

Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

Form Status: Approved	
Overall Rating:	Satisfactory
Decision:	
Portfolio/Project Number:	00075132
Portfolio/Project Title:	PEI Joint UNDP-UNEP Poverty-Environm Initiative-Phase II
Portfolio/Project Date:	2013-07-01 / 2019-03-31

Strategic	Quality Rating: Satisfactory
<p>1. Did the project pro-actively identified changes to the external environment and incorporated them into the project strategy?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="radio"/> 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) <input checked="" type="radio"/> 2: <i>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)</i> <input type="radio"/> 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. <p>Evidence:</p>	

With the end of PEI approaching, the project focused on taking the lessons learned under PEI and develop a new project building on these and further scale them up. This was also addressed in the PEI final evaluation and management response, which were endorsed by the board. New opportunities to build on the PEI lessons learnt and experience to date as well as to adapt to the initial challenges of SDG implementation and the application of integrated approaches at Country Levels are realized under the successor project to PEI, Poverty Environment Action for Sustainable Development Goals project. Poverty-Environment Action operates at country, regional and global levels, promoting integrated approaches to poverty-environment and climate mainstreaming in support of national development priorities—but with a renewed focus on shifting public and private finance and investment towards environmental sustainability and climate objectives for poverty eradication in the context of national SDG implementation and acceleration efforts. To address and, to the extent feasible, mitigate the barriers to poverty-environment mainstreaming and to meet the implementation challenges of Agenda 2030, the Poverty-Environment Action focus and strategy encompasses the following areas:

- Influencing national and, where applicable, sub-national budgets; and enhancing coherence of relevant policies, plans and budgets
- Enabling legal, regulatory and fiscal reform
- Improving the evidence base for demonstrating the impact of poverty-environment mainstreaming policy changes
- Strengthening public sector capacity to engage the private sector and promote quality investment in support of environmental sustainability and climate objectives for poverty eradication
- Strengthening advocacy for poverty-environment mainstreaming and the role of “champions” in the public sector, parliament, civil society and the private sector
- Enabling strategic partnerships and improving coordination and complementarity with other development actors and initiatives at the country level

List of Uploaded Documents			
#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	PEIFinalEvaluation2019JMRFINAL_1332_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PEIFinalEvaluation2019JMRFINAL_1332_301.pdf)	alexandra.regner-burke@undp.org	10/2/2019 12:05:00 PM
2	PEIFinalEvaluationReportApril2019_1332_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PEIFinalEvaluationReportApril2019_1332_301.pdf)	alexandra.regner-burke@undp.org	10/2/2019 12:06:00 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:

PEI was directly linked to one of the 2014-2017 Strategic Plan (SP) areas of work i.e.Sustainable Development Pathways, which addresses the complexity of development issues. PEI was supposed to end in 2017 but was extended to 2018 which overlapped with the new Strategic Plan 2018-2021. The PEA project, which is the successor of the PEI project, is linked to the new SP through outcome 1-Eradicate poverty in all its forms and dimensions. More specifically, this will contribute to output 1.1.1 capacities developed a cross government to integrate 2013 Agenda, Paris Agreement and other international agreements in development plans and budgets, and to analyze progress towards the SDG using innovative and data driven solutions.

List of Uploaded Documents			
#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Relevant

Quality Rating: **Highly 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:

