

# Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

**Form Status: Approved**

**Overall Rating:** Highly Satisfactory

**Decision:**

**Portfolio/Project Number:** 00105180

**Portfolio/Project Title:** WB FCPF REDD+ Readiness II

**Portfolio/Project Date:** 2018-01-01 / 2022-03-31

**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:**

Funded by the World bank and implemented by UN DP from 2015 to 2020 (in two phases), the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility (FCPF) REDD+ Readiness Project aimed at getting Papua New Guinea ready for implementing the REDD+.

The project's relevance has been assessed as "Very Satisfactory". The project has created an opportunity for the country to apply for the next phase of REDD+ Implementation - Results Based Payment. This will allow the country to achieve climate change mitigation targets by 2030 as indicated in the national and international strategic documents.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

| # | File Name  | Modified By                | Modified On           |
|---|--|----------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | FCPFfinalevaluationreportFinalclean_6009_301 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FCPFfinalevaluationreportFinalclean_6009_301.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FCPFfinalevaluationreportFinalclean_6009_301.docx</a> ) | mirzohaydar.isoev@undp.org | 12/29/2020 1:02:00 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 settings<sup>1</sup> 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 is aligned with:

- National strategies, in particular:
  - o The Vision 2050, which foresees the conservation of 70% of PNG's forest for carbon purposes;
  - o The Medium Term Development Plan III (2018-2022) and its key result area 7. "Responsible sustainable development";
  - o The National Strategy for Responsible Sustainable Development for Papua New Guinea (STaRS) and its associated Green Growth Framework;
  - o The Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC), the Climate Response Roadmap (SDG13), the National Climate Change Action Plan, the Climate Change Management Act and the Implementation Act of Paris Agreement.
- PNG international commitments, in particular through the UNFCCC the Paris Agreement;
- The United Nations Development Assistance Framework (2018-2022) for PNG, in particular its outcome 3 "Sustainable management of natural resources, biodiversity conservation, strengthened climate and disaster resilience" and the UNDP Strategic plan, especially its Signature Solution 4 "Promote nature-based solutions for a sustainable planet".

**List of Uploaded Documents**

| # | File Name  | Modified By                 | Modified On           |
|---|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | FCPFfinalevaluationreportFinalclean_6009_302 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FCPFfinalevaluationreportFinalclean_6009_302.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FCPFfinalevaluationreportFinalclean_6009_302.docx</a> ) | mirzohaydar.isoiev@undp.org | 12/29/2020 1:14:00 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:

The project has built capacity of the Government to manage REDD+ and engaged other relevant government agencies such as Department of Agriculture and Livestock (DAL), Conservation and Environment Protection Authority (CEPA), Department of Lands and Physical Planning (DLPP) as well as representatives from sub-national government, civil society and private sector in implementation of project activities.

#### List of Uploaded Documents

| # | File Name   | Modified By                | Modified On           |
|---|---|----------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFFormDocuments/2020UNDPFCPFAnnualReport_6009_303.pdf">2020UNDPFCPFAnnualReport_6009_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFFormDocuments/2020UNDPFCPFAnnualReport_6009_303.pdf)</a> | mirzohaydar.isoev@undp.org | 12/29/2020 1:17:00 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:**

The project design is based on the lessons learnt from UN-REDD programme (2011 – 2017), which has been the main project supporting REDD+ readiness in the country prior to the FCPF projects. These lessons have been gathered through a national workshop and the project final evaluation. They have been in general well considered in the FCPF project. However, some recommendations, including from the project Mid Term Review (MTR) have not been sufficiently addressed (e.g. establishment of NRSC, co-financing formalized in project document, minutes of PMU meetings).

**List of Uploaded Documents**

| #                       | File Name | Modified By | Modified On |
|-------------------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|
| No documents available. |           |             |             |

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:**

Despite the COVID 19 imposed restrictions on the project activities more than 200 representatives (25% female) participated virtually and benefited from the World Bank's Forest Carbon Partnership (FCPF) REDD+ Project through active online engagement in different stakeholder consultations and capacity building programmes mainly at the national level.

