

Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

Form Status: Approved

Overall Rating:	Needs Improvement
Decision:	
Portfolio/Project Number:	00079046
Portfolio/Project Title:	ABS Nagoya Protocol in Cook Is (MSP)
Portfolio/Project Date:	2015-07-06 / 2020-01-31

Strategic

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

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 document included the standard UNDP/ GEF budgeted monitoring and evaluation plan. The M&E plan was broken down into quarters with an allocated budget linked to the MYWP. The rating for the M&E design at project startup was 'Satisfactory' (pg 35 of the Terminal Evaluation). A Terminal Evaluation was conducted at the end of the project. The implementation of the M&E plan was rated 'Satisfactory' (pg36 of the Terminal Evaluation).

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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 is aligned with the UNDP Strategic Plan Outcome 1: Growth and development are inclusive and sustainable, incorporating productive capacities that create employment and livelihoods for the poor and excluded, as outlined in the Project Document. The project focuses on growth and sustainability, and the creation of employment opportunities. The project opened up new markets within the Cook Islands and internationally (pg3 - 4 of Component 3 - 2019 Q3 PR). The Cook Islands government formally integrated traditional Cook Islands Maori Medicines into the health system. The bone and skin regenerating products will be made available within the Cook Islands and can be shipped overseas upon request.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	CKIABS_Component3_20193rdQuarterProgressReportYear3Workplan_4918_302 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CKIABS_Component3_20193rdQuarterProgressReportYear3Workplan_4918_302.pdf)	jeffery.leung.wai@undp.org	3/10/2020 11:14:00 PM

Relevant

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

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

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

Evidence:

Consultations and workshops have been carried out, in which relevant stakeholders and landowners were consulted. A regional workshop was conducted by S PREP including on ABS Project Inception and Capacity Building, in which participants went through relevant training. During Q3 2017, about 45% of all stakeholders were reached by the ABS awareness campaign. The campaign conducted included meetings, social media posts and television advertisements. The Project Board, also known as the Biodiversity Steering Committee (BSC), acts as the Board for multiple projects. The BSC met on quarterly basis, bringing together relevant ministries/divisions such as Marine Resources, Climate Change, OPM-Marae Moana, Natural Heritage Trust, Cultural Development, Tourism Corporation, Development Coordination Division, Agriculture, and the Te Ipukarea Society. These stakeholders contribute to the decision making of the project.

The ABS CI Progress Report 2018 Q1 clearly states further consultations and meeting taking place. There was an ABS Capacity Building support provided remotely with the Commencement of situational and (ABS) stakeholder analysis with Heads of Ministries related to ABS were consulted (refer to page 3 and pages 47 to 57_ABS CI PR 2018 Q1). Consultations were also provided for members of the local community (refer to pages 14 to 17_ABS CI PR 2018 Q1). Educational awareness raising and Policy consultations were held during the second quarter of 2018 (refer to page 3_ABS CI PR 2018 Q2). A total of 23 stakeholders was reached by the awareness campaign (refer to page 9_ABS CI PR 2018 Q2). Further consultations and educational awareness were continued throughout the 3rd quarter of 2018 covering the northern and southern island groups (page 2_ABS CI PR 2018 Q3). The final ABS community consultation was held in Rarotonga in November 2018 (refer to page 3 & page 15 to 16_ABS CI PR 2018 Q4). Matheson Enterprises and members of Koutu Nui played key roles in the dialogue, review and community consultation process of ABS Policy. (Output 3.1 remains contingent on this Policy being implemented) (pg 5_CKI ABS Component 3_2019_PR).

