

Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

Form Status: Approved

Overall Rating: Satisfactory

Decision:

Portfolio/Project Number: 00077150

Portfolio/Project Title: PIM4625 Strengthening mgt. & generating env benefits of PA

Portfolio/Project Date: 2014-01-01 / 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:

The Project team had an opportunity to undertake some horizon scanning during the Mid-Term Review process and came up with an acceleration strategy which was implemented taking into account changes to the external environment. For example, the Seventh National Development Plan shifted the implementation approach from sectoral to outcome-based approach supported by implementation structures created at the national level to facilitate coordination at poli

cy and technical levels. As a result, the Forestry Department and Department of National Parks and Wildlife fell under the same cluster, contributing to the same programmes at the national level. This formalised the coordination approach that the project had adopted and was further strengthened by the Mid-Term Review recommendation for the project to constitute a Technical Committee. The Steering Committee identified a new opportunity by taking into account the recommendation and approved the constitution of the Technical Committee in order to improve the technical joint decision making and oversight for the Project.

One of the threats identified by the project was the absence of a provision for the legal recognition of the Village Action Groups under the Wildlife Act, which would affect the enforcement of the Integrated Land Use Plans, especially for activities such as illegal charcoal production, which was anticipated to further escalate with the increased load shedding. An opportunity was identified with the signing of Statutory Instrument No. 11 of 2018 "Guidelines on Community Forest Management", which provided for the legal recognition of the Village Action Groups as Community Forest Management Groups. The Technical Committee meeting held in May 2018, instructed the project team to commence the process of facilitating the formation of the groups. Technical Committee Meeting Minutes held on 18th May 2018.

The Project Implementation Unit identified the delay in implementing the acceleration strategy as a threat to the achievement of the project. This was due to a number of external factors such as the dry spells which affected conservation farming activities in some areas, the restriction on animal movements, which affected the small grants livestock livelihood activities, as well as the demise of the consultant facilitating the REDD+ activities. The Technical Committee considered the implications of the incomplete implementation of the Acceleration Strategy to the achievement of the Project's objectives, with a few months left to project closure and adopted the proposed modifications to the Strategy's action plan with emphasis on adaptive management to ensure the achievement of the project's objective. Minutes of 3rd Technical Committee Meeting of March 2019.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	SixthSteeringCommitteeMeetingMinutes_4113_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SixthSteeringCommitteeMeetingMinutes_4113_301.pdf)	nancy.mukumbuta@undp.org	12/9/2020 7:25:00 PM
2	AccelerationStrategy-GEF5Project_4113_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/AccelerationStrategy-GEF5Project_4113_301.pdf)	nancy.mukumbuta@undp.org	12/9/2020 7:31:00 PM
3	Draft3rdTechnicalCommitteeMeetingMinutes20102020_4113_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Draft3rdTechnicalCommitteeMeetingMinutes20102020_4113_301.doc)	nancy.mukumbuta@undp.org	12/9/2020 7:47:00 PM

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

- ☒ 3: The project responded to at least one of the development settings as specified in the Strategic Plan (SP) and adopted at least one Signature Solution .The project's RRF included all the relevant SP output indicators. (all must be true)
- ☐ 2: The project responded to at least one of the developments settings1 as specified in the Strategic Plan. The project's RRF included at least one SP output indicator, if relevant. (both must be true)
- ☐ 1: While the project may have responded to a partner's identified need, this need falls outside of the UNDP Strategic Plan. Also select this option if none of the relevant SP indicators are included in the RRF.

Evidence:

Project implementation spanned two Strategic Plans, 2014-2017 and 2018-2021, which the project was aligned to. Under the Strategic Plan 2014-2017 the project was responding to area of work 1: sustainable development pathways and specifically on effective maintenance and protection of natural capital. The project's RRF was expected to contribute to achieving the SP output indicator 1.3.1: Number of new partnership mechanisms with funding for sustainable management solutions of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste at national or sub-national levels. In supporting the government and community-based structures to reduce the funding gaps in the Kafue National Park, the project facilitated the development of a strategy for improved management effectiveness and increased revenues. The project further facilitated the process for the establishment of a Public Private Partnership in the West Lunga ecosystem but unfortunately the negotiations fell through when the private partner pulled out just before the contract was signed. Under the Strategic Plan 2018-2021, the project was responding to development Outcome 1: Eradicate poverty in all its forms and dimensions and was aligned mainly to Signature Solution 4: Promote nature-based solutions for a sustainable planet partially to Signature Solution 3: Strengthening gender equality and empowerment for women and girls. Under Output 1.4.1: Solutions scaled up for sustainable management of natural resources, including sustainable commodities and green and inclusive value chains, the project contributed to the building the capacities of communities to manage land and forests more sustainably through conservation farming and community forest management. The project further dedicated part of the small grants to women to finance alternative livelihood activities to empower them financially in order to reduce the pressure on natural resources. As part of strengthening gender equality, the project facilitated gender mainstreaming training was part of the capacity building activities.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	CommunityGenderTrainingofTrainersWorkshop-WestLunga002_4113_302 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CommunityGenderTrainingofTrainersWorkshop-WestLunga002_4113_302.docx)	nancy.mukumbuta@undp.org	12/9/2020 8:31:00 PM
2	FINALDRAFTKNPSTRATEGICPLAN2017-2021_4113_302 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FINALDRAFTKNPSTRATEGICPLAN2017-2021_4113_302.docx)	nancy.mukumbuta@undp.org	12/9/2020 9:40:00 PM