The Government has selected three provinces for the project to build the capacity for REDD+ implementation: Madang, East New Britain and West New Britain. This selection seems relevant and was based on the presence of forest cover loss hotspots, previous work done, private sector activity, and ongoing dev

s work done, private sector activity, and ongoing development interventions.

All four design elements of the Warsaw Framework (National REDD+ Strategy, National Forest Monitoring System, SIS and FREL/FRL) were developed with technical assistance of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). This allowed PNG to prepare a submission for RBP to the Green Climate Fund (GCF) and other donor agencies.

PNG's Guidelines on Provincial Forest Plans (PFP) supported and endorsed by the National Forest Board in its Meeting No.227 Resolutions 6.2 on 14 May 2020. PFPs of Madang, West New Britain and East New Britain of PFPs for Madang, ENB and WNB submitted to the respective provincial administrations for endorsement by the Provincial Executive Councils;

A REDD+ Summary of Information (SOI) and REDD+ Safeguards Information Systems (SIS) Framework developed and endorsed by NEC, Decision 343/2020. Copy of the SOI uploaded on the UNFCCC website.

Regional stakeholder consultation workshops on the review of the National Sustainable Land Use Policy supported. The Land Use Policy highlights the importance of land use planning for sustainable development. More than 65 participants attended each of this workshop with (40% female) participants.

Regional stakeholder consultations on the review of PNG Forestry Act (1991) supported. More than 65 participants attended each of this workshop with (25% female) participants.

Development of future scenarios for private sector engagement in PNG's forest Sector highlighted the development of scenarios of possible futures for the PNG forestry sector undertaken based on extensive consultation, collation of facts and evidence, and via a participatory process. Four scenarios identified and considered for the immediate and out to 2050 implications for the forestry sector.

PNG's Enhanced Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC) and the Implementation Plan endorsed by the National Executive Council under Decision number 398/2020. The development of PNG's NDCs aligns with the national strategies and builds on the first NDC submitted in 2016.

NDC Submitted in 2010

**List of Uploaded Documents**

| # | File Name  | Modified By                | Modified On           |
|---|--|----------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | 2020UNDPFCPFAnnualReport_6009_305 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2020UNDPFCPFAnnualReport_6009_305.pdf) | mirzohaydar.isoev@undp.org | 12/29/2020 1:37:00 AM |

**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-inclusive REDD+ stakeholder engagement plans have been developed for the three target provinces in order to support the full and effective participation of key stakeholders in the implementation of PNG's National REDD+ Strategy. However, they have not been clearly endorsed by the provinces.

A gender analysis has been carried out but not very much mainstreamed in NRS and NRFIP. There is no gender guidelines for REDD+ implementation. Only gender-sensitive engagement plans in the three provinces have been developed, and gender disaggregated data for participation has been generated

### List of Uploaded Documents

| # | File Name  | Modified By                | Modified On           |
|---|--|----------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | FCPFfinalevaluationreportFinalclean_6009_306 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FCPFfinalevaluationreportFinalclean_6009_306.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FCPFfinalevaluationreportFinalclean_6009_306.pdf</a> ) | mirzohaydar.isoev@undp.org | 12/29/2020 1:40:00 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 complied with FCPF Common Approach for Multiple Delivery Partners.

Based on UNDP's Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) applying UNDP's Social and Environmental Standards (SES), a draft Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) has been developed for a UNDP concept note for the Green Climate Fund (GCF) that aimed to implement the National REDD+ Strategy (NRS). However, this analysis has not been much integrated to the NRFIP, which lacks an assessment of the risks and mitigation measures associated with each investment.

