

Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

Form Status: Approved

Overall Rating:	Satisfactory
Decision:	
Portfolio/Project Number:	00062173
Portfolio/Project Title:	Strengthening the Resilience of our Islands and our Com
Portfolio/Project Date:	2012-07-01 / 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 completed its terminal evaluation in third quarter of 2018. Throughout the project life cycle, the team discovered changes in the external environment, however these were minor changes during the implementation which does not have any impact to the project strategy/objective as well as national priorities. However, the project team implied an adaptive management approach that best fit the situation. On a strategic level, the project developed the Joint National Action Plan (JNAP II) 2 and enhanced 12 National Policies (National Sustainable Development Plan NSDP and 11 Climate Sustainable Development Plan). The National Climate Change and Disaster Management Policy was also developed and endorsed by the cabinet on 6th August 2013. Refer to Annex IV (Summary of Project Achievement by Objectives and Outcomes) of Terminal Evaluation Report. (Also refer below links to access on the above documents).

Moreover, an analysis of UNDP Comparative Advantage vis-a'-vis partner is also reflected in Terminal Evaluation Report (pg 10)

https://www.pacificclimatechange.net/components/com_booklibrary/ebooks/JNAP%20-%20FINAL%20012.pdf

<http://www.mfem.gov.ck/development/development-programmes/national-programmes/327-climate-change#policies-and-planning>

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	FinalreportofTEofSRIC-CCproject_31Aug018005_4015_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FinalreportofTEofSRIC-CCproject_31Aug018005_4015_301.doc)	ioane.iosefo@undp.org	3/4/2020 1:46:00 PM

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

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

Evidence:

Yes. The project links to outcome 5 of the Strategic Plan. Countries that look at reducing the likelihood of conflict, and lowering the risk of natural disasters, including from climate change. The project focus to strengthen resilience, which corresponds to one of the areas of development in the SP. (Refer to project document attached)

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	SRIC_projectdocument_4015_302 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SRIC_projectdocument_4015_302.pdf)	ioane.iosefo@undp.org	3/5/2020 2:37:00 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:

Targeted groups for the project are people of Cook I slands in all 11 Pa Enuas. The project engaged with these targeted groups in the implementation stage of the project. SRIC-CC have implemented several small grant projects that range from Agriculture, Climate resilience, coastal protection, tourism and water enhancement projects through the supply of water tank to the outer islands in the north and south groups.

SRIC project also helped community members in outer islands such as young farmers (the youth groups), men and women. One of the highlight of the project is the story of young farmers in Mangaia Island which was published via UNDP exposure website and made it to the Top 5 stories as well as on the Cook I slands News. Refer to link below. To learn more about the project engagement with targeted groups, refer to final project report attached.

<https://undp-adaptation.exposure.co/young-farmers>

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	SRICProjectFinalReport_4015_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SRICProjectFinalReport_4015_303.pdf)	ioane.iosefo@undp.org	3/5/2020 12:42:00 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 through its quarterly progress reports (at tached) highlight projects issues and lessons learnt. They are discussed in the projects quarterly board m eetings. The PMU have taken into account all the ris ks encountered and have managed them well to ens ure a positive turn around or result. The lessons ste m from issues with procurement to limited flights or s hipping options to the Islands in the North and thus t he PMU have worked out options that fit well and ha ve delivered to the Pa Enuua in the north.

In addition, the Project Team and UNDP have multip le Skype calls/teleconferences to discuss on what h as worked and how it can be replicated to other oute r islands. For example, the young farmers started in Mangaia Islands and it is quite successful. Towards t he end of the project, 4 other outer islands joined th e young farmers programme.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	SRICProjectFinalReport_4015_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SRICProjectFinalReport_4015_304.pdf)	ioane.iosefo@undp.org	3/5/2020 1:17:00 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:

As the project prepares for its final phase, the project clearly have reached several beneficiaries in the Pa Enuas who are still approaching the project with project ideas to expand in certain areas that will increase their resilience. The Office of the Prime Ministers submitted a proposal to the adaptation fund for a phase II of this project, that they call PEARL (Pa Enua Action for Resilient Livelihoods) that is to scale up some of the activities that SRIC started and see value in its upscale. It's an approach also by the Government to ensure the sustainability of the project, that it will not end here. Refer to the links for more details on PEARL - <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/project/akamatutuanga-kia-tukatau-te-oraanga-ite-pa-enua-pa-enua-action-resilient-livelihoods-pearl-2/>

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Principled

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

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

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

Evidence:

The project addresses the issue of gender inequalities and empowerment of women effectively. The project team have captured in all its reporting and news stories published the contribution the project has on this issue of gender. For example, on Mangaia Island, they have a young farmers programme that is championed by a young female who is expanding her area of farming and variety of crops (total of 11 crops), she has been sharing knowledge on farming techniques for certain veges and crops in Aitutaki, a clear indication of knowledge sharing. She has attracted more females who are now starting up farms in Mangaia as well as the males joining too. refer to the link for the story on this (<https://www.adaptation-fund.org/cook-islands-labor-love/>).