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	SignedQ1Q22019minutes_4918_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SignedQ1Q22019minutes_4918_303.pdf)	jeffery.leung.wai@undp.org	3/10/2020 11:32:00 PM
2	SignedQ32019minutes_4918_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SignedQ32019minutes_4918_303.pdf)	jeffery.leung.wai@undp.org	3/10/2020 11:32:00 PM
3	SignedQ42019minutes_4918_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SignedQ42019minutes_4918_303.pdf)	jeffery.leung.wai@undp.org	3/10/2020 11:32:00 PM
4	ABSCIPR2017Q1_4918_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ABSCIPR2017Q1_4918_303.pdf)	jeffery.leung.wai@undp.org	3/10/2020 11:35:00 PM
5	ABSCIPR2017Q2_4918_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ABSCIPR2017Q2_4918_303.pdf)	jeffery.leung.wai@undp.org	3/10/2020 11:35:00 PM
6	ABSCIPR2017Q3_4918_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ABSCIPR2017Q3_4918_303.pdf)	jeffery.leung.wai@undp.org	3/10/2020 11:35:00 PM
7	ABSCIPR2017Q4_4918_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ABSCIPR2017Q4_4918_303.pdf)	jeffery.leung.wai@undp.org	3/10/2020 11:36:00 PM
8	ABSCIPR2018Q1_4918_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ABSCIPR2018Q1_4918_303.pdf)	jeffery.leung.wai@undp.org	3/10/2020 11:36:00 PM
9	ABSCIPR2018Q2_4918_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ABSCIPR2018Q2_4918_303.pdf)	jeffery.leung.wai@undp.org	3/10/2020 11:37:00 PM
10	ABSCIPR2018Q3_4918_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ABSCIPR2018Q3_4918_303.pdf)	jeffery.leung.wai@undp.org	3/10/2020 11:40:00 PM
11	ABSCIPR2018Q4_4918_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ABSCIPR2018Q4_4918_303.pdf)	jeffery.leung.wai@undp.org	3/10/2020 11:40:00 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 project generated lessons learned from internal and external sources. The project team participated in a UNDP Project Management Workshop in early November of 2019, which provided the opportunity for all UNDP project teams from Samoa, Niue, the Cook Islands and Tokelau to present their lessons learned and share knowledge with peers. The Project Progress Reports in Section 6 outline the lessons learned and best practices of the project. Refer to attachments for evidence.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	ABSCIPR2017Q1_pg11to12_Section6_Lessonslearnedandgoodpractices_4918_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ABSCIPR2017Q1_pg11to12_Section6_Lessonslearnedandgoodpractices_4918_304.pdf)	jeffery.leung.wai@undp.org	3/10/2020 11:51:00 PM
2	ABSCIPR2017Q2_pg10_Section6_Lessonslearnedandgoodpractices_4918_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ABSCIPR2017Q2_pg10_Section6_Lessonslearnedandgoodpractices_4918_304.pdf)	jeffery.leung.wai@undp.org	3/10/2020 11:51:00 PM