PNG has established a multi-stakeholder Technical Working Committee on Social and Environmental Safeguards (SES-TWC) to serve as the primary platform for engaging stakeholders in its country approach to safeguards. The SES-TWC is co-chaired by DNP M and CCDA. Its members comprise representatives from government agencies, academic institutions, civil society organizations and private sector.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

| # | File Name   | Modified By                | Modified On           |
|---|---|----------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | FCPFFinalProgressReport2015-2020_6009_307 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FCPFFinalProgressReport2015-2020_6009_307.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FCPFFinalProgressReport2015-2020_6009_307.pdf</a> ) | mirzohaydar.isoev@undp.org | 12/29/2020 1:43:00 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:**

A Summary of Information (SOI) on safeguards, together with a National Safeguards Information System (SIS), which have been endorsed by the National Executive Council in November 2020, as well as the guidelines for a Grievance and Redress Mechanism (GRM).

**List of Uploaded Documents**

| # | File Name  | Modified By                | Modified On           |
|---|--|----------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | Final_Revised_CCDA_GRM_Guidelines_6009_308 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Final_Revised_CCDA_GRM_Guidelines_6009_308.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Final_Revised_CCDA_GRM_Guidelines_6009_308.pdf</a> ) | mirzohaydar.isoev@undp.org | 12/29/2020 1:46:00 AM |

**Management & Monitoring****Quality Rating: Highly 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 was 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 developed its M&E plan to track the progress of achievement of targets and indicators. 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 was some slippage in following the frequency stated in the Plan and data sources was not always reliable.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

| # | File Name   | Modified By                | Modified On           |
|---|---|----------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | FCPFPProjectMonitoringPlan_6009_309 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FCPFPProjectMonitoringPlan_6009_309.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FCPFPProjectMonitoringPlan_6009_309.docx</a> ) | mirzohaydar.isoev@undp.org | 12/29/2020 1:50:00 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:**

Decision-making in the Project Executive Board (PEB) has been transparent and effective, with many stakeholders invited as observers and minutes elaborated. However, the PEB composition, which has varied over time, did not respect what was indicated in the project documents and could have been improved. In fact, as the agency in charge of implementing outcome 4 of the FCP project phase II, FAO should arguably have been part of the PEB, which was not the case. Likewise, the PEB was supposed to meet twice a year and met only once every year. More frequent meetings could have helped to strengthen ownership and accountability of the different organizations involved and their involvement in steering the project. The PEB has approved annual work plan and budgets, but some changes in the project's outputs (e.g. not to develop Provincial REDD+ action plans) are not mentioned in the PEB minutes. The PEB has also discussed the project's progress, challenges and lessons learnt and provided recommendations to steer the project implementation.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

| # | File Name  | Modified By                | Modified On           |
|---|--|----------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | 2020_PEBMeetingMinutes_final_6009_310 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2020_PEBMeetingMinutes_final_6009_310.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2020_PEBMeetingMinutes_final_6009_310.docx</a> )                    | mirzohaydar.isoev@undp.org | 12/29/2020 1:53:00 AM |
| 2 | FCPFfinalevaluationreportFinalclean_6009_310 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FCPFfinalevaluationreportFinalclean_6009_310.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FCPFfinalevaluationreportFinalclean_6009_310.pdf</a> ) | mirzohaydar.isoev@undp.org | 12/29/2020 1:53:00 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 has been well-managed, with good practices implemented in terms of planning and budgeting, risk management, monitoring and reporting, as well as compliance. Adaptive management has allowed to be flexible and responsive enough to seize opportunities and build synergies with other works, for example in relation to policy reforms and fundraising. The UNDP concept note for the GCF on REDD+ implementation has been abandoned at an early stage (concept note) as the prospect of success was not good and the project has focused instead on attracting GEF7 and EU funding for REDD+-relevant activities, which was successful. The development of REDD+ provincial action plans have also been deemed unnecessary and abandoned. The project's results framework, in particular for the second phase, has been sometimes too qualitative to effectively assess progress, but has allowed for adaptive management. The MTR recommended to formalize PMU meeting minutes, which has not been fully implemented, the project team relying rather on emails and weekly priorities.

