

# Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

**Form Status: Approved**

<b>Overall Rating:</b>	Satisfactory
<b>Decision:</b>	
<b>Portfolio/Project Number:</b>	00084399
<b>Portfolio/Project Title:</b>	Ridge to Reef Approach in Cook Islands_Full Size
<b>Portfolio/Project Date:</b>	2015-04-01 / 2021-12-31

**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 team did identify changes in the external environment and these were discussed in the National Biodiversity Steering Committee (NBSC) (the Project Board) that met regularly on the quarterly basis. Throughout the duration of the project, there was high turnover of staff within the project team. In addition there were challenges and delays in project implementation due to internal arrangements within the key government agencies, the project manager was a manager within the IP and her time was not dedicated to the project alone but also to other functions within the IP. The internal arrangements were discussed at the project steering committee and internal channeling of funds to the project was diverted back to the project IP account for the project. Implementation for the project continued to be delayed due to reluctance of project partners to recruit international consultants to complete project tasks and preferred to utilise government personnel who had other competing priorities with their agencies. After the MTR, UNDP procured the services for a capacity needs assessment as an adaptive management strategy, with the CTA and Protected Areas Specialist to follow, however the IP took on the recruitment of the CTA and PA specialist. Another challenge that was encountered by the project team in completing some of the needed assessments for the project were the distance and timing for travel to outer islands and weather conditions as boat travel to some remote outer islands targeted by the project were not regular and the survey teams could only reach the outer islands by chartering a boat. One other matter that was recognised early on in the project in the NBSC was that their decision makers of the project partners did not attend the meeting but sent a representative that could not make decisions on project matters. This was recognised and the Heads of ministries attended the NBSC. Lesson learnt from this project will be implemented and considered in future programming in the Cook Islands

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2021Q1NBSCmeetingminutes_8532_301.docx">2021Q1NBSCmeetingminutes_8532_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2021Q1NBSCmeetingminutes_8532_301.docx)</a>	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/25/2021 7:39:00 AM

2	BSCMinutes-201530thSeptFINAL_8532_301 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/BSCMinutes-201530thSeptFINAL_8532_301.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/BSCMinutes-201530thSeptFINAL_8532_301.pdf</a> )	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/25/2021 5:29:00 AM
3	BSCMinutes-201615thDecFINAL_8532_301 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/BSCMinutes-201615thDecFINAL_8532_301.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/BSCMinutes-201615thDecFINAL_8532_301.pdf</a> )	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/25/2021 5:39:00 AM
4	BSCMinutes-20165thOctFINAL_8532_301 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/BSCMinutes-20165thOctFINAL_8532_301.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/BSCMinutes-20165thOctFINAL_8532_301.pdf</a> )	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/25/2021 6:11:00 AM
5	BSCMinutes-20165thJulyFINAL_8532_301 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/BSCMinutes-20165thJulyFINAL_8532_301.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/BSCMinutes-20165thJulyFINAL_8532_301.pdf</a> )	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/25/2021 6:12:00 AM
6	BSCMinutes-20168thAprilFINAL_8532_301 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/BSCMinutes-20168thAprilFINAL_8532_301.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/BSCMinutes-20168thAprilFINAL_8532_301.pdf</a> )	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/25/2021 6:12:00 AM
7	BSCMinutes-20175thAprilFINAL_8532_301 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/BSCMinutes-20175thAprilFINAL_8532_301.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/BSCMinutes-20175thAprilFINAL_8532_301.pdf</a> )	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/25/2021 6:17:00 AM
8	BSCMinutes2017Q310thOct_8532_301 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/BSCMinutes2017Q310thOct_8532_301.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/BSCMinutes2017Q310thOct_8532_301.pdf</a> )	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/25/2021 6:20:00 AM
9	BSCMinutes-201826Jan_8532_301 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/BSCMinutes-201826Jan_8532_301.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/BSCMinutes-201826Jan_8532_301.pdf</a> )	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/25/2021 6:45:00 AM
10	SignedQ1Q22019minutes_8532_301 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SignedQ1Q22019minutes_8532_301.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SignedQ1Q22019minutes_8532_301.pdf</a> )	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/25/2021 7:07:00 AM
11	SignedQ32019minutes_8532_301 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SignedQ32019minutes_8532_301.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SignedQ32019minutes_8532_301.pdf</a> )	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/25/2021 7:08:00 AM
12	SignedQ42019minutes_8532_301 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SignedQ42019minutes_8532_301.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SignedQ42019minutes_8532_301.pdf</a> )	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/25/2021 7:08:00 AM