PEI as a global programme in principle worked to systematically prioritise marginalised populations (poor and women) through mainstreaming the environment into national development policy, planning and budgets to ensure sustainable use of ENR in a manner that reduces poverty and protects the environment from issues that can be related to growth focused development. Where possible CO level projects have been advised and sought to engage targeted beneficiary groups (particularly where PEI implements “demonstration activities”) in the implementation and monitoring of CO projects. An example of how PEI'S work directly benefitted discriminated and marginalized groups is the Green Villages project in Rwanda. The Green Village concept was designed to demonstrate how addressing poverty related environmental problems such as soil erosion, inadequate access to water, deforestation and unsustainable land use and clean energy, among others, can help achieve national development goals and priorities. The first Green Village was launched in Rubaya village in 2011 by the President of Rwanda Paul Kagame. Today, around 44 green villages have been established benefiting some 2,020 households. Sustainable solutions include rainwater harvesting and water reservoirs; new agricultural practices such as agroforestry, terraces and soil erosion control; and biogas installation. The interventions have enabled community members to earn more money, improve nutrition and food security, protect natural resources and send children to school. As part of this initiative, a tool kit was developed with inputs from direct experiences from initial trial village. This 'SMART' Green Village Toolkit provides users with the basic strategies and tactics necessary to transform the existing villages into SMART Green villages, low carbon institutions with the capacity to address livelihood, climate change, increase resource efficiency, enhance ecosystem management and minimize waste and pollution. The Local beneficiaries of the Smart Green Villages are trained especially on the Maintenance, Uses and Importance of the Toolkit Components. To effectively support this journey and other transformative processes in the Green Villages, the Toolkit was structured in such a way that the focus is on the sustainable planning, design, development and management of the Smart Green Village and can be replicated in any other districts. See Rwanda Green Villages toolkit for further information attached as evidence.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	A_toolkit_for_the_development_of_smart_green_villages_in_Rewanda_1332_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/A_toolkit_for_the_development_of_smart_green_villages_in_Rewanda_1332_303.pdf)	alexandra.regner-burke@undp.org	10/9/2019 4:11:00 PM
2	PEIfinalreport-fulldraft7-LR_1332_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PEIfinalreport-fulldraft7-LR_1332_303.pdf)	alexandra.regner-burke@undp.org	10/9/2019 4:12:00 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:

In 2019, PEI published an extensive Lessons learned report, which captures lessons learned through the entire PEI experience over its 13 years of existence and

is divided into three main sections:

- Overview: PEI 2005–2018 briefly reviews PEI's conceptual and programmatic approach to poverty-environment mainstreaming

- Looking Back synthesizes 10 lessons learned and good practice from PEI country-level experience in mainstreaming poverty-environment objectives into national, sectoral and subnational development planning, implementation and monitoring systems and processes

- Looking Ahead provides a snapshot of how the integrated approaches, tools and lessons from PEI experience can be leveraged to help strengthen and accelerate national SDG implementation, including through the successor to PEI, the new joint UNDP-UNEP programme Poverty-Environment Action for Sustainable

Development Goals 2018–2022. This report follows the recent release of PEI's final global progress report Reward and Renewal.

The lessons learned report was presented at the final PEI DSG board meeting. As the final PEI DSG meeting only took place recently, the minutes of the project board will be uploaded as evidence as soon as they become available.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	PEIlessonslearned-draft3002_1332_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PEIlessonslearned-draft3002_1332_304.pdf)	alexandra.regner-burke@undp.org	10/1/2019 11:23:00 AM
2	PEIfinalreport-fulldraft7-LR_1332_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PEIfinalreport-fulldraft7-LR_1332_304.pdf)	alexandra.regner-burke@undp.org	10/2/2019 12:06:00 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:

Over the past decade, PEI has pioneered integrated approaches to addressing poverty-environment mainstreaming in national development planning and implementation. These approaches were first implemented in support of national efforts to achieve the Millennium Development Goals and are now a model for the kind of integrated approaches needed to implement the 2030 Agenda and the SDGs.

Mainstreaming poverty-environment objectives into the core development policies and activities of government is a demanding process of policy and institutional change which requires a programmatic approach. There is now a substantial body of country-level mainstreaming experience which governments and other stakeholders can draw on to more effectively integrate environmental sustainability and climate objectives into national development planning and implementation for the SDGs.

Under PEI, results have been achieved through the provision of an integrated approach to mainstreaming the poverty-environment nexus in 24 national and 4,214 local development plans for 17 countries, 93 sector strategies in 13 countries, 84 budget processes in 10 countries and 56 monitoring and evaluation systems in 12 countries.

In Africa PEI has further influenced a number of UN partners including UN Women, FAO and other UN Environment programmes. In Malawi, the collaboration with FAO around soil loss and with UN Women on the gender gap in the agriculture sector has been scaled up to a One UN Flagship programme bringing the four agencies together to jointly focus on tackling environmental, social and economic problems related to agriculture and food security.