3	ABSCIPR2017Q3_pg12to13_Section6_Lessonslearnedandgoodpracticespdf_4918_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ABSCIPR2017Q3_pg12to13_Section6_Lessonslearnedandgoodpracticespdf_4918_304.pdf)	jeffery.leung.wai@undp.org	3/10/2020 11:51:00 PM
4	ABSCIPR2017Q4_pg11to12_Section6_Lessonslearnedandgoodpractices_4918_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ABSCIPR2017Q4_pg11to12_Section6_Lessonslearnedandgoodpractices_4918_304.pdf)	jeffery.leung.wai@undp.org	3/10/2020 11:52:00 PM
5	ABSCIPR2018Q1_pg12_Section6_Lessonslearnedandgoodpracticespdf_4918_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ABSCIPR2018Q1_pg12_Section6_Lessonslearnedandgoodpracticespdf_4918_304.pdf)	jeffery.leung.wai@undp.org	3/10/2020 11:52:00 PM
6	ABSCIPR2018Q2_pg12_Section6_Lessonslearnedandgoodpractices_4918_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ABSCIPR2018Q2_pg12_Section6_Lessonslearnedandgoodpractices_4918_304.pdf)	jeffery.leung.wai@undp.org	3/10/2020 11:52:00 PM
7	ABSCIPR2018Q3_pg13_Section6_Lessonslearnedandgoodpracticespdf_4918_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ABSCIPR2018Q3_pg13_Section6_Lessonslearnedandgoodpracticespdf_4918_304.pdf)	jeffery.leung.wai@undp.org	3/10/2020 11:52:00 PM
8	ABSCIPR2018Q4_pg11to12_Section6_Lessonslearnedandgoodpractices_4918_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ABSCIPR2018Q4_pg11to12_Section6_Lessonslearnedandgoodpractices_4918_304.pdf)	jeffery.leung.wai@undp.org	3/10/2020 11:52:00 PM
9	CKIABS_Component3_20193rdQuarterProgressReportYear3Workplan_pg8to9_Section6_Lessonslearnedandgoodpracticespdf_4918_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CKIABS_Component3_20193rdQuarterProgressReportYear3Workplan_pg8to9_Section6_Lessonslearnedandgoodpracticespdf_4918_304.pdf)	jeffery.leung.wai@undp.org	3/10/2020 11:52:00 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 able to reach a large number of people including in the outer islands (Refer to pg 31 of Terminal Evaluation). As mentioned in the 2019 PG Q 3, the volume of plant material processed has been scaled up. The target volume of 50kgs of plant material has been exceeded as the extraction of larger scale batches moved from experimental to standardization phase. The project team prepared a sustainability plan in the beginning of 2017 (Refer to PR 2017 Q 10 and was revised in 2018 (Refer to PR 2018 Q2).

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	ABSCIPR2017Q1_pg12to13_Section7_Sustainabilityplanning_4918_305 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ABSCIPR2017Q1_pg12to13_Section7_Sustainabilityplanning_4918_305.pdf)	jeffery.leung.wai@undp.org	3/11/2020 12:20:00 AM
2	ABSCIPR2018Q2_pg13to14_Section7_Sustainabilityplanning_4918_305 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ABSCIPR2018Q2_pg13to14_Section7_Sustainabilityplanning_4918_305.pdf)	jeffery.leung.wai@undp.org	3/11/2020 12:20:00 AM
3	TerminalEvaluationReport_CIs_191216_pg31_Partnershiparrangements_4918_305 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/TerminalEvaluationReport_CIs_191216_pg31_Partnershiparrangements_4918_305.pdf)	jeffery.leung.wai@undp.org	3/11/2020 12:20:00 AM

Principled**Quality Rating: Needs Improvement**

6. Were the project's measures (through outputs, activities, indicators) to address gender inequalities and empower women relevant and produced the intended effect? If not, evidence-based adjustments and changes were made.

- 3: The project team gathered data and evidence through project monitoring on the relevance of the measures to address gender inequalities and empower women. Analysis of data and evidence were used to inform adjustments and changes, as appropriate. (both must be true)
- 2: The project team had some data and evidence on the relevance of the measures to address gender inequalities and empower women. There is evidence that at least some adjustments were made, as appropriate. (both must be true)
- 1: *The project team had limited or no evidence on the relevance of measures to address gender inequalities and empowering women. No evidence of adjustments and/or changes made. This option should also be selected if the project has no measures to address gender inequalities and empower women relevant to the project results and activities.*

Evidence:

There is no clear evidence within the ProDoc that indicates measures to address gender inequalities and empower women. There is also no evidence in the Project Progress reports in which gender inequalities are addressed.

Management Response:

The UNDP MCO will ensure that new projects address gender inequalities and women's empowerment.

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:

There is no clear evidence that the social and environmental risks were monitored. There was also a lack of information in the project's M&E activities as identified by the consultant in the TE report. The only environmental risk identified was the risk of over harvesting of the Hibiscus titiaceus which is very moderate (pg 17 of Terminal Evaluation). There was no Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) undertaken due to the size and impact of the project with the risks being low to moderate. However, there were sustainability plans in place. There is also an Environmental and Social Screening Survey in the ProDoc (pg 83 to 94).