13	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Q12020NBSCMeetingminutes_8532_301.pdf">Q12020NBSCMeetingminutes_8532_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Q12020NBSCMeetingminutes_8532_301.pdf)</a>	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/25/2021 7:08:00 AM
14	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Q22020NBSCMeetingMinutes_8532_301.pdf">Q22020NBSCMeetingMinutes_8532_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Q22020NBSCMeetingMinutes_8532_301.pdf)</a>	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/25/2021 7:09:00 AM
15	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Q32020NBSCMeetingMinutes_8532_301.docx">Q32020NBSCMeetingMinutes_8532_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Q32020NBSCMeetingMinutes_8532_301.docx)</a>	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/25/2021 7:09:00 AM
16	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Q42020NBSCMeetingminutes_8532_301.docx">Q42020NBSCMeetingminutes_8532_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Q42020NBSCMeetingminutes_8532_301.docx)</a>	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/25/2021 7:09:00 AM
17	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CookIslandsR2RFinalTEReportPIMS5168_8532_301.pdf">CookIslandsR2RFinalTEReportPIMS5168_8532_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CookIslandsR2RFinalTEReportPIMS5168_8532_301.pdf)</a>	taufao.t@undp.org	9/1/2021 4:37:00 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 responded to UNDP SP 2014-2017 outcome 1 UNDP SP Outcome 1 (Growth and development are inclusive and sustainable, incorporating productive capacities that create employment and livelihoods for the poor and excluded). This was reflected in its Strategic Results Framework through Planning at sub-national levels to help connect national priorities with action on the ground as seen in the objective indicator where the project supported the development framework for conservation in the Southern group of the Cook Islands through the operationalisation Marae Moana (Cook Islands Marine Park - CIMP) as well as the review of the National Environment Act for the Cook Islands. The 1.9 million square kilometre Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) of Cook Islands was declared under the Marae Moana Act in 2017 and the CIMP management was supported by the project through the Technical Advisory Group and Marae Moana Council meetings, the Sustainable Financing mechanism, the development of the Marae Moana Outlook Report, Marine Spatial Planning and Marine Ecosystems Valuation studies. Refer to prodoc coverpage and strategic results frameworks pages from the prodoc attached. Although the project precedes the current SP, it clearly adopts what is now known as the Signature Solution on "Environment: nature-based solutions for development".

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	72426R2RProjectcoverpageandSRF_8532_302 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/72426R2RProjectcoverpageandSRF_8532_302.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/72426R2RProjectcoverpageandSRF_8532_302.pdf</a> )	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/25/2021 7:50:00 AM

**Relevant****Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

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

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

**Evidence:**

The project target groups were engaged in the implementation of the project through the activities implemented by the responsible partners of the project. Refer to NBSC meeting minutes in 1. and project progress reports (PIRS). Targeted beneficiaries of the project were engaged through activities implemented by the key project partners National Environment Service, Marae Moana Technical Advisory committee, Ministry of Marine Resource, Ministry of Agriculture, House of Ariki, Cook Islands Tourism Corporation, Office of the Prime Minister, Te Ipukarea Society.

