 AM

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:

The project was directly implemented by UNDP. However, government stakeholders were very closely involved in most aspects of decision-making and project implementation since the project inception. For instance, government stakeholders were involved and consulted extensively for beneficiary selection, project intervention selection and many other aspects of the project (please refer to project board meeting minutes attached for Question 10 and meeting minutes from the community and ministry level attached for Question 16).

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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:

This is a directly implemented project.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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:

The project has had multiple discussions to review and finalize its exit strategy. The highlight of the exit strategy for the UNDP component is; to ensure the sustainability of the micro-enterprises established by UNDP, in consultation with the Ministry of Environment. The enterprises were brought under one umbrella and registered as a cooperative. The enterprises will be governed, monitored, and supported by the Department of Cooperatives after project closure.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Co-OpRegistrationCertificate_6133_320 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Co-OpRegistrationCertificate_6133_320.pdf)	devmini.withanachchi@undp.org	10/23/2020 7:29:00 AM

QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments

The CCAP project is a WFP & Ministry of Environment led project. WFP brought in UNDP to expedite the livelihood development components of the project. Within this scope, the project has been able to successfully achieve the intended results identified in the Project Document and has delivered a hundred percent of the planned outputs. Most notably, the project has also effectively addressed certain structural gender barriers that plague communities in the project sites. In this context, the Closure Project Board Meeting was conducted recently and the terminal evaluation is underway.

One persistent issue in terms of project interventions has been the sustainability of the micro-enterprises—considering the timeframe afforded to UNDP, ensuring the durability of these micro-enterprises was of paramount concern. The implications of the COVID-19 pandemic only added another unprecedented layer of risk to this issue. However, upon discussion with the stakeholders, UNDP established these micro-enterprises within a cooperative (as an exit strategy and a sustainability measure), where the Department of Cooperatives will now be supporting and monitoring these enterprises.

The project has also developed knowledge products, specifically three policy briefs based on lessons from the project interventions, and these policy briefs will inform future policymaking processes and advocate for building resilience to climate change. Along the lines of further building climate resilience, WFP together with UNDP and the Ministry of Environment is working on developing a proposal to scale up the project (soon to be submitted to the Adaptation Fund). Lastly, the project has also been a catalyst in improving collaboration and cooperation between other UN agencies such as the WFP and the close working arrangements with the government stakeholders have enabled the UNDP to build a relationship to not only successfully conclude this project but also to work on other development projects.