The Government of Tanzania scaled up initial work on green energy and sustainable agriculture practices in three districts with support from the private sector. Preliminary assessments from an ongoing cost-benefit analysis indicate that the use of biogas systems have been particularly beneficial for users, as, for example, it has reduced their dependency on firewood. In turn, this has reduced unpaid work and drudgery for women and girls and lowered their exposure to smoke, which has resulted in fewer eye infections and less smoking-induced coughing. Furthermore, the application of bio-slurry, which is the by-product of the biogas production, is expected to improve soil fertility, increase agricultural output and reduce the use of chemical fertilizers. This benefit has informed the prioritization of renewable green energy technologies in the new National Five-Year Development Plan II and similar local economic development initiatives. This information is trickling down to local communities through local radio programmes and is promoting discussion in support of sustainable development.

See final report and Lessons learned report previously uploaded as evidence.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	SignedFINALPEAprojectdocument_1332_305 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SignedFINALPEAprojectdocument_1332_305.pdf)	alexandra.regner-burke@undp.org	10/2/2019 12:08:00 PM

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:

Yes. PEI has been consistent in mainstreaming gender in poverty-environment nexus across its programming. This includes:

- Cost of the gender gap analysis in five countries Malawi, Tanzania, Rwanda, Ethiopia and Uganda
- Gender responsive climate smart agriculture reviews in three countries – Malawi, Uganda and Tanzania
- Result: Malawi's agriculture policy includes objectives and targets for more sustainable agriculture and to empower women farmers
- Gender analysis of climate and energy policies in eastern and southern Africa .

The analysis informed a workshop for women entrepreneurs in the energy sector and helps to motivate the African Ministers of Environment to call for gender responsive energy policies in the Libreville Outcome Document

- Regional capacity building on the integration of gender into poverty-environment related policies, budgets and investment frameworks (2014 Naivasha, 2015 Dakar, 2016 Rwanda)
- Local environmental sustainability solutions that empowers women implemented in Tanzania, Malawi, Rwanda, Mauritania and Burkina Faso
- Review of gender-environment indicators in Malawi and on the status of gender mainstreaming for the poverty-environment nexus in Mali

The new PEA project will continue the PEI practice of having activities at both regional and country level to support the empowerment of women and furthering gender equality within the context of the poverty-environment nexus.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	costing_gender_final_eng_0_1332_306 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/costing_gender_final_eng_0_1332_306.pdf)	tapona.manjolo@undp.org	10/11/2019 10:20:00 AM
2	GenderandEnvironmentOutlook_1332_306 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/GenderandEnvironmentOutlook_1332_306.pdf)	tapona.manjolo@undp.org	10/11/2019 10:22:00 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 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:

Environmental impact and risks were monitored during the project lifespan even though a SESP was not undertaken during the formulation of the project document. In relation to project implementation, PEI is a policy-focused programme with limited exposure to social and environmental risks which, in principle, makes it a low risk project. PEI fundamentally by its design is related to reducing, limiting, and mitigating social and environmental impacts and risks.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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

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

Evidence:

No project specific grievance mechanism was setup however, UNDP grievance mechanisms were made available to project target groups.No unanticipated social and environmental risks or grievances for PEI have occurred during the life of the project.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Management & Monitoring

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

9. Was the project's M&E Plan adequately implemented?

- 3: The project had a comprehensive and costed M&E plan. Baselines, targets and milestones were fully populated. Progress data against indicators in the project's RRF was reported regularly using credible data sources and collected according to the frequency stated in the Plan, including sex disaggregated data as relevant. Any evaluations conducted, if relevant, fully meet decentralized evaluation standards, including gender UNEG standards. Lessons learned, included during evaluations and/or After-Action Reviews, were used to take corrective actions when necessary. (all must be true)
- 2: *The project costed M&E Plan, and most baselines and targets were populated. Progress data against indicators in the project's RRF was collected on a regular basis, although there was may be some slippage in following the frequency stated in the Plan and data sources was not always reliable. Any evaluations conducted, if relevant, met most decentralized evaluation standards. Lessons learned were captured but were used to take corrective actions. (all must be true)*
- 1: The project had M&E Plan, but costs were not clearly planned and budgeted for, or were unrealistic. Progress data was not regularly collected against the indicators in the project's RRF. Evaluations did not meet decentralized evaluation standards. Lessons learned were rarely captured and used. Select this option also if the project did not have an M&E plan.