List of Uploaded Documents			
#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	2017-PIR-PIMS5168-GEFID5348_8532_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2017-PIR-PIMS5168-GEFID5348_8532_303.pdf)	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/25/2021 8:25:00 AM
2	2018-GEF-PIR-PIMS5168-GEFID5348_8532_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2018-GEF-PIR-PIMS5168-GEFID5348_8532_303.pdf)	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/25/2021 8:26:00 AM
3	Vertical-Fund-COVID-Survey-April-2020-PIMS51681_8532_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Vertical-Fund-COVID-Survey-April-2020-PIMS51681_8532_303.docx)	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/25/2021 8:26:00 AM
4	2019-GEF-PIR-PIMS5168-GEFID5348_8532_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2019-GEF-PIR-PIMS5168-GEFID5348_8532_303.docx)	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/25/2021 8:26:00 AM
5	2020-GEF-PIR-PIMS5168-GEFID5348CookIslands_8532_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2020-GEF-PIR-PIMS5168-GEFID5348CookIslands_8532_303.docx)	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/25/2021 8:27:00 AM

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:**

Yes the project generated knowledge and lessons learned drawn project implementation and activities by the project partners informed decisions to ensure the project remained relevant. Assessments through project and project support to the marine spatial planning in the Cook Islands is key to sustainability of the Marae Moana beyond the duration of the project. The eco tourism certification programme would be sustained beyond the project. Refer to PIRs, BSC meeting minutes, assessment reports below.

Some of the knowledge materials for ecotourism was distributed via the project Facebook page <https://www.facebook.com/nationalenvironmentservices/>

## Mana Tiaki videos

## 1. Sustainable Water Use

<https://www.facebook.com/249403468750645/videos/464595013898155>

## 2. Rubbish – Keep CKI clean

<https://www.facebook.com/249403468750645/videos/463551597335830>

## 3. Sanitation

<https://www.facebook.com/249403468750645/videos/464591813898475>

## 4. Tourism

<https://www.facebook.com/249403468750645/videos/463537560670567>

## 5. Lagoon

<https://www.facebook.com/249403468750645/videos/463542770670046>

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PAMPDISCUSSIONPAPER18DECEMBER2020_8532_304">PAMPDISCUSSIONPAPER18DECEMBER2020_8532_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PAMPDISCUSSIONPAPER18DECEMBER2020_8532_304.docx)</a>	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/25/2021 8:41:00 AM
2	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/4.FINALCookIslandsBioregionalisationReport4.12.20_8532_304">4.FINALCookIslandsBioregionalisationReport4.12.20_8532_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/4.FINALCookIslandsBioregionalisationReport4.12.20_8532_304.docx)</a>	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/25/2021 8:41:00 AM



3	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ProjectoreduceplasticbottlesintheCookIslands_8532_304.pdf">ProjectoreduceplasticbottlesintheCookIslands_8532_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ProjectoreduceplasticbottlesintheCookIslands_8532_304.pdf)</a>	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/25/2021 8:42:00 AM
4	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/TCAVisitorsGuide_Draft_8532_304.pdf">TCAVisitorsGuide_Draft_8532_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/TCAVisitorsGuide_Draft_8532_304.pdf)</a>	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/25/2021 8:43:00 AM
5	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/AssessmentofCoconutCrapatPalmerston_coconut_crab_CI_8532_304.pdf">AssessmentofCoconutCrapatPalmerston_coconut_crab_CI_8532_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/AssessmentofCoconutCrapatPalmerston_coconut_crab_CI_8532_304.pdf)</a>	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/25/2021 8:43:00 AM
6	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/DraftPalmerstonIslandNaturalResourceManagementPlan-HW23.11.2020_8532_304.docx">DraftPalmerstonIslandNaturalResourceManagementPlan-HW23.11.2020_8532_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/DraftPalmerstonIslandNaturalResourceManagementPlan-HW23.11.2020_8532_304.docx)</a>	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/25/2021 8:44:00 AM
7	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CookIslandsPACS-policypaperv11_8532_304.pdf">CookIslandsPACS-policypaperv11_8532_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CookIslandsPACS-policypaperv11_8532_304.pdf)</a>	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/25/2021 8:44:00 AM
8	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MaraeMoanaMSPPolicyPaper_FINAL_8532_304.pdf">MaraeMoanaMSPPolicyPaper_FINAL_8532_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MaraeMoanaMSPPolicyPaper_FINAL_8532_304.pdf)</a>	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/25/2021 8:44:00 AM
9	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CookIslands_SUMA_report_DRAFT76.1.2021_8532_304.docx">CookIslands_SUMA_report_DRAFT76.1.2021_8532_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CookIslands_SUMA_report_DRAFT76.1.2021_8532_304.docx)</a>	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/25/2021 8:46:00 AM
10	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FinalSFMReport_8532_304.docx">FinalSFMReport_8532_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FinalSFMReport_8532_304.docx)</a>	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/25/2021 8:46:00 AM
11	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/KopekaSpeciesStatusReportfinal-corrected11.9.2020_8532_304.docx">KopekaSpeciesStatusReportfinal-corrected11.9.2020_8532_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/KopekaSpeciesStatusReportfinal-corrected11.9.2020_8532_304.docx)</a>	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/25/2021 8:50:00 AM
12	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FINALRPT_2020-08_R2R-Mokoero_Takūtea-AssessmentWildlifeSanctuary_JBriders_8532_304.pdf">FINALRPT_2020-08_R2R-Mokoero_Takūtea-AssessmentWildlifeSanctuary_JBriders_8532_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FINALRPT_2020-08_R2R-Mokoero_Takūtea-AssessmentWildlifeSanctuary_JBriders_8532_304.pdf)</a>	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/25/2021 8:52:00 AM