Relevant**Quality Rating: Highly 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:

Targeted groups were actively involved in implementation and monitoring throughout the project period. Community representatives were part of inception and validation meetings, specific training and planning workshops. Target groups were further always engaged during monitoring visits. This engagement was done to get their feedback in order to ensure their needs were addressed and their input was taken into account when decisions that affected them were made. The project ensured that women and youths were ably represented.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	InceptionReport_4113_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/InceptionReport_4113_303.pdf)	nancy.mukumbuta@undp.org	12/9/2020 9:30:00 PM

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

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

Evidence:

The Mid-Term Review process provided an opportunity for the project to receive knowledge, learn lessons and identify changes to be made from both internal and external sources. This was done through the the ory of change workshop and the recommendations i n the Mid-Term Review Report. Further knowledge a nd lesson generated during implementation of activit ies were documented in quarterly and annual report s prepared by both the Implementing Agents and the project and discussed during quarterly and annual re view meetings. Additional knowledge and lessons le arnt were generated during monitoring visits to the p roject area. Some changes were made to the project such as reducing the areas in which to operate due t o the vastness of the area as well as immediately co mmencing alternative livelihood activities through th e provision of small grants despite pre requisite activ ities not being completed in order to provide an ince ntive for communities to adopt sustainable use of na tural resources.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	PIMS4625ZambiaMTR-FinalReport_4113_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PIMS4625ZambiaMTR-FinalReport_4113_304.docx)	nancy.mukumbuta@undp.org	12/9/2020 9:46:00 PM
2	FinalDraftTOCTRainingWorkshopReport24-03-17_4113_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FinalDraftTOCTRainingWorkshopReport24-03-17_4113_304.docx)	nancy.mukumbuta@undp.org	12/9/2020 9:49:00 PM

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

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

Evidence:

The project was sufficiently at scale, with some targets being exceeded such as the number of households that had adopted conservation farming practices from the targeted 1,600 to 17,343 households and the hectareage under conservation farming from the targeted 3,760 ha to 23,448 ha in both the Kafue and West Lunga ecosystems. There was also wide coverage of fire management and law enforcement activities as well as the number of Village Action Groups that were recipients of small grants. Nevertheless, there are plans to further scale up conservation farming activities in the Kafue ecosystem with the support of Community Markets for Conservation (COMACO) while in West Lunga ecosystem, the success of farmers who adopted conservation farming in terms of yields, incomes and avoided deforestation has encouraged other farmers to adopt the practice on their own. Similarly, livelihood activities such as goat rearing have the potential to scale up through the pass on mechanism which will be continued even after the project. There is also potential to scale up Community Forest Management Activities through the Forestry Department and COMACO, once the groups have been formed and are generating benefits from both REDD+ and non-wood forest products.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Principled**Quality Rating: Exemplary**

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:

From inception, the project put in measures to ensure that gender inequalities were addressed to empower women by ensuring the inclusion of women in all activities. Data and evidence were collected on the relevance of measures to address gender inequalities and empower women. Gender analysis was conducted as part of implementation and information was used to inform adjustments and change. As a result, the intended effect was achieved and can be seen in the outputs and indicators. Women representation in governance structures exceeded the targeted 40% representation on Village Action Group and Community Resource Board leadership committees by 10%. In order to sustain women's continued participation in project activities, even beyond the project, gender mainstreaming manuals were developed and Village Action Group members, Implementing Partners and the Project Implementation Unit members were trained in gender mainstreaming. A sample gender mainstreamed Community Resource Board Constitution was made available to the Community Resource Board for consideration. A sample gender mainstreamed project workplan was also prepared for consideration.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Gef5-MubambeCRBConstitution_4113_306 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Gef5-MubambeCRBConstitution_4113_306.docx)	nancy.mukumbuta@undp.org	12/9/2020 9:53:00 PM
2	RevisedCommunityGenderTrainingofTrainersWorkshop-KafueN.P_4113_306 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/RevisedCommunityGenderTrainingofTrainersWorkshop-KafueN.P_4113_306.docx)	nancy.mukumbuta@undp.org	12/9/2020 9:59:00 PM