Moreover, graph 1, 2 and 3 of the attached SRIC Final Report highlight key achievement of the project in addressing gender issues. The project has increase women participation and empowerment to enable them understand climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction concepts and take appropriate measures to cope and adapt. 53% of small grants projects were spearheaded by women.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	SRICProjectFinalReport_4015_306 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SRICProjectFinalReport_4015_306.pdf)	ioane.iosefo@undp.org	3/11/2020 2:56:00 AM

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 Substantial and 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 Substantial and 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, Substantial, or Moderate Risk, there was no evidence that social and environmental assessments completed and/or management plans or measures development, implemented or monitored. There are substantive changes to the project or changes in the context but SESP was not updated. (any may be true)

Evidence:

The project reported social and environmental risks through quarterly reporting as well as annual reports required under Adaptation Fund PPR (Project Progress Review). In addition, the project follows the recommendations in MTE and TE report, many of the recommendations made by the evaluators looks at enhancing monitoring and making sure communities are kept informed on any environmental issues and risks. The project team have managed and monitored the identified through steps of mitigation approaches outlined in PPR attached.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	SRICPPROct2016-Sept2017_WorkingDoc_4015_307 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SRICPPROct2016-Sept2017_WorkingDoc_4015_307.xlsx)	ioane.iosefo@undp.org	3/11/2020 4:16:00 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, Substantial, 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 Substantial or 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:

There were issues encountered during the implementation phase of the project. However, these issues were discussed on project board and government level. For example, isolation of islands and inconsistency of transportation to outer-islands. Several projects were delayed due to change of shipping schedule, hence, there were complaints from Island Councils of the delays. The Project Management Unit has been working together with suppliers, shipping agents and Island Governments to move projects forward to avoid delays.

An example is highlighted in the quarterly progress report attached for Q2 2018.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	FinalQUARTERLYREPORTQ22018-MLTJune18th2018_4015_308 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FinalQUARTERLYREPORTQ22018-MLTJune18th2018_4015_308.pdf)	ioane.iosefo@undp.org	3/11/2020 4:31:00 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:

The project has a costed M&E plan in the project document as well as the inception report (attached inception report). The quarterly progress report also contributes to M&E. The project have completed both its Mid-Term and Terminal Evaluation as well as the management response, most of the recommendations made by the external evaluator have been completed.

The progress reports captures the lessons learnt each quarter and have seen progress made by the PMU to mitigate some of the risks encountered by the project so far. The annual Project Progress Report (PPR) also reflects on progress towards project indicators and targets. (Refer attached PPR report)

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	SRIC-CCInceptionPhaseReport_19Dec2012_4015_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SRIC-CCInceptionPhaseReport_19Dec2012_4015_309.docx)	ioane.iosefo@undp.org	3/11/2020 4:48:00 AM
2	SRICPPROct2016-Sept2017_WorkingDoc_4015_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SRICPPROct2016-Sept2017_WorkingDoc_4015_309.xlsx)	ioane.iosefo@undp.org	3/11/2020 4:48:00 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 SRIC Project Board also known as Project Appraisal Committee met quarterly. The Committee discussed and reviewed project budgets, workplans and technical progress report before submitting to UNDP. The last PAC meeting held on 19th September 2018 to discuss terminal evaluation management response as well as the project final report. The UNDP Deputy Resident Representative together with the Programme Associate in the Environment/Climate Change team were present at the meeting.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	SRIC-CCProjectClosureDebriefing_4015_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SRIC-CCProjectClosureDebriefing_4015_310.msg)	ioane.iosefo@undp.org	3/11/2020 5:07:00 AM
2	scan0431_4015_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/scan0431_4015_310.pdf)	ioane.iosefo@undp.org	3/11/2020 11:36:00 PM

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:

The project reported risks through its quarterly reporting as well as annual reports required under Adaptation Fund PPR (Project Progress Review) Risk Assessment. In addition, the project followed the recommendations in MTE and TE report, many of which focused on enhancing monitoring and making sure that communities are kept informed on any issues and risks. The project team have managed and monitored the identified risks through steps of mitigation approach as outlined in PPR attached. An example is also summarized below:

Risks: Communication, access and community coordination difficulties delay timely implementation of the planned programme activities at the target community level.