Evidence:

The project had a M&E plan and indicators were tracked on a regular basis. The terminal evaluation report indicates that considerable effort was placed on improving the Results Framework as presented in the project document. The Results Framework consequently set quite manageable targets for the project, many of which were quantitative and provided insight into their impact. (Refer to project evaluation uploaded)

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	PEIFinalEvaluationReportApril2019_1332_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PEIFinalEvaluationReportApril2019_1332_309.pdf)	alexandra.regner-burke@undp.org	10/2/2019 10:08:00 AM

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

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

Evidence:

The project's governance mechanism functioned as intended. PEI held regular Donor Steering Group (DSG) and Joint Management Board (JMB) meetings and annual progress reports were submitted to the project board for all years (see evidence attached). The final PEI DSG meeting was recently held in Stockholm and the minutes will be uploaded as soon as they become available.

List of Uploaded Documents			
#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	PEI2013annualprogressreport_1332_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PEI2013annualprogressreport_1332_310.pdf)	alexandra.regner-burke@undp.org	10/2/2019 10:13:00 AM
2	PEI2014annualprogressreport_1332_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PEI2014annualprogressreport_1332_310.pdf)	alexandra.regner-burke@undp.org	10/2/2019 10:13:00 AM
3	PEI2015annualprogressreport_1332_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PEI2015annualprogressreport_1332_310.pdf)	alexandra.regner-burke@undp.org	10/2/2019 10:13:00 AM
4	PEI2016annualprogressreport_1332_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PEI2016annualprogressreport_1332_310.pdf)	alexandra.regner-burke@undp.org	10/2/2019 10:13:00 AM
5	PEI2017annualprogressreportzerodraft_1332_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PEI2017annualprogressreportzerodraft_1332_310.docx)	alexandra.regner-burke@undp.org	10/2/2019 10:13:00 AM
6	PEIFinalGlobalprogressreport2014-18_1332_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PEIFinalGlobalprogressreport2014-18_1332_310.pdf)	alexandra.regner-burke@undp.org	10/2/2019 10:13:00 AM
7	PEI_PEAprojectboardminutes04July2018_1332_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PEI_PEAprojectboardminutes04July2018_1332_310.docx)	alexandra.regner-burke@undp.org	10/2/2019 10:16:00 PM
8	PEI_PEAprojectboardminutes06Dec2018_1332_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PEI_PEAprojectboardminutes06Dec2018_1332_310.docx)	alexandra.regner-burke@undp.org	10/2/2019 10:16:00 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:

PEI conducted risks monitoring and management at the global level and CO level on a regular basis through quarterly and annual reports. Mitigation measures and management plans were prepared in response to monitor implementation where needed (refer to PEI evaluation report Table A page VI, Table B page VIII).

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	PEIFinalEvaluationReportApril2019_1332_311 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PEIFinalEvaluationReportApril2019_1332_311.docx)	tapona.manjolo@undp.org	10/11/2019 9:04:00 AM

Efficient

Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory

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

- Yes
- No

Evidence:

Adequate resources have been mobilized to deliver the results as expected by the project document. Donors see the value of investing in PEI due to the core contributions from UN Environment and UNDP Country Offices and the local resource mobilization often achieved through PEI interventions. For the project, an average investment of US\$ 5 million per year by the global donors resulted in US\$ 13-15 million in expenditure. The Co-Directors highlight the mobilization of core UNDP and UN Environment funds as a key management achievement.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	PEIFinalFinancialReportProjectBoard18thSept2019FINAL_1332_312 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PEIFinalFinancialReportProjectBoard18thSept2019FINAL_1332_312.ppt)	alexandra.regner-burke@undp.org	10/2/2019 12:15:00 PM