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

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

Evidence:

The project's environmental and social impacts were identified to be largely positive and could be addressed with the application of best management practices. Social and environmental risks were tracked and managed in the risk log and relevant management plans were developed, implemented and monitored. The participation of women through gender mainstreaming were promoted through governance structures and deliberate inclusion of women in all project activities.

The proposed changes to the use of natural resources to reduce the negative environmental impact from open access exploitation and the impact on communities was managed through the participatory development of Integrated Land Use Plans and formation of Community Forest Management Groups.

Climate change was not initially identified as a potential environment risk at the beginning of the project but was identified during project implementation as having the potential to increase pressure on wildlife resources due to crop failure caused by drought and floods. To mitigate against this, Community Based Organisations were provided with small grants for livelihood activities such as livestock and chicken rearing and irrigated gardens for crop and vegetable production and bee keeping to generate alternative sources of income. These livelihood activities had been proposed by communities during the consultative Integrated Land Use Plans development process.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	MaungaIntegratedLandUsePlan_4113_307 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QA/FormDocuments/MaungaIntegratedLandUsePlan_4113_307.doc)	nancy.mukumbuta@undp.org	12/9/2020 10:14:00 PM

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

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

Evidence:

The Grievance mechanism was in place and the project affected people were informed of the UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism. In cases of grievances, the project affected people used the project level grievance mechanisms and their grievances were addressed in accordance with the SRM guidance.

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 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:

13. The project costed M&E plan and most baselines and targets were populated. The project M&E Plan was adequately implemented. At the beginning of the project the inception workshop was held, and a report were prepared. Means of Verification for project progress on outputs and implementation was done through the Project Implementation Report (PIR), which was prepared annually. Periodic quarterly reports were prepared and quarterly review meetings held to discuss progress and plan for the following quarter, although these were not consistent. At the mid-point of project implementation, the Mid-Term Evaluation was conducted and lessons learned were captured and recommendations made and the management response action plan used to take corrective action. Although off course, the Terminal Evaluation has commenced and will be completed after the operational closure. The Draft Terminal Evaluation Report was prepared and has not yet been completed. Annual audits were conducted and the project received an unqualified rating throughout the project implementation period. Field visits to project sites were undertaken by both UNDP and government representatives although not at the frequency in the plan.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	FinalPIMS4625ZambiaPRODOC_4113_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QA/FormDocuments/FinalPIMS4625ZambiaPRODOC_4113_309.pdf)	nancy.mukumbuta@undp.org	12/9/2020 10:29:00 PM

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

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

Evidence:

The project board met at least once a year, or more frequently in some years to review the annual progress, including risks and opportunities and approve the annual workplan and budget for the following year.

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:

Risks were adequately monitored and managed, although there were sometimes lapses in updating the risk log in ATLAS. Updates were made to management plans and mitigation measures.

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:

The project budget was adequate to achieve the intended results.

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:

The project had a procurement plan which was updated annually during the 3rd and 4th quarter. Operational bottle necks to procuring inputs in timely manner, usually consultants, were addressed through appropriate management actions, which usually resulted in adjustments of timeframes.

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 monitored its own cost and coordinated activities with other projects within the unit in order to achieve cost efficiency. This was done for Project Implementation Review meetings, quarterly and annual progress meetings which were held as combined meetings.

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 not on track, although in the end delivered most but not all of its expected outputs after an extension of 18 months. There were a number of reasons for this. Project implementation was initially slow due to a delay in signing the Project Document due to the multifocal nature of stakeholders. Consultations took longer than anticipated. Once the document was signed, recruitment of PIU staff took longer than anticipated which caused further delays, including prerequisite baseline studies. The transformation of Zambia Wildlife Authority to Department of National Parks and Wildlife slowed down staff responses to enable activities to proceed until the realignment of staff at headquarters was completed. The 2016 election slowed down implementation as field work was suspended due to security concerns during campaigns. The slow pace at which the IPs responded to consultancy reports delayed the commencement of activities which were based on recommendations from commissioned consultancies. The new UNDP financial and disbursement guidelines slowed down implementation because they were not conducive to rural settings and therefore delayed funds disbursements. The initial low financial and management capacity of many small grants recipient CBOs led to poor financial management and delays in disbursement of funds. COVID travel restrictions affected the implementation of field work, which delayed the completion of some activities.