13	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/TourismAccreditationBiodiversityConservationProjects06102020compressed_8532_304.pdf">TourismAccreditationBiodiversityConservationProjects06102020compressed_8532_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/TourismAccreditationBiodiversityConservationProjects06102020compressed_8532_304.pdf)</a>	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/25/2021 8:52:00 AM
14	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/HW_MitiaroFanPalmfinal11.9.2020_8532_304.docx">HW_MitiaroFanPalmfinal11.9.2020_8532_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/HW_MitiaroFanPalmfinal11.9.2020_8532_304.docx)</a>	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/25/2021 8:52:00 AM
15	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FINALTCAManagementPlan_8532_304.pdf">FINALTCAManagementPlan_8532_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FINALTCAManagementPlan_8532_304.pdf)</a>	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/25/2021 8:53:00 AM
16	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/TISPalmerstonebirds2018_8532_304.docx">TISPalmerstonebirds2018_8532_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/TISPalmerstonebirds2018_8532_304.docx)</a>	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/25/2021 8:54:00 AM
17	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MaraeMoanaOutlookReportFINALDRAFT_8532_304.pdf">MaraeMoanaOutlookReportFINALDRAFT_8532_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MaraeMoanaOutlookReportFINALDRAFT_8532_304.pdf)</a>	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/25/2021 8:54:00 AM
18	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/AitutakiandManuaeNearshoreInvertebrateandFinfishAssessment2017_8532_304.pdf">AitutakiandManuaeNearshoreInvertebrateandFinfishAssessment2017_8532_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/AitutakiandManuaeNearshoreInvertebrateandFinfishAssessment2017_8532_304.pdf)</a>	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/25/2021 8:29:00 AM
19	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MangaiaNearshoreInvertebrateandFinfishAssessment2018_8532_304.pdf">MangaiaNearshoreInvertebrateandFinfishAssessment2018_8532_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MangaiaNearshoreInvertebrateandFinfishAssessment2018_8532_304.pdf)</a>	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/25/2021 8:30:00 AM
20	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MitiaroReportNearshoreInvertebrateandFinfishAssessment2018_8532_304.pdf">MitiaroReportNearshoreInvertebrateandFinfishAssessment2018_8532_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MitiaroReportNearshoreInvertebrateandFinfishAssessment2018_8532_304.pdf)</a>	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/25/2021 8:30:00 AM
21	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Atiu_TakuteaNearshoreInvertebrate_FinfishAssessment2018_8532_304.pdf">Atiu_TakuteaNearshoreInvertebrate_FinfishAssessment2018_8532_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Atiu_TakuteaNearshoreInvertebrate_FinfishAssessment2018_8532_304.pdf)</a>	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/25/2021 8:30:00 AM

22	TangaeoSpeciesStatusReportfinal11.9.2020_8532_304 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/TangaeoSpeciesStatusReportfinal11.9.2020_8532_304.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/TangaeoSpeciesStatusReportfinal11.9.2020_8532_304.docx</a> )	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/25/2021 8:53:00 AM
23	KakeroriSpeciesStatusReportfinal10.09.2020_8532_304 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/KakeroriSpeciesStatusReportfinal10.09.2020_8532_304.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/KakeroriSpeciesStatusReportfinal10.09.2020_8532_304.docx</a> )	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/25/2021 8:53:00 AM
24	NESPalmerstonBTOR_8532_304 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/NESPalmerstonBTOR_8532_304.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/NESPalmerstonBTOR_8532_304.pdf</a> )	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/25/2021 8:54:00 AM
25	ManaTiakiEcoCertificationFinal3-10-181_8532_304 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ManaTiakiEcoCertificationFinal3-10-181_8532_304.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ManaTiakiEcoCertificationFinal3-10-181_8532_304.pdf</a> )	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/25/2021 8:54:00 AM
26	BTOR_Mitiaro_SpeciesSurvey_2017_8532_304 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/BTOR_Mitiaro_SpeciesSurvey_2017_8532_304.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/BTOR_Mitiaro_SpeciesSurvey_2017_8532_304.pdf</a> )	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/25/2021 8:55:00 AM
27	R2RConsultations_Mangaia1_8532_304 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/R2RConsultations_Mangaia1_8532_304.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/R2RConsultations_Mangaia1_8532_304.pdf</a> )	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/25/2021 8:55:00 AM
28	R2RExitSustainabilityStrategy_FINAL50_8532_304 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/R2RExitSustainabilityStrategy_FINAL50_8532_304.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/R2RExitSustainabilityStrategy_FINAL50_8532_304.pdf</a> )	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/25/2021 9:04:00 AM
29	EoPPerformanceReport_FINAL34_8532_304 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/EoPPerformanceReport_FINAL34_8532_304.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/EoPPerformanceReport_FINAL34_8532_304.pdf</a> )	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/25/2021 9:04:00 AM

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 in terms of implementing mainly focussed on the southern group of islands in the Cook Islands. Based on the project outputs and results from the R2R project has laid the groundwork further opportunities to work with the government of the Cook Islands as a Small Islands developing states to ensure the sustainability of Marae Moana into the future with the MSP and policy. refer to reports uploaded in 4. and also PIRs.

**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:**

While the project did not actively collect or document gender specific data during project implementation, the project actively engaged women throughout the duration of the project and this is documented in TAG meeting minutes, quarterly progress and annual PIR reporting as well as community engagement activities by the project partners. Workshops have had good participation and gender balance, with representation of women often outnumbering those of men present and involved in knowledge gathering and decision making activities. Women have represented important cultural associations such as the Koutou Nui traditional leaders, as well as others.

In the Cook Islands women are included in decision making or discussions involving their land or as the traditional leaders in their family. The support of women in every meeting or consultation can be taken for granted as their roles are reflective in the many 'hats' they wear. They are not only mothers, they are council members, traditional leaders including religious leaders in their own right as well as business owners who support all developments on their islands/groups.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

#	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:**

Social and environmental impacts and risk were tracked in the ATLAS risk log. The project reported social and environmental risks through quarterly reporting as well as annual reporting - PIR.

An example of a risk is the COVID-19 pandemic where travel to the Cook Islands was restricted to safeguard Cook Islanders as the country was COVID-19. During the COVID-19 international consultants worked remotely with PMU to ensure that remaining activities in the project continued, and for the TE UNDP recruited an international Team leader and a national team expert to conduct the terminal evaluation for the project. The challenge encountered with international consultants is that there are limitations in communication - slow internet connection and also if the consultant has not worked in the country previously they are not able to understand the national context.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	UNDPSocialEnvironmentalScreening_8532_306_8532_307 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/UNDPSocialEnvironmentalScreening_8532_306_8532_307.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/UNDPSocialEnvironmentalScreening_8532_306_8532_307.pdf</a> )	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/24/2021 8:20:00 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:**

If any, grievances were channeled through and dealt with via the IP - National Environment Service. Any grievances if reported would have documented in the project progress reports and PIR annual reporting.