#### List of Uploaded Documents

| # | File Name   | Modified By                 | Modified On           |
|---|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | FCPFFinalProgressReport2015-2020_6009_311 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FCPFFinalProgressReport2015-2020_6009_311.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FCPFFinalProgressReport2015-2020_6009_311.pdf</a> ) | mirzohaydar.isoiev@undp.org | 12/29/2020 1:55:00 AM |
| 2 | FCPFRisksLog_6009_311 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FCPFRisksLog_6009_311.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FCPFRisksLog_6009_311.docx</a> )   | mirzohaydar.isoiev@undp.org | 12/29/2020 1:55:00 AM |

**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 project Efficiency was assessed by the Independent Evaluator as "Satisfactory".

Some works have not yet produced the expected results (e.g; PNGPOP, UNDP concept note to the Green Climate Fund), other works could have been carried out in a more cost-effective way (e.g. retreats in provinces, REDD+ trainings), but overall, the project's efficiency is deemed satisfactory.

Good quality of work but sometimes lack of integration between workstreams (e.g. ESMF and NRFIP).

Some delays due to COVID, political reasons (e.g. PNGPOP, forest act, SLUP), as well as lack of data, weaknesses of sectoral strategic plans, and focus on parallel workstreams (e.g. NRFIP).

Good quality of staffs and expertise mobilized, including through partnerships (e.g. FAO, GCP). Outstanding contribution of CTA, good continuity of consultants but lack of capacities of public agencies.

PEB transparent and effective but composition and frequency of meetings could have been improved.

Good project management, planning and budgeting, monitoring and reporting, as well as compliance. Adaptive management has allowed flexible support to different complementary initiatives (policy reforms, fundraising, NFI...).

Results framework sometimes too qualitative to effectively assess progress.

Good coordination with different government agencies.

Good donors coordination but no formal mechanism for that.

Gender analysis carried out but not very much mainstreamed in NRS and RFIP. No gender guidelines for REDD+ implementation. Gender disaggregated data for participation.

The project has applied successfully FCPF Common Approach for Multiple Delivery Partners (e.g. guidelines on SESA, Stakeholder Engagement, Disclosure of Information and Grievance and Redress Mechanisms).

**List of Uploaded Documents**

| # | File Name  | Modified By                | Modified On           |
|---|--|----------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QA/FormDocuments/Annex4_FCPFFinalEvaluation_MI_6009_312.pdf">Annex4_FCPFFinalEvaluation_MI_6009_312 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QA/FormDocuments/Annex4_FCPFFinalEvaluation_MI_6009_312.pdf)</a> | mirzohaydar.isoev@undp.org | 12/29/2020 2:00:00 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:**

With the support of UNDP Country Office, the project has developed its procurement plan which was annually reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addressed them through appropriate management actions.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

| #                       | File Name | Modified By | Modified On |
|-------------------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|
| No documents available. |           |             |             |

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 developed Programme and Financial Delivery Plans to review the costs against targets and indicators. The project actively coordinated with other relevant ongoing projects and initiatives (UNDP or other) to ensure complementarity and sought efficiencies wherever possible.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

| #                       | File Name | Modified By | Modified On |
|-------------------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|
| No documents available. |           |             |             |

**Effective****Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory**

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

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

**Evidence:**

The project has achieved all targets and indicators in accordance with the Logical Framework.

### List of Uploaded Documents

| # | File Name  | Modified By                | Modified On           |
|---|--|----------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | FCPFfinalevaluationreportFinalclean_6009_315 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FCPFfinalevaluationreportFinalclean_6009_315.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FCPFfinalevaluationreportFinalclean_6009_315.pdf</a> ) | mirzohaydar.isoev@undp.org | 12/29/2020 2:06:00 AM |

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:

With the support of the Country Office Programme Support Unit and the Country Office senior management, the project has regularly updated quarterly progress data and report to ensure that the activities implemented were most likely to achieve the desired results.