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:

Initially a review of the project workplan was done every quarter during review meetings based on the pace of implementation of planned activities to achieve the outputs. This was followed by a major review done in the 2nd or 3rd Quarter, which sometimes necessitated a budget revision.

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 target groups were identified at the project design stage based on their geographical location and in the case of the project were from the selected Village Action Groups. At implementation stage further targeting was done to ensure specific targeting, especially women, who the gender analysis study conducted during the Project Preparatory Grant phase, identified as being marginalised due to social and cultural practices. To further ensure the active participation of women, gender mainstreaming training was conducted for beneficiaries. There was continuous engagement and consultations with the targeted groups. Representatives from targeted beneficiaries attended various meetings, workshops and trainings. There was constant engagement with beneficiaries during the year to ensure they were benefiting from the various interventions. This was done mainly through technical support and monitoring visits. Evidence to show that beneficiaries were benefiting can be seen from the number of both men and women that have adopted conservation farming and livelihood activities supported by small grants. Further targeting was done to include the youth as a specific target group to benefit from small grants and a provision was made in the Annual Work Plan and Budget targeting them

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	SignedGEFV2020AnnualWorkplanandBudget_4113_317 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SignedGEFV2020AnnualWorkplanandBudget_4113_317.pdf)	nancy.mukumbuta@undp.org	12/9/2020 10:43:00 PM

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

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

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

Evidence:

16. Stakeholders and national partners were fully engaged in decision-making, implementation and monitoring of the project. This was done through meetings, workshops, trainings and field activities. During the inception phase of the project, all stakeholders, including targeted beneficiaries were represented at the project inception meeting, where an opportunity was presented for adjustments to be made to the project document before it was signed. National partners, both Implementing Agencies (IAs) and Implementing Partners (IPs) participated in all annual planning meetings at which the workplans were prepared. During implementation of activities the project team worked with the IAs, The Nature Conservancy, Conservation Farming Unit and Community Markets for Conservation and IPs at both national and district level to who facilitated activities with beneficiaries on the ground. In the case of procurement of goods and services, both government and UNDP systems were utilized depending on comparative advantage for effectiveness, timeliness and value for money. Monitoring followed the project monitoring and evaluation framework, which ensured the engagement of stakeholders and national partners. IA, IPs and UNDP participated in quarterly and annual review meetings, including the Project Implementation Review (PIR). Field monitoring visits were undertaken by the IPs and UNDP to monitor the work of the IAs and beneficiaries' activities and the IAs to monitor community implemented activities. Further monitoring was done by the Technical Committee and Project Steering Committee, both with membership from a wide range of stakeholders. In line with the Seventh National Development Plan coordinated monitoring approach, the National Climate Change Projects Steering Committee, comprising representatives from different line Ministries provided overall monitoring oversight.

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:

HACT Assessments were conducted for Zambia Wildlife Authority, Conservation Farming Unit and The Nature Conservancy at the beginning of the project. When the wildlife sector was reorganised and ZAWA was transformed into the Department of National Parks and Wildlife, the changes in capacities and performance were monitored and implementation arrangement adjusted to reduce the approval responsibility and assign more responsibilities to the Forestry Department to enable activities to proceed until the realignment of staff at headquarters was completed. A HACT assessment was conducted for Department of National Parks and Wildlife when the restructuring was completed but follow up activities on the implementation of capacity and performance changes have not been monitored to adjust the changes in the capacities of the capacities.

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 transformation of the wildlife sector and the withdrawal of the Trident Foundation from the negotiations to establish a Public Private Community Partnership (PPCP) in the West Lunga ecosystem necessitated the review of the project's sustainability plan. The plan was to establish a financial sustainability plan that would incorporate Protected Area financing into national development planning and a PPCP. In order to ensure the project remained on track in meeting the arrangements for transition and phase out, a partnership was entered into with Community Markets for Conservation, a local Non-Governmental Organisation, to provide capacity building and markets for alternative livelihood activities and continue with the REDD+ activities for accessing carbon financing beyond the project period. The Nature Conservancy was identified to continue supporting fire management activities and management of the Kafue National Park, under a longstanding MOU it had with the Department of National Parks and Wildlife.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
---	-----------	-------------	-------------

No documents available.

QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments

