

# Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

<b>Form Status: Approved</b>	
<b>Overall Rating:</b>	Needs Improvement
<b>Decision:</b>	
<b>Portfolio/Project Number:</b>	00059799
<b>Portfolio/Project Title:</b>	PIMS4552 PNG AF Climate Resilient Communities in PNG
<b>Portfolio/Project Date:</b>	2012-01-01 / 2019-12-24

<b>Strategic</b>	<b>Quality Rating: Satisfactory</b>
<p>1. Did the project pro-actively identified changes to the external environment and incorporated them into the project strategy?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="radio"/> 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)</li> <li><input checked="" type="radio"/> 2: <i>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)</i></li> <li><input type="radio"/> 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.</li> </ul>	

**Evidence:**

During the project implementation some disconcerting issues arose. The combination of these issues may have triggered the asymmetrical management that emerged, as discussed below.

It was assumed that the PCCC who was a recipient of knowledge and skills . mainstreaming climate change adaptation, could at the same time discharge the function of overseeing the processes of integrating and coordinating climate change-related activities, to monitor progress of the AF project and to ensure the necessary cooperation within and among agencies and communities. These are implementing responsibilities of consequence and may be the reasons why the PMU did not have a budget to travel to conduct activities in the provinces . It may have been assumed that the PCCC was going to substitute the PMU in the provinces

the perception is that these committees were tasked with the coordination of project-supported activities at the provincial level but also at the local government and community level. However, this coordination mechanism did not work out in the end. As a matter of fact, the PCCC has not delivered the provincial planning process of key sectors to be integrated with the DRM/DRR geospatial data to develop provincial plans to cope with coastal/inland flooding . The MTE assessed that Provinces lack clear strategy in terms of what the Project is trying to achieve, including the kind of sustained results that are anticipated. In fact, in this TE, in almost every meeting with members of PCCC, they shared the fact that they unsuccessfully requested the presence of the PM on site several times to review technical and administrative matters for which they themselves could not find a solution at that time.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	FinalReport_AFProjectEvaluation_201218_145_301 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FinalReport_AFProjectEvaluation_201218_145_301.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FinalReport_AFProjectEvaluation_201218_145_301.pdf</a> )	momenat.al-khateeb@undp.org	7/2/2019 1:48:00 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 PNG Strategic Plan (2010-2030) climate change goal states "Adapt to the domestic impacts of climate change and contribute to global efforts to abate greenhouse gas emissions". The project did align with the thematic focus of UNDP's strategic plan that identified climate change as a priority and given current limitations in technical skills, knowledge and management, the lack of coordination among stakeholders the project aims to strengthen institutional and individual capacity for coordination, assessment and adaptation. As a result, the project conducted climate risk assessments and recommended risk management options for implementation.

Evidence in the Evaluation Report.

**Management Response:**

UNDP will conduct implementing capacity assessment during the design of any project to inform the development of appropriate capacity development plans which will be implemented simultaneously with implementation of project activities.

UNDP Project Management and Procurement Trainings will be conducted for all implementing partners including government agencies, private sectors, non-government organisations and community-based organisations selected to implement activities.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

**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 is in line with supporting development priorities at all levels of the Government of Papua New Guinea's efforts to lead planning, coordination and on-the-ground implementation of measures to facilitate adaptation at all administrative levels.

The target groups were reached but the resources and approach used allowed a symptomatic treatment of needs. No other donor approached the development matter as UNDP

Evidence in the Evaluation Report.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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 has generated a series of knowledge products on a range of issues (e.g., protection and conservation of mangrove, El Nino response, flood preparedness etc.). The project is also working on creating a website that will be a repository of climate change adaptation knowledge. Besides, regular meetings with project implementation unit (twice in a month) and annual meeting of the project steering committee are the main avenues to discuss lessons learned. Feedback from the meetings help change (if need be) project activities and implementation modalities. It is difficult to disseminate technical information to beneficiaries without a handbook. Experience shows that without handbooks the information fades away, as does the sustainability of the training activities undertaken.