**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 document included a costed monitoring and evaluation plan (pages 84 - 88). Progress data against indicators of project strategic results framework was monitored by the project and reported at the NBSC meetings, in the quarterly progress reports and the annual PIR reporting. Lesson learnt from the project were the captured in the MTR and TE reports and these will be taken on board for future programming in the Cook Islands. Refer to meeting minutes in Q1, progress reports attached here and final evaluation uploaded in Q1 as well.

<b>List of Uploaded Documents</b>			
#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	SignedQ1QPR2020_8532_309 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SignedQ1QPR2020_8532_309.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SignedQ1QPR2020_8532_309.pdf</a> )	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/30/2021 5:32:00 AM
2	EndorsedR2RQPRQ22020_8532_309 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/EndorsedR2RQPRQ22020_8532_309.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/EndorsedR2RQPRQ22020_8532_309.pdf</a> )	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/30/2021 5:32:00 AM
3	EndorsedR2RQPRQ32020_8532_309 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/EndorsedR2RQPRQ32020_8532_309.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/EndorsedR2RQPRQ32020_8532_309.pdf</a> )	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/30/2021 5:32:00 AM



4	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/1.EndorsedR2RQPRQ42020_8532_309.pdf">1.EndorsedR2RQPRQ42020_8532_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/1.EndorsedR2RQPRQ42020_8532_309.pdf)</a>	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/30/2021 5:33:00 AM
5	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/1.R2RQPRQ12021_8532_309.pdf">1.R2RQPRQ12021_8532_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/1.R2RQPRQ12021_8532_309.pdf)</a>	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/30/2021 5:35:00 AM
6	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Q22021R2RQPR_8532_309.pdf">Q22021R2RQPR_8532_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Q22021R2RQPR_8532_309.pdf)</a>	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/30/2021 5:35:00 AM
7	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/R2RQPRQ42019_8532_309.pdf">R2RQPRQ42019_8532_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/R2RQPRQ42019_8532_309.pdf)</a>	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/30/2021 5:35:00 AM
8	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/R2RQPRQ32019-FINAL-signed_8532_309.pdf">R2RQPRQ32019-FINAL-signed_8532_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/R2RQPRQ32019-FINAL-signed_8532_309.pdf)</a>	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/30/2021 5:35:00 AM
9	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CKIR2R2017QPR3_8532_309.pdf">CKIR2R2017QPR3_8532_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CKIR2R2017QPR3_8532_309.pdf)</a>	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/31/2021 2:12:00 AM
10	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2017R2RQPR4FinalSigned_8532_309.pdf">2017R2RQPR4FinalSigned_8532_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2017R2RQPR4FinalSigned_8532_309.pdf)</a>	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/31/2021 2:15:00 AM
11	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2016Q1QPRR2RCKI_8532_309.pdf">2016Q1QPRR2RCKI_8532_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2016Q1QPRR2RCKI_8532_309.pdf)</a>	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/31/2021 5:59:00 AM
12	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2016Q2PR-R2R_8532_309.pdf">2016Q2PR-R2R_8532_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2016Q2PR-R2R_8532_309.pdf)</a>	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/31/2021 6:00:00 AM
13	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2016Q3PR-R2R_8532_309.pdf">2016Q3PR-R2R_8532_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2016Q3PR-R2R_8532_309.pdf)</a>	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/31/2021 6:03:00 AM
14	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CKIR2RQ12018QPR_8532_309.pdf">CKIR2RQ12018QPR_8532_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CKIR2RQ12018QPR_8532_309.pdf)</a>	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/31/2021 1:49:00 AM
15	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2017-CKIR2RQPR1st2017_8532_309.pdf">2017-CKIR2RQPR1st2017_8532_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2017-CKIR2RQPR1st2017_8532_309.pdf)</a>	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/31/2021 1:56:00 AM
16	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/20172ndQPRR2RFINAL_8532_309.pdf">20172ndQPRR2RFINAL_8532_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/20172ndQPRR2RFINAL_8532_309.pdf)</a>	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/31/2021 1:57:00 AM