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	ABS Nagoya ProDoc_pg83to94_4918_307 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ABS Nagoya ProDoc_pg83to94_4918_307.pdf)	jeffery.leung.wai@undp.org	3/11/2020 12:51:00 AM
2	Terminal Evaluation Report_CIs_191216_pg17_4918_307 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Terminal Evaluation Report_CIs_191216_pg17_4918_307.pdf)	jeffery.leung.wai@undp.org	3/11/2020 12:51:00 AM

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

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

Evidence:

Due to the size of the project, the number of people affected is very small. The Project PRs include Section 5 in which Project risks and issues are addressed. There is also a Biodiversity Steering Committee chaired by the National Environmental Service that includes all relevant government ministry representatives. The BSC includes the Ministries of Cultural Development, Marine Resources, Office of Prime Minister and Agriculture. The BSC ensures that any grievances are addressed in a timely manner, consulting and informing affected people via meeting, social media and TV. The risks stated in the project document are Low to Medium. There have been no grievances reported by anyone in relation to the project during implementation.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	ABSNagoyaProDoc_pg83to94_4918_308 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ABSNagoyaProDoc_pg83to94_4918_308.pdf)	jeffery.leung.wai@undp.org	3/11/2020 12:58:00 AM
2	SignedQ1Q22019minutes_4918_308 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SignedQ1Q22019minutes_4918_308.pdf)	jeffery.leung.wai@undp.org	3/11/2020 12:58:00 AM
3	SignedQ32019minutes_4918_308 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SignedQ32019minutes_4918_308.pdf)	jeffery.leung.wai@undp.org	3/11/2020 12:59:00 AM
4	SignedQ42019minutes_4918_308 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SignedQ42019minutes_4918_308.pdf)	jeffery.leung.wai@undp.org	3/11/2020 12:59:00 AM

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:

Page 68 to 70 of the Project document includes a Monitoring and Evaluation Plan. The plan clearly lays out the type of M&E activity, responsible parties, budget, and time frame. The M&E Plan includes risks, issues and quality logs to be created by the Project Manager. The Terminal Evaluation has given a rating of 'Satisfactory' for M&E design and project startup, a rating of 'Satisfactory' for M&E Plan Implementation, and a rating of 'Satisfactory' for the overall quality of M&E (refer to pg 7 of M&E). The project provided all 4 quarterly progress reports for 2018 and only one PR was received in 2019 except for a Progress Report 2019 Q3 provided by Matheson Enterprises covering only component 3. The progress reports also contribute towards the M&E. The Progress Reports of 2018 have a standard format that includes; (1) Financial summary and progress, (2) Project risks and issues, and (3) Lessons learned and good practices (refer to ABS CI PR 2018 Q1-Q2 Reports). The lessons learned also included good practices which were used to take corrective action. The lack of Progress reports in 2019 was due to the Project Coordinator resigning causing the project to be put on hold (refer to page 9_Signed Q1 & Q2 2019 minutes and page 3_Signed Q3 2019 minutes of the Biodiversity Steering Committee meetings).

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	TerminalEvaluationReport_CIs_191216_pg6to10_ME_4918_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/TerminalEvaluationReport_CIs_191216_pg6to10_ME_4918_309.pdf)	jeffery.leung.wai@undp.org	3/11/2020 1:19:00 AM
2	ABSNagoyaProDoc_pg68to70_MonitoringandEvaluationPlan_4918_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ABSNagoyaProDoc_pg68to70_MonitoringandEvaluationPlan_4918_309.pdf)	jeffery.leung.wai@undp.org	3/11/2020 1:12:00 AM

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

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

Evidence:

