Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

Overall Project Rating: Needs Improvement

Project Number : 00074268

Project Title : Strengthening Climate Information And Early Warning Systems In Africa For Climate Resilient Development And Adaptation To Climate Change

Project Date : 01-May-2013

Strategic **Quality Rating:** Highly Satisfactory

1. Did the project pro-actively take advantage of new opportunities and adapt its theory of change to respond to changes in the development context, including changing national priorities? (select the option from 1-3 which best reflects this project)

○ 3: The project team regularly completed and documented a comprehensive horizon scanning exercise to identify new opportunities and changes in the development context that required adjustments in the theory of change. There is clear evidence that the project board considered the scanning and its implications, and documented changes to the project's RRF, partnerships, etc. made in response, as appropriate. (both must be true to select this option)

◉ *2: The project team has undertaken some horizon scanning over the life of the project to identify new opportunities and changes in the development context. The project board discussed the scanning and its implications for the project, as reflected in the board minutes. There is some evidence that the project took action as a result, but changes may not have been fully integrated in the project's theory of change, RRF, partnerships, etc. (all must be true to select this option)*

○ 1: The project team may have considered new opportunities and changes in the development context since implementation began, but this has not been discussed in the project board. There is limited to no evidence that the project team has considered changes to the project as a result. This option should also be selected if no horizon scanning took place during project implementation.

Evidence

The results of the project contribute to those of its unit which are donated and capitalized in its sector of belonging for the achievement of the development objectives during sectoral reviews (environment unit) and UNDAF

Midterm and final evaluation reports

2. Was the project aligned with the thematic focus of the Strategic Plan? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

◉ *3: The project responded to one of the three areas of development work as specified in the Strategic Plan. It addressed at least one of the proposed new and emerging areas and implementation was consistent with the issues-based analysis incorporated into the project. The project's RRF included all the relevant SP output indicators. (all must be true to select this option)*

○ 2: The project responded to one of the three areas of development work as specified in the Strategic Plan. The project's RRF included at least one SP output indicator, if relevant. (both must be true to select this option)

○ 1: While the project may have responded to one of the three areas of development work as specified in the Strategic Plan, it was based on a sectoral approach without addressing the complexity of the development issue. None of the relevant SP indicators were included in the project's RRF. This option is also selected if the project did not respond to any of the three SP areas of development work.

Evidence

Evidence
The project is in alignment with a number of strategic documents. It is related to:
- National priorities identified in UNDAF effect 2.1: "Improved sustainable natural resource use and food security", effect 2.2 "Improved access to sustainable livelihoods in a private sector" innovative and competitive ", and the effect 2.3" better access to sustainable basic infrastructure "SAP / IC will support all these results by providing forecasts (short-term and seasonal) according to the needs of the end user.

- the priorities set out in the Second National Communication (DCN) of Benin on Climate Change (2011) defined under the CCNUCC and developed within the Climate Change Unit of the Ministry of the Environment
-Urgent adaptation capacities needed in four agro-ecological zones of Benin, and three of the top five priorities identified in the NAPA.
- the Millennium Development Goals (OMD) and sustainable development strategies in Benin, including the SCRP Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper above.
With the transition from the OMD to the ODD and the advent of the new regime with PAG, the project meets government expectations across
- ODDs 13 "Measures to combat climate change" and 14 "Aquatic life"
- pillar 3 "improving the living conditions of the population" and axis 7 "balanced and sustainable development of the national space" of the PAG

3. Evidence generated through the project was explicitly used to confirm or adjust the programme/CPD's theory of change during implementation.

- ◉ *Yes*
- ○ No

Evidence

the project's outputs are integrate to CPD and UNDAF monitoring indictors tables

Relevant **Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

4. Were the project's targeted groups systematically identified and engaged, with a priority focus on the excluded and marginalized, to ensure the project remained relevant for them? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

- ○ 3: Systematic and structured feedback was collected regularly from a representative sample of beneficiaries, with a priority focus on the excluded and marginalized, as part of the project's monitoring system. Representatives from the targeted group were active members of the project's governance mechanism (i.e., project board or equivalent) and there is credible evidence that their feedback informed decision making. (all must be true to select this option)
- ◉ *2: Targeted groups were engaged in implementation and monitoring, with a priority focus on the excluded 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

All national institutions targeted by the project are engaged and take a role play in the project implementation and monitoring

5. Did the project generate knowledge, particularly lessons learned (i.e., what has worked and what has not) – and has this knowledge informed management decisions and changes/course corrections to ensure the continued relevance of the project towards its stated objectives, the quality of its outputs and the management of risk? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

- ◉ *3: Knowledge and lessons learned (gained, for example, from Peer Assists, After Action Reviews or Lessons Learned Workshops) backed by credible evidence from evaluation, analysis and monitoring were regularly discussed in project board meetings and reflected in the minutes. There is clear evidence that the project's theory of change was adjusted, as needed, and changes were made to the project to ensure its continued relevance. (both must be true to select this option)*

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 to select this option)

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

- mid-term evaluation report of the project
- narrative report of the project
- final evaluation report
- progress reports

PIRs

6. Were the project's special measures (through outputs, activities, indicators) to address gender inequalities and empower women relevant and produce the intended effect? If not, were evidence-based adjustments and changes made? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

3: The project team systematically gathered data and evidence on the relevance of the special measures in addressing gender inequalities and empowering women. Analysis of data and evidence were used to inform adjustments and changes, as appropriate. (both must be true to select this option)

2: The project team had some data and evidence on the relevance of the special measures in addressing gender inequalities and empowering women. There is evidence that at least some adjustments made, as appropriate. (both must be true to select this option)

1: The project team had limited or no evidence on the relevance of the special measures in addressing gender inequalities and empowering women. No evidence that adjustments and/or changes were made, as appropriate. This option should also be selected if the project had no special measures in addressing gender inequalities and empowering women relevant to project results and activities.

Evidence

The project target groups are national institutions but climate information produced will be used by the vulnerable communities such as smallholders
SAP works with State institutions involved in the management of climate, climate information to strengthen their ability to produce forecast and alert the choice executives need to strengthen capacity takes into account the genre. The indirect beneficiaries of the project being the entire population of Benin, it would be to say that 52 percent of women in this population benefit indirectly from the project activities.

7. Was the project sufficiently at scale, or is there potential to scale up in the future, to meaningfully contribute to development change? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

3: There is credible evidence that the project reached a 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 initiative in the future (e.g. by extending its coverage in a second phase or using project results to advocate for policy change).

1: The project was not at scale, and there are no plans currently to scale up the initiative in the future.

Evidence

Technical studies for inalization of the second phase's conceptual note are on going .The capacities of the partner structures (direct beneficiaries of the project) have been reinforced in equipment, maintenance, monitoring and training. The progress and evaluation reports made mention of it

Social & Environmental Standards **Quality Rating: Needs Improvement**

8. Did the project seek to further the realization of human rights using a human rights-based approach? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

3: There is credible evidence that the project aimed to further the realization of human rights, on the basis of applying a human rights based approach. Any potential adverse impacts on enjoyment of human rights were actively identified, managed and mitigated through the project's management of risks. (all must be true to select this option)

2: There is some evidence that the project aimed to further the realization of human rights. Potential adverse impacts on the enjoyment of human rights were identified and adequately mitigated through the project's management of risks. (both must be true to select this option)

1: There is no evidence that the project aimed to further the realization of human rights. There is limited to no evidence that potential adverse impacts on the enjoyment of human rights were managed.

Evidence

the project is an istitutional capacities reinforcement supported. it not target local communities. despite the flood warming information sharing that benefit population at national level, the project don't realize specifics activities for vulnerables and marginalized peoples as mentioned in the SESP Template and in the final evaluation report. Forward pcoming phase of the project these aspects will be integrated.

9. Were social and environmental impacts and risks (including those related to human rights, gender and environment) successfully managed and monitored in accordance with the project document and relevant action plans? (for projects that have no social and environmental risks the answer is "Yes")

Yes

No

Evidence

PIR and progress reports

10. Were any unanticipated social and environmental issues or grievances that arose during implementation assessed and adequately managed, with relevant management plans updated? (for projects that did not experience unanticipated social and environmental risks or grievances the answer is "Yes")

Yes

No

Evidence

Risk Log in PIR and progress reports

Management & Monitoring **Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

11. Was the project's M&E Plan adequately implemented? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

3: Progress data against indicators in the project's RRF was reported regularly using highly credible data sources and collected according to the frequency stated in the project's M&E plan, including sex disaggregated data as relevant. Evaluations, if conducted, fully met decentralized evaluation standards, including gender UNEG standards, and management responses were fully implemented. Lessons learned, including during evaluations, were used to take corrective actions when necessary. (all must be true to select this option)

2: Progress data against indicators in the project's RRF was collected on a regular basis, although there may have been some slippage in following the frequency stated in the project's M&E plan and data sources were not always reliable. Any evaluations conducted meet most decentralized evaluation standards; management responses were fully implemented to the extent possible. Lessons learned have been captured but not used to take collective actions. (all must be true to select this option)

1: Progress data either was not collected against the indicators in the project's RRF, or limited data was collected but not regularly; evaluations did not meet decentralized evaluation standards; and/or lessons learned were rarely captured and used.

Evidence

Periodic progress reports
- mid-term evaluation report of the project
- final evaluation report .
- End term technical report

12. Did the project's governance mechanism (i.e., the project board or equivalent) function as intended? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

The project's governance mechanism operated very well, and is a model for other projects. It met in the agreed frequency stated in the project document and the minutes of the meetings are 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)

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)

The project's governance mechanism did not met in the frequency stated in the project document, and/or the project board or equivalent did not function as a decision making body for the project as intended.

Evidence

The reports of the sessions of the technical committee of the project. Note that there was a relaxation in the last year for various reasons
- The reports of the steering committees of the environmental unit in which the project participated;
- The reports of the sectoral reviews in which the project participated

13. Were risks to the project adequately monitored and managed? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

3: The project actively monitored risks every quarter including consulting with key stakeholders at least annually to identify continuing and emerging risks to project implementation and to assess if the main assumptions remain valid. There is clear evidence that relevant management plans and mitigating measures were fully implemented to address each key project risk, and some evidence that risk mitigation has benefitted performance. (all must be true to select this option)

2: The project monitored risks every quarter, as evidenced by a regularly updated risk log. Some updates were made to management plans and mitigation measures. (both must be true to select this option)

1: The risk log was not updated every quarter as required. There may be some evidence that the project monitored risks that could have affected the project's achievement of results, but there is no explicit evidence that management actions were taken to mitigate risks. The project's performance was disrupted by factors that could have been anticipated or managed.

Evidence

Risk monitoring table contained in periodic progress reports and PIR

Efficient **Quality Rating: Needs Improvement**

14. 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 lack of that impact some output achievement. national contribution have not been adequatly mobilized as planned.

15. Were project inputs procured and delivered on time to efficiently contribute to results? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

- 3: The project had a procurement plan and kept it updated. Implementation of the plan was generally on or ahead of schedule. On a quarterly basis, the project reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addressed them through appropriate management actions. (all must be true to select this option)
- *2: The project had a procurement plan and kept it updated. The project annually reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addressed them through appropriate management actions. (all must be true to select this option)*
- 1: The project did not have an updated procurement plan. The project team may have reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs regularly, however management actions were not taken to address them. This option is also selected if operational bottlenecks were not reviewed during the project in a timely manner.

Evidence

Supply plan annexed to the PTA before signature
- UNDP Global Procurement Plan taking into account the procurement needs of the different projects.

16. Was there regular monitoring and recording of cost efficiencies, taking into account the expected quality of results? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

- 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 to select this option)
- *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 communicated with a few other projects to coordinate activities. (both must be true to select this option)*
- 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. It is not clear that the link between cost savings and quality of results was made.

Evidence

Competition always made for acquisitions;
- Synergy between projects and programs of the same unit and the cost are monitored base on the best value for money

Effective **Quality Rating: Needs Improvement**

17. Is there evidence that project outputs contributed to the achievement of programme outcomes?

- *Yes*

No

Evidence

CPD 's indicators and ROAR 2016 Environment Unit

18. The project delivered its expected outputs.

Yes

No

Evidence

the expected outputs are delivered (C.F TEMP report)

19. 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? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

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) were used to inform course corrections, as needed. (both must be true to select this option)

2: There was at least one review of the work plan each year with a view to assessing if project activities were on track to achieving the desired development results (i.e., outputs.) There is no evidence that data or lessons learned were used to inform the review(s).

1: While the project team may have reviewed the work plan at least once per 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 regular review of the work plan by management took place.

Evidence

The sessions of the Technical Committee for
- appreciate the evolution of the project and
- provide for future programming on the basis of the results achieved
- see the implementation of the recommendations

20. Were the intended targeted groups systematically identified and engaged, prioritizing the marginalized and excluded, to ensure results were achieved as expected? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

3: Targeted groups were systematically identified 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 to confirm that targeted groups were reached as intended. The project engaged regularly with targeted groups to assess whether they benefitted as expected and adjustments were made if necessary to refine targeting. (all must be true to select this option)

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 were members of the targeted groups. There was some engagement with beneficiaries to assess whether they benefitted as expected. (all must be true to select this option)

1: The project did not report on specific targeted groups, or there is no evidence to confirm that project beneficiaries have capacity needs or are populations deprived and/or excluded from development opportunities relevant to the project's area of work. There may have been some engagement with beneficiaries to assess whether they benefitted as expected, but not regularly.

Not Applicable

Evidence

Synergy working with partner structures through:
- the designation of the focal points in each of said structures;
- the establishment of the inter-institutional unit;
- direct accountability in carrying out certain activity;
therfefore, the project aims to target more local and vulnerables communities with specifics activities in the upcoming phase II

21. Were at least 40 per cent of the personnel hired by the project, regardless of contract type, female?

- Yes
- *No*

Evidence

Only one woman in the project implementation Team.

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

22. Were stakeholders and partners fully engaged in the decision-making, implementation and monitoring of the project? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

- 3: Only national systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) were 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. (all must be true to select this option)
- *2: National systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) were used in combination with other support (such as country office support or project systems) to implement and monitor the project, as needed. 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 to select this option)*
- 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

Synergy working with partner structures through:
- the designation of the focal points in each of said structures;
- the establishment of the inter-institutional unit;
- direct accountability in carrying out certain activity
For the acquisitions, existence of the committee of counting, analysis and treatment of the offers put on the spot by the director of the administration and finances of the ministry.

23. Were there regular monitoring of changes in capacities and performance of institutions and systems, and were the implementation arrangements adjusted according to changes in partner capacities? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

- 3: Changes in capacities and performance of national institutions and systems were regularly and comprehensively assessed/monitored using clear indicators, rigorous methods of data collection and credible data sources. There is clear evidence that capacities and performance of national institutions and systems improved by the end of the project, if applicable. Implementation arrangements were formally reviewed and adjusted, if needed, in agreement with partners according to changes in partner capacities. (all must be true to select this option)

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. There is limited evidence that capacities and performance of national institutions and systems improved by the end of the project, if applicable. Some adjustment was made to implementation arrangements if needed to reflect changes in partner capacities. (all must be true to select this option)

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 were not considered. Also select this option if changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems were not monitored by the project.

Not Applicable

Evidence

capacity building of institutions and materials and training,
- meetings of the interinstitutional cell and regular production of alerts.
- focal points;
- working synergy between the structures producing climate information.
But it have no system in place for technical and operational capacities changes such as data traitment, monitoring

24. Were the transition and phase-out arrangements implemented as planned by the end of the project, taking into account any adjustments made to the plan during implementation? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

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 to select this option)

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. The plan was implemented by the end of the project, taking into account any adjustments made during implementation. (both must be true to select this option)

1: The project may have had a sustainability plan that specified arrangements for transition and phase-out, 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 acquisition and installation of various stations in agreement and involvement of the stakeholders;
Transferring of all équipements installed to relevant institution for their integration in the national network stations
- the establishment of the inter-institutional unit and the synergy of work between the institutions involved
- the Standard Operating Procedure (MON)
- accountability of the structures through the retrocession of installed and / or rehabilitated stations;
- designations of the focal points in each participating structure;
- the provision of a means of communication and networking to facilitate exchanges between focal points;
- production of warning bulletins, especially in critical seasons

25. Please upload the final lessons learned report that was produced for this project.

Summary/Final Project Board Comments:

Develop a second phase for targeting local communties climate information and specifics actions concerned. integrate in this second phase other dimension for make an multisectorial and national warming system administrate by ANPC