17	2016Q4PR_8532_309 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2016Q4PR_8532_309.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2016Q4PR_8532_309.pdf</a> )	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/31/2021 6:07:00 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 governance mechanism - the National Biodiversity Steering Committee (NBSC) operated as the project board for the R2R project as well as other biodiversity related projects in the Cook Islands. the Committee was made up of Ministry of Marine Resources. Ministry of Agriculture, Office of the Prime Minister - Marae Moana Coordination Office and Climate Change Cook Islands, Natural Heritage Trust, House of Ariki - Cultural development, Cook Islands Tourism Corporation, Te Ipukarea Society and committee was co-chaired by the Te Ipukarea Society and the National Environment Service. The NBSC met on a regular basis on the quarterly basis to review project progress and address project issues. Refer NBSC meeting minutes in 1.

<b>List of Uploaded Documents</b>			
#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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

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

**Evidence:**

Project risks were monitoring by the project team and documented in quarterly progress and annual reporting (uploaded) and mitigation measure taken were documented. Project risks were updated by UNDP on the project risk log in ATLAS (refer to uploaded progress reports)

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

**Efficient**

**Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

12. Adequate resources were mobilized to achieve intended results. If not, management decisions were taken to adjust expected results in the project's results framework.

- Yes
- No

**Evidence:**

Adequate resources were sufficient to achieve intended results, however the project experienced delays in implementation due to limited human capacities in the PMU, reluctance to recruit international consultants and a CTA in the early stages. A lesson learnt here is that any future projects should have full PMU dedicated to project implementation (and not government employees with other competing priorities within government) and a Senior/Chief technical advisor and required short term consultancies should be recruited to complete project outputs as timelines for projects short with the requirement dedicated focus on the achievement of project target within the defined timelines.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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

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

**Evidence:**

The project had a procurement that was updated annually but mainly based on the procurement plan approved at project inception. There were delays in procurement mainly of short-term consultants and project staff. This project operated a full NIM with no signed letter of agreement (LoA) for country office support services to the project although the MCO did conduct some support services to try to mitigate project delays.

<b>List of Uploaded Documents</b>			
#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	ProcurementPlanNovember20151_8532_313 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ProcurementPlanNovember20151_8532_313.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ProcurementPlanNovember20151_8532_313.pdf</a> )	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/26/2021 8:43:00 AM
2	R2RProcurementPlan-May2019_8532_313 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/R2RProcurementPlan-May2019_8532_313.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/R2RProcurementPlan-May2019_8532_313.pdf</a> )	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/26/2021 8:43:00 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:**

This project was NIM and monitored its own costs with oversight from the Ministry of Financial and Economic Management and UNDP MCO.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

**Effective**

**Quality Rating: Needs Improvement**

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

- Yes
- No

**Evidence:**

Project implementation was delayed due to limited human resource capacities in-country in the PMU, reluctance to recruit international consultants and a CTA in the early stages. The project was granted two extensions first for 18 months to allow for project to complete project activities and the second extension due to force majeure - COVID-19 pandemic. See the Terminal Evaluation report uploaded as evidence #17 under Q1 above.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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

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

**Evidence:**

The NBSC met on the quarterly basis and these meetings informed the project workplan to ensure project activities were on track and to manage any bottlenecks. Workplan updates were provided in the uploaded quarterly progress reporting. Kindly refer NBSC minutes uploaded on Q1 above.

<b>List of Uploaded Documents</b>			
#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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

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

**Evidence:**

The targeted groups were based on the approved project document. This is documented in the project progress reports (refer Q9 attachments) and the annual PIR reporting (refer Q3).

**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:**

This project was a Nationally implemented modality (NIM) project where national systems were used to implement the project and stakeholder were fully engaged in the decision making, implementation and monitoring of the project. The UNDP MCO supported the procurement for the MTR and TE as well as the Capacity Needs Assessment and Chief Technical Advisor consultancy. There was no Letter of Agreement or approved budget in the GEF approved project document for additional support services by the UNDP MCO for this project however, the MCO intervened with the procurement support to the project as project implementation was delayed and there was limited capacity in-country to complete the required outputs of the project.