The project's governance mechanism functioned well as intended. The Government of Cook Islands has a Biodiversity Steering Committee (BSC) chaired by IP-National Environment Service (NES) which also serves as a Project Board. The members of the committee included relevant ministries/divisions such as, Marine Resources, Climate change, OPM-Marae Moana, Natural Heritage Trust, Cultural Development, Tourism Corporation, Development Coordination Division, Agriculture and Te Ipukarea Society. These members contribute to the decision making of the project. The Biodiversity Steering Committee also has well recorded minutes of their discussions and decisions which are signed and circulated to all projects, stakeholders and UNDP. The Terminal Evaluation also clearly states the role and importance of the committee in endorsing policies for Cabinet approval (refer to pg 7 of Terminal Evaluation)

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	SignedQ1Q22019minutes_4918_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SignedQ1Q22019minutes_4918_310.pdf)	jeffery.leung.wai@undp.org	3/11/2020 1:30:00 AM
2	SignedQ32019minutes_4918_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SignedQ32019minutes_4918_310.pdf)	jeffery.leung.wai@undp.org	3/11/2020 1:31:00 AM
3	SignedQ42019minutes_4918_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SignedQ42019minutes_4918_310.pdf)	jeffery.leung.wai@undp.org	3/11/2020 1:31:00 AM
4	TerminalEvaluationReport_Cls_191216_pg7_4918_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/TerminalEvaluationReport_Cls_191216_pg7_4918_310.pdf)	jeffery.leung.wai@undp.org	3/11/2020 1:35:00 AM

11. Were risks to the project adequately monitored and managed?

- 3: The project monitored risks every quarter and consulted with the key stakeholders, security advisors, to identify continuing and emerging risks to assess if the main assumptions remained valid. There is clear evidence that relevant management plans and mitigating measures were fully implemented to address each key project risk and were updated to reflect the latest risk assessment. (all must be true)
- 2: *The project monitored risks every year, as evidenced by an updated risk log. Some updates were made to management plans and mitigation measures.*
- 1: The risk log was not updated as required. There was may be some evidence that the project monitored risks that may affected the project's achievement of results, but there is no explicit evidence that management actions were taken to mitigate risks.

Evidence:

Project risks have been monitored and reported in quarterly progress reports. The template of the Project Report contains Section 5 which covers project risks and issues. Risks and issues were clearly stated in all reports submitted for review of the Biodiversity Steering Committee. The Terminal Evaluation report (page 23) has also identified risks associated with the project during the project preparation phase with proposed mitigation measures to address. Page 24 of the Terminal Evaluation report has identified 12 risks and assumptions during the formulation phase that included risks per outcome. Five risks were rated as medium while seven were considered as low. Some of these risks were clearly defined and had already affected the project's implementation.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	ABSNagoyaCookIslands_TEFinalReport_4918_311 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ABSNagoyaCookIslands_TEFinalReport_4918_311.pdf)	jeffery.leung.wai@undp.org	3/11/2020 1:47:00 AM
2	ABSCIPR2017Q1_pg11Section5_Projectrisksandissues_4918_311 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ABSCIPR2017Q1_pg11Section5_Projectrisksandissues_4918_311.pdf)	jeffery.leung.wai@undp.org	3/11/2020 1:40:00 AM
3	ABSCIPR2017Q2_pg10_Section5_Projectrisksandissues_4918_311 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ABSCIPR2017Q2_pg10_Section5_Projectrisksandissues_4918_311.pdf)	jeffery.leung.wai@undp.org	3/11/2020 1:40:00 AM