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 efficiently procured and delivered projects inputs and procurement plans were on file at the global as well as the country level. The project commenced the phasing out process and there was no need for a Procurement Plan in 2019.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	2016GCRED_ProcurementPlanincl.PEI_1332_313 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2016GCRED_ProcurementPlanincl.PEI_1332_313.pdf)	alexandra.regner-burke@undp.org	10/9/2019 4:40:00 PM
2	017GCRED_ProcurementPlanincl.PEI_1332_313 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/017GCRED_ProcurementPlanincl.PEI_1332_313.pdf)	alexandra.regner-burke@undp.org	10/9/2019 4:40:00 PM
3	2018GCRED_ProcurementPlanincl.PEI_1332_313 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2018GCRED_ProcurementPlanincl.PEI_1332_313.pdf)	alexandra.regner-burke@undp.org	10/9/2019 6:59:00 PM

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:

Final report and project evaluation indicated that costs were regularly reviewed for optimal value for money with given resources.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	PEIFinalFinancialreport_14August2019_1332_314 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PEIFinalFinancialreport_14August2019_1332_314.pdf)	tapona.manjolo@undp.org	10/1/2019 4:27:00 PM

Effective

Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory

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

- Yes
- No

Evidence:

The outputs and outcomes were achieved at the global, regional and country level, with the exception of a just missed target related to the development of government led cross sector coordination mechanisms globally and the introduction of budget and expenditure processes in a couple of the regions. In many cases the targets were exceeded.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	PEIFinalEvaluationReportApril2019_1332_315 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PEIFinalEvaluationReportApril2019_1332_315.docx)	tapona.manjolo@undp.org	10/1/2019 4:30:00 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:

Regular reviews of the workplan were conducted through the project's governance mechanism which functioned as intended. Amendments were made where applicable. PEI held regular Donor Steering Group (DSG) and Joint Management Board (JMB) meetings and annual progress reports were submitted to the project board for all years (Refer to attachments 7 and 8 under question 10 above). The final PEI DSG meeting was recently held in Stockholm and the minutes will be uploaded as soon as they become available.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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

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

Evidence:

PEI as a global programme in principle works to systematically prioritize marginalized populations (poor and women) through mainstreaming the environment into national development policy, planning and budgets to ensure sustainable use of ENR in a manner that reduces poverty and protects the environment from issues that can be related to growth focused development (Refer to the PEI project document Annexes 2 and 1).

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	PEIprodoc2013-2017_signed_1332_317 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PEIprodoc2013-2017_signed_1332_317.pdf)	tapona.manjolo@undp.org	10/11/2019 9:35:00 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:

Most PEI country level projects are implemented through NIM with 100% CO support modalities (essential to ensure the ability of PEI to deliver EU funds) and all projects engage the Government counterparts actively in project planning, decision-making, implementation and monitoring. As a global programme the national partners are not engaged at the global programme level (Please refer to PEI evaluation report i.e. section 3.3 page 37, Table A page VI and VII).

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	PEIFinalEvaluationReportApril2019_1332_318 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PEIFinalEvaluationReportApril2019_1332_318.docx)	tapona.manjolo@undp.org	10/11/2019 9:53:00 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:

While this takes place in country projects under PEI and has been adjusted for selected country projects, it is not assessable at the global programme level.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

20. Were the transition and phase-out arrangements were reviewed and adjusted according to progress (including financial commitment and capacity).

- 3: The project's governance mechanism regularly reviewed the project's sustainability plan, including arrangements for transition and phase-out, to ensure the project remained on track in meeting the requirements set out by the plan. The plan was implemented as planned by the end of the project, taking into account any adjustments made during implementation. (both must be true)
- 2: *There was a review of the project's sustainability plan, including arrangements for transition and phase-out, to ensure the project remained on track in meeting the requirements set out by the plan.*
- 1: The project may have had a sustainability plan but there was no review of this strategy after it was developed. Also select this option if the project did not have a sustainability strategy.