**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:**

Two HACT micro-assessments were completed for the NES in 2015 and 2020. Two Spot check reports were completed for NES and the R2R project. These documents are uploaded here. In addition, a Capacity Needs Assessment was conducted under the R2R project and this will be reviewed and incorporated into future programming with NES

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	CookIslandsNES-UNDP-Micro-assessmentreport-final_8532_319 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CookIslandsNES-UNDP-Micro-assessmentreport-final_8532_319.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CookIslandsNES-UNDP-Micro-assessmentreport-final_8532_319.pdf</a> )	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/26/2021 9:28:00 AM
2	R2RCNAReport_FINAL_8532_319 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/R2RCNAReport_FINAL_8532_319.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/R2RCNAReport_FINAL_8532_319.pdf</a> )	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/26/2021 9:28:00 AM
3	CKINESMicroAssmtSept2015_8532_319 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CKINESMicroAssmtSept2015_8532_319.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CKINESMicroAssmtSept2015_8532_319.pdf</a> )	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/26/2021 9:36:00 AM
4	CookIslandsR2R-UNDP-SpotCheckReport_8532_319 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CookIslandsR2R-UNDP-SpotCheckReport_8532_319.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CookIslandsR2R-UNDP-SpotCheckReport_8532_319.pdf</a> )	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/26/2021 9:38:00 AM
5	NESCookIslands-BDO2020SpotCheckReport-31March2021_8532_319 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/NESCookIslands-BDO2020SpotCheckReport-31March2021_8532_319.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/NESCookIslands-BDO2020SpotCheckReport-31March2021_8532_319.pdf</a> )	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/26/2021 9:40:00 AM

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 NBSC met on the quarterly basis.(refer Q1 uplo aded) The project exit and sustainability strategy (up loaded below) was completed by the CTA and revie wed by the NBSC. This strategy will be incorporated into future programming in Cook Islands.

<b>List of Uploaded Documents</b>			
#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	R2RExitSustainabilityStrategy_FINAL50_8532_320 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/R2RExitSustainabilit yStrategy_FINAL50_8532_320.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/Project QA/QAFormDocuments/R2RExitSustainabilit yStrategy_FINAL50_8532_320.pdf</a> )	anne.trevor@undp.org	8/26/2021 9:47:00 AM

**QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments**

The implementation of the Cook Island R2R project was initially constrained by delays in recruitment of key project personnel followed by the delay implementation of activities and completion of project outputs linked to achieving project targets. This project was a full NIM project and there was no LOA or budget for support services from the UNDP MCO. In addition the Project Manager from project start to end-2019 was the Senior Manager in NES who had other obligations and priorities within NES. In late 2019, the new Director of NES brought onboard a Project Manager to focus completely on project implementation until the end of the project. The project suffered from staff turnover in the PMU as well as limited technical capacities within the team. UNDP advised the IP to recruit a senior technical advisor from the beginning of the project but there was reluctance to recruit a technical advisor or any international consultants, as the partner agencies wanted to conduct activities themselves. However, this proved to be a bottleneck since government personnel had their competing work priority and project activities could not be completed within the expected timelines or were not completed at all. The Cook Islands did have the technical capacities to fulfil project outputs, but given the small population and narrow market there were few technical experts available to complete work on time due to other commitments or were already working within the government agencies. While the project had many challenges, several outputs were completed or were started with support from the project and these outputs can inform future programming and legislative/policy review in the Cook Islands. These included the various biodiversity assessments, the review of the Environment Act and the support to the Marae Moana Coordination with Marine Spatial Planning. In addition, this was the first NIM project implemented by NES, and it has contributed to building capacities within NES and the Cook Islands government in implementing a project of this scale.

A critical lesson learnt is that any future projects should have a full PMU dedicated to project implementation, and a part-time Senior/Chief technical advisor as well as required short term consultancies should be procured timely to complete project outputs, thus enabling projects to achieve targets within the defined timelines of the project. In addition, recommendations and lessons learnt and documented by the R2R project TE, EoP, Sustainability Strategy and project outputs should be incorporated into future programming in the Cook Islands.