4	ABSCIPR2017Q3_pg12_Section5_Projectrisksandissues_4918_311 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ABSCIPR2017Q3_pg12_Section5_Projectrisksandissues_4918_311.pdf)	jeffery.leung.wai@undp.org	3/11/2020 1:40:00 AM
5	ABSCIPR2017Q4_pg11_Section5_Section5_Projectrisksandissues_4918_311 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ABSCIPR2017Q4_pg11_Section5_Section5_Projectrisksandissues_4918_311.pdf)	jeffery.leung.wai@undp.org	3/11/2020 1:40:00 AM
6	ABSCIPR2018Q1_pg12_Section5_Projectrisksandissues_4918_311 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ABSCIPR2018Q1_pg12_Section5_Projectrisksandissues_4918_311.pdf)	jeffery.leung.wai@undp.org	3/11/2020 1:40:00 AM
7	ABSCIPR2018Q2_pg12_Section5-Projectrisksandissues_4918_311 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ABSCIPR2018Q2_pg12_Section5-Projectrisksandissues_4918_311.pdf)	jeffery.leung.wai@undp.org	3/11/2020 1:41:00 AM
8	ABSCIPR2018Q3_pg13_Section5_Projectrisksandissues_4918_311 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ABSCIPR2018Q3_pg13_Section5_Projectrisksandissues_4918_311.pdf)	jeffery.leung.wai@undp.org	3/11/2020 1:41:00 AM
9	ABSCIPR2018Q4_pg13_Section5_Projectrisksandissues_4918_311 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ABSCIPR2018Q4_pg13_Section5_Projectrisksandissues_4918_311.pdf)	jeffery.leung.wai@undp.org	3/11/2020 1:41:00 AM

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:

Adequate resources have been allocated and mobilized to achieve the intended results. However, there were delays in the project implementation due to the resignation of the Project Coordinator, especially in development of the needed regulatory framework. The Terminal Evaluation (pg7) rates financial sustainability as 'Moderately Likely, thereby giving an indication that there were sufficient funds allocated to achieve the intended results.

List of Uploaded Documents			
#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	ABS Nagoya Cook Islands_TEFinalReport_4918_312 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ABS Nagoya Cook Islands_TEFinalReport_4918_312.pdf)	jeffery.leung.wai@undp.org	3/11/2020 3:59:00 AM

13. Were project inputs procured and delivered on time to efficiently contribute to results?

- 3: The project had a procurement plan and kept it updated. The project quarterly reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addressed them through appropriate management actions. (all must be true)
- 2: The project had updated procurement plan. The project annually reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addressed them through appropriate management actions. (all must be true)
- 1: *The project did not have an updated procurement plan. The project team may or may not have reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs regularly, however management actions were not taken to address them.*

Evidence:

There is also no evidence of an updated procurement plan. of the project results were delayed due to the loss of the project coordinator. The delays were raised with the Biodiversity Steering Committee. The departure of the coordinator has resulted in the project being put on hold. The recruitment of a new project coordinator was also delayed (page 16 of the Terminal Evaluation)

Management Response:

One of the significant challenges the project faced was due to deficiencies in the project management arrangements at the design stage, which was unfortunately not addressed during the project inception phase, according to the Terminal Evaluation report. The UNDP MCO will ensure that for future projects, the project management arrangements are robust.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	ABSNagoyaCookIslands_TEFinalReport_4918_313 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ABSNagoyaCookIslands_TEFinalReport_4918_313.pdf)	jeffery.leung.wai@undp.org	3/11/2020 4:05:00 AM

14. Was there regular monitoring and recording of cost efficiencies, taking into account the expected quality of results?

- 3: There is evidence that the project regularly reviewed costs against relevant comparators (e.g., other projects or country offices) or industry benchmarks to ensure the project maximized results delivered with given resources. The project actively coordinated with other relevant ongoing projects and initiatives (UNDP or other) to ensure complementarity and sought efficiencies wherever possible (e.g. joint activities.) (both must be true)
- 2: *The project monitored its own costs and gave anecdotal examples of cost efficiencies (e.g., spending less to get the same result,) but there was no systematic analysis of costs and no link to the expected quality of results delivered. The project coordinated activities with other projects to achieve cost efficiency gains.*
- 1: There is little or no evidence that the project monitored its own costs and considered ways to save money beyond following standard procurement rules.