Mitigation Approach: Active engagement of the respective Island Councils, supported by the Focal Points employed by the project ensures effective coordination. Establishment of a procedure for a small grants programme that allows community ownership and actions driven by them. Coordination and monitoring of island level climate change adaptation and Disaster risk reduction initiatives have been incorporated into the job descriptions of the island council members after the recent election in June 2016 (after the midterm evaluation visits). With this institutional change, the coordination level has increased, and therefore, coordination at the island level has improved. The S RIC-CC Project database was created and implemented in this PPR as recommended by the HACT Audit. The Database highlighted the Small Grants Program Projects with roadmap and links to the NSDP Goals (16 total Goals) and JNAP II Strategies (9 total Strategies).

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	SRICPPROct2016-Sept2017_WorkingDoc_4015_311 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SRICPPROct2016-Sept2017_WorkingDoc_4015_311.xlsx)	ioane.iosefo@undp.org	3/11/2020 5:45:00 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:

Yes, financial resources were sufficient to implement project activities and achieve intended results. The project total grant of US\$ 4.96 million from Adaptation Fund and co-finance of US\$ 1.56 million from Government of Cook Islands and other partners. There were challenges faced by the project specially on transportation cost between the main island (Rarotonga) and outer-islands. This was also identified as an ongoing issue/risk in the project progress report. However, the project has been working through a south-south cooperation approach with Ridge to Reef project (GEF) on activities that delivers results for both - For example, P3D modelling in the southern group. These information are all available in PPR and Terminal Evaluation report attached.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	FinalreportofTEofSRIC-CCproject_31Aug018005_4015_312 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FinalreportofTEofSRIC-CCproject_31Aug018005_4015_312.doc)	ioane.iosefo@undp.org	3/11/2020 6:10:00 AM
2	SRICPPROct2016-Sept2017_WorkingDoc_4015_312 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SRICPPROct2016-Sept2017_WorkingDoc_4015_312.xlsx)	ioane.iosefo@undp.org	3/11/2020 6:11:00 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:

The project procurement follows the national government processes. The procurement plan are developed in the beginning of the year for review by UNDP and Project Board. All procurements are reported through the Adaptation Project Progress Report (PPR (Refer attached Procurement Tab in the PPR). The project team have a database developed to note the projects small grant projects and the procurement timeline.

The PPR also identified procurement as an operational risk of SRIC-CC project. However, the project were able to address this issue through utilization of UNDP procurement as per LOA for UNDP support services.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	SRICPPROct2016-Sept2017_WorkingDoc_4015_313 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SRICPPROct2016-Sept2017_WorkingDoc_4015_313.xlsx)	ioane.iosefo@undp.org	3/11/2020 6:33:00 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:

Definitely, the project monitored its own cost and gave anecdotal examples of cost efficiencies. The project coordinated activities with other projects to achieve cost efficiency gains. For example, SRIC project have implemented an activity together with GEF Project (R2R) on P3D model in two outer-islands as well as school awareness activities on climate adaption. Moreover, the Local Island Government in outer-islands contributed through free labour cost on construction and installation of households water tanks (Refer to Mid-term Review report co-finance table pg. 66)

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	MTE_final_4015_314 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MTE_final_4015_314.pdf)	ioane.iosefo@undp.org	3/11/2020 7:14:00 AM

Effective

Quality Rating: **Satisfactory**

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

- Yes
- No

Evidence:

The project delivered its expected outputs/results stipulated in the project document at the end of the project as reflected in the terminal evaluation attached. SRIC-CC project team reported status of project progress on a quarterly basis which were reviewed by UNDP for quality assurance and oversight, then the information feeds into the Adaptation Fund Project Progress Review under Project Indicators and Results Tracker. All PPRs were approved by Adaptation Fund Secretariat. The overall rating of project results in the terminal evaluation is Satisfactory (page 25).

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	FinalreportofTEofSRIC-CCproject_31Aug018005_4015_315 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FinalreportofTEofSRIC-CCproject_31Aug018005_4015_315.doc)	ioane.iosefo@undp.org	3/11/2020 10:36:00 PM
2	SRICPPROct2016-Sept2017_WorkingDoc_4015_315 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SRICPPROct2016-Sept2017_WorkingDoc_4015_315.xlsx)	ioane.iosefo@undp.org	3/11/2020 10:36:00 PM

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

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

Evidence:

Annual work plans are completed at the beginning of the every year which are reviewed by UNDP and approved by the Board. Annual Work plans are also broken down into each quarter (quarterly work plans) (Refer attached) which are also reviewed by UNDP and endorsed by Project Board on a quarterly basis. These quarterly work plans determined the disbursement of funds from UNDP to Implementing Partner. At the completion of mid-term evaluation, it provides a clear picture of priorities for the project in developing its work plans for the remaining years. The project team managed to re-programme funding in each quarter to avoid impacts on project delivery. For example, there were delays with government procurement process, the project utilize the funding by bringing forward other activities planned for future quarters.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	2017AWPREVISED_4015_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2017AWPREVISED_4015_316.pdf)	ioane.iosefo@undp.org	3/12/2020 12:44:00 AM
2	AWP2018_4015_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/AWP2018_4015_316.pdf)	ioane.iosefo@undp.org	3/12/2020 12:44:00 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:

Targeted groups for the project are people of Cook I slands in all 11 Pa Enuas. The project engaged with these targeted groups in the implementation stage of the project. SRIC-CC have implemented several small grant projects that range from Agriculture, Climate resilience, coastal protection, tourism and water enhancement projects through the supply of water tank to the outer islands in the north and south groups.