Evidence:

In 2015 (as part of the Internal Mid-term Review) Exit and Sustainability strategies were developed for all countries, setting out the exit process and options for sustainability post 2018. The PEI Sustainability Strategy is attached for easy reference. Furthermore, as evidenced in the PEI final evaluation report, the sustainability of PEI Outcomes depends on awareness at all levels of Government and among stakeholders, policy frameworks and legislation, processes, tools and systems for P-E mainstreaming and the capacity and knowledge to implement them. In some countries it is believed that the work will continue even without PEI support, for example in Bhutan, while in other countries partners will continue the work of deepening and upscaling PEI's achievements, such as the Partnership for Action on Global Economy (PAGE) in Kyrgyzstan. A key factor contributing to the sustainability of PEI's work at the country level is the working relationships established with the Ministries of Planning / Finance. However, for most countries ongoing assistance is considered to be needed to fully institutionalise P-E mainstreaming, especially in Africa. Exit and Sustainability strategies were developed for PEI countries in 2015, with all countries concluding that a 'hard PEI-Exit' without any continuing technical assistance would endanger sustainability. Sustainability will depend on the capacity, financing and on-going political will of countries to support P-E mainstreaming. The financial sustainability of the project is supported through the successor project PEA. PEI has also achieved an increase in public financing in a number of countries supported by the mainstreaming of P-E criteria into national budget processes. However, additional funding, from others, is needed to institutionalize P-E mainstreaming and to leverage PEI tools and approaches to new levels, and at a faster rate. PEI has built capacity at the individual, institutional, and system level, however, further interventions are considered necessary to ensure capacity is strong enough to independently steer and implement integrated planning. Capacity gaps are especially pronounced at the subnational level and in Africa. It is beyond PEI/PEA to finance capacity building at the sub-national level beyond pilot districts and across all the necessary sectors and therefore support from partners is required.

List of Uploaded Documents			
#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Annex7_SustainabilityStrategy_PEI8thDSGmeeting2016_1332_320 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Annex7_SustainabilityStrategy_PEI8thDSGmeeting2016_1332_320.pdf)	alexandra.regner-burke@undp.org	10/2/2019 10:34:00 PM

QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments

The PEI final narrative and financial report were endorsed by the final PEI DSG meeting on 18th September 2019. While the project is operationally closed, PEI will remain financially open until the financial closure process is completed. The minutes of the final PEI project board meeting will be uploaded as soon as they become available.

Based on the PEI final evaluation evidence, PEI is a well lauded programme, which has achieved groundbreaking work with a relatively small budget. It has developed specialized know-how, a comprehensive Poverty-Environment mainstreaming tool kit and a number of strong case studies which can inspire others. The demand for PEI's services remains strong, especially given the recognized support PEI can offer on SDG implementation. PEI UNDP-UN Environment collaboration is seen as a leading example of joint working at the forefront of the UN reform process towards a One UN. The project had considerable success at the country level, and is held in high esteem in several countries. The PEI has strategically worked to break down the marginalization of the environment. It has done this by not solely working with stand-alone and generally less well-resourced environment departments but by convincing more influential Government departments such as the Ministry of Finance, Planning of the importance of Poverty-Environment (P-E) mainstreaming. The PEI has built strong relationship with Ministries of Planning / Finance in the countries in which it works – something that many other environmental initiatives have been unable to do. It has achieved this by putting in place strong technical advisors, who have been able to build trust through their long-term presence and clear understanding of Government priorities, and through the development of tools that can help these Ministries reach their objectives. Engagement with these ministries greatly facilitates the mainstreaming of P-E into plans and budgets and is resulting in higher country level investments in and budget allocations for poverty-environment objectives and climate change adaptation. The project's achievements in countries reflects the maturity of the services provided by PEI, which have evolved over 13 years. The project saw the deepening of PEI's efforts in mainstreaming into sectors and budgets (e.g. the development of Public Environmental Expenditure Reviews in a number of countries) and increased activity at the subnational level. More attention was placed on the political economic aspects of poverty-environment mainstreaming, including equity and the social inclusion of marginalized groups (especially women). The project facilitated Government's efforts to localize the SDGs, a role highly valued by countries. In a discreet number of cases it is possible to link PEI's policy work, often initiated in the previous stage of PEI, through to improvements in the lives of the poor. PEI's impact on institutions, policies and investments derives from a diverse range of interventions including: capacity building for decision makers in sustainability and climate change adaptation; economic research and analysis; tracking public spending on climate change; and improving enforcement of environmental regulations. PEI's extensive toolkit is an asset for the whole development community.