Evidence:

There was regular monitoring and recording of cost efficiencies, but no systematic analysis of costs linked to the quality of results delivered. The progress reports provided include results tracking and financial summaries to mark progress of the project. The Terminal Evaluation (page 45) gave a rating of 'Moderately Satisfactory (MS)' for the project efficiency.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	TerminalEvaluationReport_CIs_191216_pg44to45_4918_314 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/TerminalEvaluationReport_CIs_191216_pg44to45_4918_314.pdf)	jeffery.leung.wai@undp.org	3/11/2020 4:53:00 AM

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 to deliver its expected outputs. This is due to the resignation of the Project Coordinator in early 2019, resulting in the project being put on hold. This has delayed the development of the needed regulatory framework. During Q4 2019, the NES continued to face challenges filling the vacant position. Refer to page 16, 25 -28 of Terminal Evaluation

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	ABS Nagoya Cook Islands_TEFinalReport_4918_315 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ABS Nagoya Cook Islands_TEFinalReport_4918_315.pdf)	jeffery.leung.wai@undp.org	3/11/2020 5:04:00 AM

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

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

Evidence:

The work plan has undergone a review in the year 2018. The work plan revised was approved by the Biodiversity Steering Committee on the 26th Feb 2019. The same work plan was again brought before the committee during the 3rd quarter of 2019 for review but no changes were made and the work plan was again approved.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	SignedQ1Q22019minutes_BiodiversitySteeringCommittee_pg8_4918_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SignedQ1Q22019minutes_BiodiversitySteeringCommittee_pg8_4918_316.pdf)	jeffery.leung.wai@undp.org	3/11/2020 5:08:00 AM
2	SignedQ32019minutes_BiodiversitySteeringCommittee_pg3_4918_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SignedQ32019minutes_BiodiversitySteeringCommittee_pg3_4918_316.pdf)	jeffery.leung.wai@undp.org	3/11/2020 5:08:00 AM

17. Were the targeted groups systematically identified and engaged, prioritizing the marginalized and excluded, to ensure results were achieved as expected?

- 3: The project targeted specific groups and/or geographic areas, identified by using credible data sources on their capacity needs, deprivation and/or exclusion from development opportunities relevant to the project's area of work. There is clear evidence that the targeted groups were reached as intended. The project engaged regularly with targeted groups over the past year to assess whether they benefited as expected and adjustments were made if necessary, to refine targeting. (all must be true)
- 2: *The project targeted specific groups and/or geographic areas, based on some evidence of their capacity needs, deprivation and/or exclusion from development opportunities relevant to the project's area of work. Some evidence is provided to confirm that project beneficiaries are members of the targeted groups. There was some engagement with beneficiaries in the past year to assess whether they were benefiting as expected. (all must be true)*
- 1: The project did not report on specific targeted groups. There is no evidence to confirm that project beneficiaries are populations have capacity needs or are deprived and/or excluded from development opportunities relevant to the project area of work. There is some engagement with beneficiaries to assess whether they benefited as expected, but it was limited or did not occurred in the past year.
- Not Applicable

Evidence:

Target groups were identified based on geography, and engaged by the project through various means. Due to geographical remoteness of some project locations, this included meetings, television broadcasts and social media. According to PR 2017 Q1, the number of stakeholders reached by the ABS awareness campaign was 44%, which is considered high. The project inception report (annex 1) showed that relevant government ministries were all involved. These same ministries are part of the Biodiversity Steering Committee. The targeted groups were also regularly engaged. For outcome 2 (Capacity building and awareness-raising for the implementation of the national Framework), the rating for the number of stakeholders reached by the ABS awareness campaign was 'Highly Satisfactory (HS)'. (page 41 of Terminal Evaluation).