SRIC project also helped community members in outer islands such as young farmers (the youth groups), men and women. One of the highlight of the project is the story of young farmers in Mangaia Island which was published via UNDP exposure website and made it to the Top 5 stories as well as on the Cook I slands News. Refer to link below. To learn more about the project engagement with targeted groups, refer to final project report attached.

<https://undp-adaptation.exposure.co/young-farmers>

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	SRICProjectFinalReport_4015_317 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SRICProjectFinalReport_4015_317.pdf)	ioane.iosefo@undp.org	3/12/2020 1:34:00 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:

While the project followed national procedures for implementation, support services were also requested from the Country Office to assist with direct payments and procurement of goods. At the first Project Management Workshop in 2016 in Samoa, the project manager Mr William Tuivaga highlighted the importance of utilizing UNDP support service to avoid delays in implementation of project activities. In the terminal evaluation report (page 21) under M&E implementation, UNDP-MCO support services through LoA (attached) are reflected.

The Project Board also known as Project Appraisal Committee was comprised of all relevant stakeholders that have a say in the implementation of the project. All stakeholders were also notified through several mediums of communication of the progress of the project through its success stories and updates on media. The team conducted site visits throughout the duration of the project.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	scan0431_4015_318 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/scan0431_4015_318.pdf)	ioane.iosefo@undp.org	3/12/2020 2:20:00 AM
2	FinalreportofTEofSRIC-CCproject_31Aug018005_4015_318 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FinalreportofTEofSRIC-CCproject_31Aug018005_4015_318.doc)	ioane.iosefo@undp.org	3/12/2020 2:26:00 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 HACT assessment for the Office of the Prime Minister was completed in September 2015 (attached). Based on findings from the assessment, a spot check was carried out in 2017 (attached). These reports highlighted key issues with performances and systems in place for implementation of the project. There have been improvements in capacities and performance of project personnel through trainings conducted by UNDP. In addition, the project developed a Financial Management Manual to integrate financial requirement by UNDP-GEF as well as the Government (attached FMM). Moreover, a new MYOB accounting system was procured and installed for SRIC project.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Samoa-JointAssurancePlan2017.Final_4015_319 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Samoa-JointAssurancePlan2017.Final_4015_319.pdf)	taufao.t@undp.org	3/11/2020 3:10:00 AM
2	CKIOPMMicroAssmtSept2015_4015_319 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CKIOPMMicroAssmtSept2015_4015_319.pdf)	taufao.t@undp.org	3/11/2020 2:54:00 AM
3	SpotCheck_OPM2017_4015_319 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SpotCheck_OPM2017_4015_319.pdf)	ioane.iosefo@undp.org	3/12/2020 3:47:00 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 project submitted a proposal to the AF called the 'PEARL' that looks at incremental value on activities done by SRIC but with more focus in the northern group. The PMU considered this proposal as their sustainability plan as it is a direct project proposal prepared by the government based on the lessons learnt from the SRIC implementation. The project was approved in late 2018 of 3 million USD. The PMU were hired under the PEARL project after SRIC project. The sustainability of the project is also reflected in the terminal evaluation report (page 36 - 3.3.7)

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	FinalreportofTEofSRIC-CCproject_31Aug018005_4015_320 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Finalreports/FTEofSRIC-CCproject_31Aug018005_4015_320.doc)	ioane.iosefo@undp.org	3/12/2020 4:29:00 AM

QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments

The project completed its terminal evaluation report as well as Finance Project Report. The overall project outcome rating is "Satisfactory" with lessons learnt as well as recommendations as stipulated in both reports. The project have identified changes in the external environment which were considered as minor changes with no impacts to project strategy and objectives. On the strategic level, the project have developed a number of policies in DRR, CCA and JNAP. One of the key highlights of SRIC-CC project is the involvement of youth and women in the implementation phase which a number of stories were developed and shared on UNDP exposure websites. Key stakeholders were well engaged through the project and were also part of Project Board also known as the Project Appraisal Committee. The project has been up-scaled to second phase through the direct access of the Government of Cook Islands to Adaptation Fund and was approved late 2018.

Nevertheless, the TE QA assessment highlighted that the findings and conclusions are not clearly and systematically articulated and relevance and sustainability aspects are left out. Despite some good aspects of the TE report, in overall the QA assessment on TE conclusions and recommendations are moderately unsatisfactory.