Choice of Partners with Sustainable Strategy

In the matter of distributing a priori outputs to entice participation of the communities, if it has to be done, the choice of partner for this process is critical. The object lesson here is to select partners with proven comparative advantage to intervene directly in the communities in the context of climate change adaptation without introducing unintended inequity issues. The overarching purpose is to promote long-term resilience among the communities while avoiding introducing unintended inequity in the short term in the distribution of resources to those who need the most.

IFAD and WFP both carry out regular analysis on the strategic framework with the countries they work, supported by logistic analysis. In this manner, the issues of inequality and sustainability are reviewed adequately. Specifically, the WFP has proven comparative advantage in the area of disaster risk reduction and management in the context of CCA. In a recent intervention in Ethiopia and Kenya, WFP demonstrated that supporting natural resource management, infrastructure rehabilitation and disaster risk reduction objectives contributed to a sustainable increase in household and community-level food security, supporting long-term resilience-building in traditionally food-deficit areas. The critical result is the long-term resilience, and the fact that the women and men in communities do not become dependent on donors.

#### The Role of Institutions in the Transfer of Technology

The object lesson here is that forward-looking institutions that drive the use of new technologies, such as geomatics. Geomatics technology is neutral; and on its own it has no impact on the sustainability of its use. It is not an automatically adopted tool. New organizational arrangements are needed to ensure that the benefits of a new technology reach the end-user. Concretely, it is the institutional infrastructure, based on the capacity building efforts of different organizations, that is the key factor in a successful transfer; this is based on experience the world over.

Regarding the inclusion of gender considerations in the design of the project, the project was to support gender participation and that women and youth were to be given a greater role in building community resilience to the climate hazards. The project was also to seek the institutionalization of gender sensitivity in disaster management to be in line with the implementation of MDGs, the 2005 Hyogo Framework for Action, the PNG Vision 2050, the Development Strategic Plan 2010-2030 and the Medium Term Development Plan 2011-2015. The project addresses gender issues at the activity-level (for example adequate involvement of women in the decision making regarding community adaptation projects). Besides the community activities such as first aid training, WASH and Food Security training includes women participants.

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:**

There is potential to scale up including community level resilience, improvement of climate information systems to manage climate hazards and scaling up of flood early warning systems inland and coastal flooding. As a result CCDA had climate change committees established in EHP and Enga provinces.

List of Uploaded Documents			
#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

**Principled**

**Quality Rating: Needs Improvement**

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:**

The project has clear gender mainstreaming milestones particularly the involvement of women. The various assessments and analysis have highlighted the role of women and youth in a range of the climate change adaptation activities – awareness, preparedness and response, mangrove reforestation and protection.

Regarding the inclusion of gender considerations in the design of the project, the project was to support gender participation and that women and youth were to be given a greater role in building community resilience to the climate hazards. The project was also to seek the institutionalization of gender sensitivity in disaster management to be in line with the implementation of MDGs, the 2005 Hyogo Framework for Action, the PNG Vision 2050, the Development Strategic Plan 2010-2030 and the Medium Term Development Plan 2011-2015. The project addresses gender issues at the activity-level (for example adequate involvement of women in the decision making regarding community adaptation projects). Besides the community activities such as first aid training, WASH and Food Security training includes women participants.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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:**

Climate change mostly deals with forecasting and projecting future scenarios as there are uncertainties involved. It is thus, essential to critically analyze future scenarios integrating social and environmental aspects for optimal resource use and opportunities that can be derived to marginally offset vulnerability. For example, one of the target communities visited, Pati Island, community members expressed multiple benefits as a result of mangrove reforestation that were not captured by the AF project. Additional benefits included improvement in fish growth and increase in crab stock which in turn generated and improved income. Although, distance to reach some of these hot spots may seem difficult, the primary objective is to raise the level of resilience of most vulnerable people through financial security and social wellbeing.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	74956-SESP_145_307 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/74956-SESP_145_307.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/74956-SESP_145_307.pdf</a> )	bushra.hassan@undp.org	7/18/2019 9:06:00 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:**

The Project activities did not yield any environmental risk. On the contrary, they were intended to conserve the environment and biodiversity and increasing livelihood opportunities at the same time. The most immediate interventions to conserve the biodiversity and increase livelihood opportunities are related to mangrove rehabilitation actions environmental risks. Moreover, is the piloting flooding EWS for Bumbu river catchment in Morobe which did not affect human settlements rain gauges and water level gauges and feeds the integrated data management system at the National Weather Services in Port Moresby.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

**Management & Monitoring****Quality Rating: Needs Improvement**

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:**

Constant monitoring of project activities was inadequately done. There are tools (in Atlas) available for use by the PMU/UNDP. The tracking system should have been used more effectively to monitor progress on a regular basis and identify opportunities or risks/threats both expected and unexpected and devise practical solutions. In addition, periodical field visits should have been mandatory for empirical evidence of project implementation.