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	SignedQ42019minutes_pg3_Attendance_4918_317 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SignedQ42019minutes_pg3_Attendance_4918_317.pdf)	jeffery.leung.wai@undp.org	3/11/2020 5:25:00 AM
2	ABSCIPR2017Q1_PG7to9_ResultsTracker_4918_317 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ABSCIPR2017Q1_PG7to9_ResultsTracker_4918_317.pdf)	jeffery.leung.wai@undp.org	3/11/2020 5:22:00 AM
3	SignedQ32019minutes_pg2_Attendance_4918_317 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SignedQ32019minutes_pg2_Attendance_4918_317.pdf)	jeffery.leung.wai@undp.org	3/11/2020 5:25:00 AM
4	TerminalEvaluationReport_CIs_191216_pg41_4918_317 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/TerminalEvaluationReport_CIs_191216_pg41_4918_317.pdf)	jeffery.leung.wai@undp.org	3/11/2020 5:20:00 AM
5	ABSCIPR2017Q1_pg16to17_ArarenessRaisingEscapeMagazine_4918_317 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ABSCIPR2017Q1_pg16to17_ArarenessRaisingEscapeMagazine_4918_317.pdf)	jeffery.leung.wai@undp.org	3/11/2020 5:24:00 AM
6	SignedQ1Q22019minutes_page2Attendance_4918_317 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SignedQ1Q22019minutes_page2Attendance_4918_317.pdf)	jeffery.leung.wai@undp.org	3/11/2020 5:24:00 AM

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:

All national partners are fully engaged during decision-making, implementation and monitoring of the project. The Biodiversity Steering Committee include all relevant stakeholders in which quarterly meetings are held. The Steering committee are given an opportunity to fully engage in the project. The committee keeps a good record of meetings and minutes kept at NES (page 29 of Terminal Evaluation).

List of Uploaded Documents			
#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	SignedQ1Q22019minutes_4918_318 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SignedQ1Q22019minutes_4918_318.pdf)	jeffery.leung.wai@undp.org	3/11/2020 5:33:00 AM
2	SignedQ32019minutes_4918_318 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SignedQ32019minutes_4918_318.pdf)	jeffery.leung.wai@undp.org	3/11/2020 5:33:00 AM
3	SignedQ42019minutes_4918_318 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SignedQ42019minutes_4918_318.pdf)	jeffery.leung.wai@undp.org	3/11/2020 5:34:00 AM
4	ABS Nagoya Cook Islands_TEFinalReport_pg29_4918_318 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ABS Nagoya Cook Islands_TEFinalReport_pg29_4918_318.pdf)	jeffery.leung.wai@undp.org	3/11/2020 5:33:00 AM

19. Were there regular monitoring of changes in capacities and performance of institutions and systems relevant to the project, as needed, and were the implementation [arrangements](#)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:

The project has recently undergone a spot check using the 2018 CDR and project IP Micro-Assessment in December 2019. Both reports confirm that there are no significant changes in internal controls since the last Micro-Assessment. The project IP Micro-Assessment 2019 has a "low" risk rating. One of the spot check report recommendations is that the IP should ensure a clear audit trail exists between the costs it declares on the FACE Forms and the individual transactions recorded in its accounting system.

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 Project's Quarterly Progress Reports (see for example PR 2017 Q1, attached above) include a section on sustainability planning as well as a matrix including project outcome, possible short term actions, possible long term actions, and responsible agencies. The Sustainability plan was again revised and included in the Progress Report 2018 Q2.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments

Despite the fact that the project lost its Coordinator, many of its activities could be completed. The project was least successful in strengthening the national regulatory and institutional framework on ABS (ABS policy, ABS Legislation). The project TE report highlights lesson learned, best practices, corrective actions and recommendations for consideration for future projects. A GEF Tracking Tool will be developed, which will take stock of GEF project achievements. The TE consultant recommended to have a project exit strategy to avoid leaving the project partners in limbo, and also for UNDP to look at the possibility to extending the project for 5-6 months to complete the remaining deliverable of the project.