### List of Uploaded Documents

| # | File Name   | Modified By                | Modified On           |
|---|---|----------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | FCPFProgressUpdate_Jan-June2020_draft2_sm1_6009_316 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FCPFProgressUpdate_Jan-June2020_draft2_sm1_6009_316.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FCPFProgressUpdate_Jan-June2020_draft2_sm1_6009_316.docx</a> ) | mirzohaydar.isoev@undp.org | 12/29/2020 2:09:00 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 Government has selected three provinces for the project to build the capacity for REDD+ implementation: Madang, East New Britain and West New Britain. This selection seems relevant and was based on the presence of forest cover loss hotspots, previous work done, private sector activity, and ongoing development interventions.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

| #                       | File Name | Modified By | Modified On |
|-------------------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|
| No documents available. |           |             |             |

**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:

Stakeholders' engagement, in particular at the national level, has been successfully sustained, providing legitimacy to the work of the project. It has been supported by an initial mapping of key stakeholders and a stakeholder's engagement plan. Gender-inclusive REDD+ stakeholder engagement plans have been developed for the three provinces in order to support the full and effective participation of key stakeholders in the implementation of PNG's National REDD+ Strategy. However, they have not been clearly endorsed by the provinces.

Though this is not an easy task, the project has missed the opportunity to strengthen civil society coordination that has been undermined by the disappearance of the eco-forestry forum. The project would also have benefitted from further engaging representatives of civil society from the local level, rather than relying to a large extent to representatives at the national level.

Stakeholders' capacities on REDD+ has been built through extensive consultations and trainings. 8 REDD+ Experts training have been conducted since 2015 in the regions with a total of 620 Participants (37% female). The different consultations and other capacity building programmes at the national and provincial levels have involved 1400 participants (35% female). While the priority has been given to national activities, regional consultations have also been held for different activities such as the National REDD+ Strategy, the National REDD+ Finance and Investment Plan (NRFIP). Institutional capacities have also been built for key national agencies such as CCDA and PNGFA through their involvement in the project.

### List of Uploaded Documents

| # | File Name  | Modified By                | Modified On           |
|---|--|----------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | FCPFfinalevaluationreportFinalclean_6009_318 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FCPFfinalevaluationreportFinalclean_6009_318.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FCPFfinalevaluationreportFinalclean_6009_318.pdf</a> ) | mirzohaydar.isoev@undp.org | 12/29/2020 2:14:00 AM |

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](#)<sup>8</sup> 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:

The capacity of the relevant Government Institution - the Climate Change and Development Authority was regularly monitored by the project. The FCPF Project has assessment institutional mandate of the organisation and provided recommendations for sustainability of CCDA. See attached report.

### 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 sustainability of the project is likely in the sense that REDD+ readiness is formally achieved and that some individual and institutional capacities have been built. The project has been able to raise funding for the continuation of some activities, and other opportunities of funding are being pursued. However, the transition towards REDD+ implementation has not been sufficiently prepared and the potential lack of external support to help steer the REDD+ process will certainly be challenging. In this regard, management response was developed to address these challenges.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

| # | File Name   | Modified By                | Modified On           |
|---|---|----------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | FCPFManagementResponse_6009_320 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FCPFManagementResponse_6009_320.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FCPFManagementResponse_6009_320.docx</a> ) | mirzohaydar.isoev@undp.org | 12/29/2020 2:21:00 AM |

**QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments**

Overall, the project has been assessed as "Very Successful" in establishing the building blocks of REDD+ readiness in the country, which was its objective. Beyond putting in place the Warsaw Framework, it has propelled significant policy reforms and facilitated the engagement of key stakeholders and cross-sectoral cooperation. Furthermore, the project has assisted with the development of SDG13 Climate Roadmap and significantly contributed in the enhancement of PNG's Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs). Both documents were approved by the Government of PNG. Much remains to be done to ensure the success of REDD+ implementation in the country. The REDD+ implementation framework is still incipient and important questions remain on how to operationalise REDD+ and bring tangible benefits to landholders at the local level.

The Project Executive Board has acknowledged the progress achieved and lessons learned. The PEB members have also endorsed all recommendations and management response to ensure continuation of REDD+ implementation in the country.