

# Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

**Form Status: Approved**

<b>Overall Rating:</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<b>Decision:</b>	
<b>Portfolio/Project Number:</b>	00089654
<b>Portfolio/Project Title:</b>	Capacity for environmental monitoring
<b>Portfolio/Project Date:</b>	2015-07-01 / 2021-12-31

**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:**

Project's Terminal Evaluation Attached.

Overall, the Terminal Evaluation has rated this project as Satisfactory. The key evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability are rated by the evaluator as:

- Relevance: The project was highly relevant to the needs of the Ministry of Tourism and Environment and their partner organizations to meet the reporting to the Rio Conventions and to meet future needs associated with Albania's proposed membership of the European Union.

- Effectiveness: The objective (development and installation of an environmental information management and monitoring system) of the project has been effectively delivered and the information system installed within the Ministry of Tourism and Environment that has enabled reports to be prepared for the Rio Conventions and national environmental management needs. The project has very effectively engaged widely with civil society to encourage awareness and involvement on environmental issues.

-Efficiency: The project has largely delivered planned activities on time or earlier than planned. The project was granted two extensions responding to a relatively slow inception period and the desire by the project to have adequate time to complete activities and the to respond to the impacts of the earthquake and COVID-19 pandemic.

-Sustainability: The environmental information and monitoring system has been established and is collecting and reporting information (nationally and to international bodies) but, environmental monitoring is very demanding on resources for further capacity development and equipment and national resources are very limited. However, the ambition of Albania to join the European Union has received a positive response with negotiations beginning in 2020 and the likelihood of additional funds to assist further strengthen and sustain the work

of this project increasing. The national institutions (Ministry of Tourism and Environment, National Agency for Environment, etc.) are fully committed to providing information, coupled with strong civil society involvement indicates a likely support for the sustainability of the actions undertaken

<b>List of Uploaded Documents</b>			
<b>#</b>	<b>File Name</b>	<b>Modified By</b>	<b>Modified On</b>
1	5308AlbaniaCCCDTEFINAL.docx_10614_301 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/5308AlbaniaCCCDTEFINAL.docx_10614_301.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/5308AlbaniaCCCDTEFINAL.docx_10614_301.pdf</a> )	odeta.cato@undp.org	11/19/2021 12:16:00 PM
2	MEPlan_10614_301 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MEPlan_10614_301.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MEPlan_10614_301.docx</a> )	odeta.cato@undp.org	11/23/2021 11:01:00 AM
3	VirtualEIMMSSteeringCommitteeMeeting_10614_301 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/VirtualEIMMSSteeringCommitteeMeeting_10614_301.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/VirtualEIMMSSteeringCommitteeMeeting_10614_301.pdf</a> )	odeta.cato@undp.org	11/23/2021 10:45:00 AM
4	TWG-Minutesofthemeetingheldondesignandsysteminitialtesting_10614_301 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/TWG-Minutesofthemeetingheldondesignandsysteminitialtesting_10614_301.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/TWG-Minutesofthemeetingheldondesignandsysteminitialtesting_10614_301.docx</a> )	odeta.cato@undp.org	11/23/2021 10:56:00 AM
5	SESP_CCCD_signed_10614_301 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SESP_CCCD_signed_10614_301.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SESP_CCCD_signed_10614_301.pdf</a> )	odeta.cato@undp.org	11/23/2021 11:05:00 AM
6	Annualcostedworkplan2020-2021EIMMS_10614_301 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Annualcostedworkplan2020-2021EIMMS_10614_301.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Annualcostedworkplan2020-2021EIMMS_10614_301.pdf</a> )	odeta.cato@undp.org	11/23/2021 11:02:00 AM
7	Genderdifferencesandcivicparticipation_10614_301 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Genderdifferencesandcivicparticipation_10614_301.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Genderdifferencesandcivicparticipation_10614_301.pdf</a> )	odeta.cato@undp.org	11/23/2021 11:03:00 AM
8	Innovationinenvironmentreport-hackathon_10614_301 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Innovationinenvironmentreport-hackathon_10614_301.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Innovationinenvironmentreport-hackathon_10614_301.pdf</a> )	odeta.cato@undp.org	11/23/2021 11:04:00 AM

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

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

**Evidence:**

The project’s objective was to establish an environmental management and monitoring system to facilitate reporting to multilateral environmental agreements. In addition to developing the required system the project included a component to develop the capacity of the institutions responsible for environmental reporting and other stakeholders that use this information nationally.

The Project Document presents the expected contributions to UNDAF Outcome 3 (Governance and Rule of Law – the Albanian State executes major governance processes following internationally agreed democratic principles and practices, while upholding the rule of law and eliminating key factors of exclusion of women), and Outcome 4 (Regional and Local Development – Government of Albania implements policies that advance democratic, equitable and sustainable regional and local development). The project was also aligned with the UNDP Strategic Plan primary and secondary outcomes relating to environment. (TE)

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

**Relevant**

**Quality Rating: Exemplary**

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

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

**Evidence:**

The project was implemented with multiple partners and stakeholders actively engaged through direct involvement in the project's outputs and their activities. These were supplemented by stakeholder participating in capacity development actions, citizen science initiatives and more formal involvement in the Project Steering Committee and the Technical Working Group meetings.