Communities indicated that mangrove nurseries were not necessary and community members resorted to direct planting which was more effective. It would be worthwhile to understand how much funds were budgeted and disbursed for mangrove planting. This are my views which I opt to share in confidence.

**Management Response:**

UNDP will continue to ensure regular engagement and dialogue on transfer of technology and skills with implementation partners.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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 governance mechanism was functioning well during the initial stages of the project. A project steering committee was been established to review the project on an annual basis which has met regularly from the beginning of the project. Annual progress report is prepared regularly and presented to the donor and as well as to the PSC members.

It is pertinent to underline that the MTE report flagged that during the inception phase, the CCDA had recommended conducting provincial level inception meetings to clarify the project management arrangements between the national and provincial level within the pilot communities and to clarify the Project's overall implementation strategy. Also, "that a formal project governance mechanism with clear roles and responsibilities including a project management unit be established immediately following the inception workshop." This was considered a critical step in ensuring that the Project is implemented within the scheduled timeframe". It appears that these recommendations were not adhered to, the CCDA had recommended conducting provincial level inception meetings to clarify the project management arrangements between the national and provincial level within the pilot communities and to clarify the Project's overall implementation strategy. Also, "that a formal project governance mechanism with clear roles and responsibilities including a project management unit be established immediately following the inception workshop." This was considered a critical step in ensuring that the Project is implemented within the scheduled timeframe". It appears that these recommendations were not adhered to.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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:**

UNDP carried out risk management activities to mitigate adverse impacts on achieving objectives and facilitated extensive international expertise to support project components, including South-South cooperation with a global climate adaptation initiative. Concretely, as part of capacity building for operation and maintenance of the Early Warning System, four staff of the National Weather Service and the Conservation, Environment and Protection Agency participated in a south to south learning exchange to Australia. It provided training for the establishment of the Bumbu river early warning system

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

**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:**

There is little or no data available to assess the appropriate allocation and economic use of resources to produce the expected outcomes. Information like yearly audit results, or a complete terminal report with an outcome-based results framework are not available. In the absence of relevant information for a rigorous review, in order to advance the assessment on efficiency, an insight can be perceived by reviewing the allocation of resources assigned in the Prodoc [Annex 5, pp 94-97] in the context of the output-based final report [FPRR] and the data reviewed by the Mission [Annexes 7, 12 and 14]. The intent is to triangulate guesstimates about the economic logic of resource allocation with respect to generating the expected results as teachable moments.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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:**

In nearly every working session The Evaluator had difficulties assessing financial control, as there was limited information available because the management team had disbanded in December 2017. One outstanding concern for stakeholders and villagers were procurement issues scheduled with the Evaluator and stakeholders and beneficiaries, issues related to procurement matters were brought to the attention of the TE. As discussions on these issues began taking time away from the brief time assigned to the TE, it was suggested that these queries be sent by email. These emails can be found in Annex 13, for the attention of auditors. On the whole, stakeholders questioned why the resources took so long to reach them. Stakeholder concerns are exemplified by one procurement case outlined in Box 2. This case outlines a situation where UNDP procurement principles are apparently applied unevenly and villagers indicated that the resources they received were insufficient. This is a complex situation because to adjudicate on procurement matters requires reviewing the contracts of each partner related to the execution of the works, in the context of the legal and administrative norms prevailing in the PNG.

Evaluators do not get involved when it comes to compliance with existing regulations. If development results have been affected by the management of procurement procedures, evaluators ordinarily report on such occurrences as has been done during the Mid Term Evaluation [MTE page 3]. The crux of the above issues appear to stem from the fact that during the last 18 months of the Project timeline, approximately USD 1.7 M, was disbursed. The FPRR does not specify what proportion of the funds were delivered as a priority outputs—and what proportion was to complete anticipated studies. However, it is clear that the delivery of a priority outputs among villagers brought about limited development results.

The evidence indicates that the trigger for the Project's distribution of a priority outputs to the communities was to entice their participation or mitigate their climate-risk conditions. As development experience shows, whenever there is a priority delivery of outputs equity issues arise because almost everyone is equally deserving to access to these outputs essential for the realization of CCA process.

<b>List of Uploaded Documents</b>			
#	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:**

There is little or no data available to assess the appropriate allocation and economic use of resources to produce the expected outcomes. Information like yearly audit results, or a complete terminal report with an outcome-based results framework are not available. In the absence of relevant information for a rigorous review, in order to advance the assessment on efficiency, an insight can be perceived by reviewing the allocation of resources assigned in the Prodoc [Annex 5, pp 94-97] in the context of the output-based final report [FPRR] and the data reviewed by the Mission [Annexes 7, 12 and 14]. The intent is to triangulate guesstimates about the economic logic of resource allocation with respect to generating the expected results as teachable moments.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

**Effective**

**Quality Rating: Needs Improvement**

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

- Yes
- No

**Evidence:**

The project was delayed since the outset – mostly management delays to establish an effective PMU with a full time Project Manager (PM). Significant progress was made in project implementation and disbursement since June 2014. Accelerated delivery was made possible due to many factors including, but not limited to: appointment of focal person/team by the government to lead and coordinate project efforts with various national and local stakeholders; strategic partnerships with NGOs and CSOs to carry out community based adaptation planning and resilience-building measures; and based on request for support services by the government, UNDP providing procurement support for technical expertise required for the Early Warning System design and implementation. Since the delivery of project activities has noticeably accelerated since 2014, which should be translated into good developmental results.

**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:**

In order to fast tract decision making and expedite project implementation a small team comprising of OCCD and UNDP meets regularly. The team comprises of two key staff from OCCD including the Director, Adaptation Division and Sr. Policy Officer. The other members of the team are the Project Manager, Project Associate and the Project Assistant from UNDP. The committee reviews and endorses grant agreements with NGO partners, develops TORs and facilitates hiring of consultants for implementation of different project activities and discusses and addresses project related issues. This arrangement is going to continue. Besides, Project Steering Committee meetings are held annually to review achievements under the project and inform course correction.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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 was worthwhile for the development priorities at all levels.  
 The target groups were reached but the resources and approach used allowed a symptomatic treatment of needs  
 No other donor approached the development matter as UNDP

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

**Sustainability & National Ownership**

**Quality Rating: Needs Improvement**

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 planned objective was not achieved; outcomes are intermediate and most outputs were achieved  
Partners contribution to outcomes has been weak with exceptions  
Intermediate outcomes have benefitted men and women equitably in most cases.

**Management Response:**

lack of capacity at the national level.

**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<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:**

Constant monitoring of project activities was inadequately done. There are tools (in Atlas) available for use by the PMU/UNDP. The tracking system should have been used more effectively to monitor progress on a regular basis and identify opportunities or risks/threats both expected and unexpected and devise practical solutions. In addition, periodical field visits should have been mandatory for empirical evidence of project implementation.

<b>List of Uploaded Documents</b>			
#	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:**

All evidence points to the fact that during project implementation there was an absence of synergy among outputs and within outputs to enable their morphing into outcomes. As argued earlier, the design of outcomes reflect ambiguity because it was indeterminate as to what to do once the outcome or subordinate outputs were attained. There was neither an exit strategy nor an anticipated institutional arrangement to house the Project's outputs/outcomes after Project completion.

**Management Response:**

CO will ensure that exist strategy will be prepared for new programme and projects

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

**QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments**

in the final board meeting, the members agreed on the following:

- 1- complete installation of billboard and automatic weather stations in the provinces.
- 2- each of the 5 provinces made presentation on the results achieved , lessons learned and measures taken to sustain and scale up in the project
- 3- the meeting took a note of sustainability and exit strategy under development in collaboration with the project partners.
- 4- project extended for 6 months to finalise the installation
- 5- the project assets to be transferred to the government