Stakeholders mostly considered that communication with the project (PIU and Ministry of Tourism and Environment) was a continuous process throughout the project execution. This was initiated during the design phase of the project and continued throughout execution. There was a strong belief that the voices of stakeholders were heard by the PIU and the Project Steering Committee. Key points raised included:

Stakeholders considered that the PIU maintained good contacts, especially with Ministry of Tourism and Environment and UNDP;

Communications were sufficient in most cases with reports, publications, Facebook and the project website. Some stakeholders commented that the project website could have included more background information and details about the project's outputs, and been more 'dynamic';

There was good involvement with students and schools through the citizen science initiatives and awareness/capacity building initiative.

The Ministry of Tourism and Environment was acknowledged in facilitating stakeholder involvement. As noted by a stakeholder engaged with the project on issues related to teachers and students 'its [the project's] achievements and the materials produced have facilitated the process of learning about the environment in general, indicators of the state of the environment, protected areas in the country, while many of the educational resources available on the EIMMS websites have been useful for these focus groups, and have been used today by student teachers when it comes to organizing environmental activities. The project has become part of all public activities or promotional events organized in the framework of the celebration of environmental days in Albania, which did not lack the project and with its promotional materials, such as the Catalogues of Flora and Fauna of Albania.'

The majority of stakeholders thought that their interactions with the project and PIU were highly effective and informative. Although, some stakeholders would have appreciated additional information on the Project and results through an enhanced website.

### 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:

This project was guided by the recommendations provided by the 2006 UNDP/GEF 'National Capacity Self-Assessment' project that identified the capacity needs and priorities with respect to global environmental conventions. The design of the project was also guided by national (e.g. GIZ, EU, GEF) and regional projects (e.g. GEF Prespa, Ohrid, Drin), regional work being undertaken by NGOs in Albania (e.g. REC) involved in environmental monitoring, reporting and civil society engagement. The UNECE second Environmental Performance Review for Albania (2012) indicated the favourable legal framework that would facilitate the monitoring. A detailed barrier analysis on cross-cutting capacity development in environmental management and identification of successful and unsuccessful lessons from previous projects were incorporated in the design (e.g. previous projects on environmental information on projects were too linked to specific individuals and consequentially, vulnerable if these left their position).

Relevance:

The GEF 5 Cross-Cutting Capacity Development project to design and implement an Environmental Information Management and Monitoring System was or

pared in close co-operation with multiple stakeholders within Albania incorporating lessons from previous projects (e.g. use of open-source software). The Project's activities are highly relevant to the Ministry of Tourism and Environment to assist in meeting international agreements (e.g. the three Rio Conventions and Aarhus Convention reporting) and to assist with national environmental management and policy development. Specifically, the development of the EI MMS, engagement of civil society in environment issues, updating the Red List of endangered species, integrating gender in the policy making and reporting activities of the Ministry of Tourism and Environment. The Project was also supportive of UNDP's Country Programme Development and to the GEF.

Synthesis of lessons:

- Ensuring national ministerial and broad stakeholder support. The project has had a high degree of ministerial and other stakeholder involvement since the development of the project concept. The design allowed for the formation of the Technical Working Group that both strengthened the technical delivery of the project and further facilitated a strong feeling of 'ownership' in many of the stakeholders involved in this Terminal Evaluation.

-Active role of civil society in environmental information and monitoring. A strong element of this project has been the development of 'citizen science' to encourage greater awareness and involvement in environmental issues, especially monitoring and information. This has engaged many sectors of society including schools and universities in the brainstorming of novel and innovative approaches

-The importance of detailed project websites. The lack of a more detailed project website was raised by some stakeholders. Whilst recognizing that there were other methods of communication used effectively within Albania and that this was a small project, a comprehensive website that contained general project information and details of outputs, workshops and other links, would enable the success of this project would facilitate the wider dissemination.



**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	CCCD_Lessons-LearnedReportTemplate_10614_304 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CCCD_Lessons-LearnedReportTemplate_10614_304.doc">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CCCD_Lessons-LearnedReportTemplate_10614_304.doc</a> )	xhesi.mane@undp.org	11/30/2021 12:44:00 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 implemented with multiple partners and stakeholders actively engaged through direct involvement in the project's outputs and their activities. These were supplemented by stakeholder participating in capacity development actions, citizen science initiatives and more formal involvement in the Project Board and the Technical Working Group meetings. Stakeholders mostly considered that communication with the project (PIU and Ministry of Tourism and Environment) was a continuous process throughout the project execution. This was initiated during the design phase of the project and continued throughout execution. There was a strong belief that the voices of stakeholders were heard by the PIU and the Project Board.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

**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:**

The project was designed with significant actions to review the roles of women and men in information management and collected disaggregated for most meetings. The Project delivered a key report on gender differences and civic participation with a focus on recommendations to best provide environmental information to local communities and best practices on environmental information and gender inclusiveness. Training sessions on gender were undertaken with relevant stakeholders.

**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:

The Project Documents identified four main risks (see section 3.1.2) to the project implantation and annexed a Social and Environmental Screening (SES) assessment of the project that did not identify any potential SES risks. The risks to the project were reviewed during the inception phase and an additional risk identified (Ensuring the long-term sustainability (financial, operational and technical) of the established information and monitoring system and centre). The inception report also identified the need for a mitigation strategy. The risks to the project were presented in the 2017 APR with appropriate mitigation strategy for each risk. No further risks were identified were presented in subsequent APRs. Understandably, the project did not plan nor expect the November 2019 earthquake or the global COVID-19 pandemic. However, the project responded to ensure there was a short project extension and appropriate 'remote' working and meetings were implemented to minimise physical contacts between project staff and stakeholders whilst permitting the project to proceed. Stakeholders did not report any significant impacts to the delivery of the project.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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:**

TE report attached.

**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:

The project had a detailed M&E programme from inception that was consistent with UNDP and GEF expectations. The project results framework was SMART (see section 3.1.1) and, in the opinion of the TE, included realistic indicators, targets and means of verification supported by adequate defined risks and assumptions. This was considered sufficient by the TE consultant for monitoring and assessing the delivery of the project's progress.  
( Terminal Evaluation report attached)

#### 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:**

Steering Committee minutes, TWG group minutes, Terminal Evaluation report.

**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 may be some evidence that the project monitored risks that may affect the project's achievement of results, but there is no explicit evidence that management actions were taken to mitigate risks.

**Evidence:**

The Project Documents identified four main risks (see section 3.1.2) to the project implantation and annexed a Social and Environmental Screening (SES) assessment of the project that did not identify any potential SES risks. The risks to the project were reviewed during the inception phase and an additional risk identified (Ensuring the long-term sustainability (financial, operational and technical) of the established information and monitoring system and centre). The inception report also identified the need for a mitigation strategy. The risks to the project were presented in the 2017 APR with appropriate mitigation strategy for each risk. No further risks were identified were presented in subsequent APRs. Understandably, the project did not plan nor expect the November 2019 earthquake or the global COVID-19 pandemic. However, the project responded to ensure there was a short project extension and appropriate 'remote' working and meetings were implemented to minimise physical contacts between project staff and stakeholders whilst permitting the project to proceed. Stakeholders did not report any significant impacts to the delivery of the project.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

**Efficient****Quality Rating: Exemplary**

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:**

**Project finance and co-finance**

The project has been effectively financial managed through appropriate project management actions. The project's financial reports were jointly signed by the Ministry of Tourism and Environment and UNDP, reflecting the original Letter of Agreement between these two parties.

The project spend per component and year is shown in Table 6 and the total spend per year is indicated in Figure 3 showing a typical project cycle spend profile. Throughout the project, the PIU with the support of the Ministry of Tourism and Environment and UNDP, demonstrated a willingness to adopt adaptive management approaches to providing project resources where activities demanded (see section 3.2.1) including the increased scope to address climate change and land degradation information, recruiting international experts when needed for completing the Red List reports, implementing a range of small grants projects resulting from a 'hackathon' brainstorming event, etc.

The planned actual co-financing (presented in Annex 7) and indicates that nearly 90% of planned (5,429,700 USD indicated in the UNDP Project Document) had been provided to support the project. (TE report)

**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:**

Project Annual Work Plans and Procurement plans.  
yearly CDRs and TE report.

**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:**

Annual Project Report, TE report.

**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:**

Yes, the project has been on track and delivered the expected outputs. At closure the project balance is of 3.49 USD . CDR for 2021 attached.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CDR2021CCCD_10614_315.pdf">CDR2021CCCD_10614_315 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CDR2021CCCD_10614_315.pdf)</a>	odeta.cato@undp.org	11/19/2021 1:16:00 PM

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

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

**Evidence:**

TE report. Steering Committee minutes and Annual Work plans.

**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:**

## Stakeholder engagement

The gender baseline assessment undertaken by the project has influenced their policy development work of the Ministry of Tourism and Environment and guided the reporting of national data to Rio Conventions. The project has engaged and involved with a variety of civil society organisations (including academic institutions, NGOs and community groups).

Stakeholders indicated that the BioBlitz activities (involving 24 schools) was in-line with the national programme for Environmental Education of the Ministry of Tourism and Environment. Stakeholders also reported that the work of the project has also helped to strengthen internal capacities of organisations involved with the assessment of Greenhouse Gas inventories and helping to bridge knowledge gaps between protected areas and the Park and Recreation Agency.

**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:**

Country office staff support with project implementation. Steering Committee meetings.  
CDRs signed from the national project director.

**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:**

TE report, annual project reports.

**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:**

TE report.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

**QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments**