

Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

Form Status: Approved

Overall Rating:	Satisfactory
Decision:	
Portfolio/Project Number:	00095671
Portfolio/Project Title:	PIMS 5399 FSP NAP GSP LDCFII
Portfolio/Project Date:	2016-05-01 / 2022-03-31

Strategic

Quality Rating: Exemplary

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:

- (1) Project did horizon scanning on an annual basis through annual reporting to the Project Board and Technical Advisory Group. This is documented in the reports/presentations to respectively the Board and the Advisory Group and the minutes of these meetings.
- (2) Project also communicated electronically with the Project Board outside Board meeting on opportunities and changes, particularly in the last 2 years, where adaptive measures to address the COVID-19 impacts were taken. This led to project extension until 31 December 2021.
- (3) Project held MTR, responded to the recommendations by the reviewers, including by adding partners to its already broad partner base, and reported this to the Project Board.
- (4) Project exceeded its targets, increasing the number of countries receiving one-on-one support (outcome 1) with the approval of Project Board.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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

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

Evidence:

The project contributes to all 3 areas of development work, and one emerging area, i.e., risk management for resilience. It contributes to one SP output indicator.

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:

The project focused on institutional strengthening at the national level. Consultations were held with target institutions and key government and non-governmental stakeholders. These informed the project activities.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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 incorporated learning at different stages:

- i) it drew on the lessons from the project first phase (2013-2016) and build on its outputs;
- ii) at the project inception phase, it collected feedback on the proposed workplan from LDC representatives, the LDC Group, the LDCs Expert Group (LEG), the GEF and other partners;
- iii) as part of outcome 1, a stocktaking exercise was conducted along with national consultations, providing a baseline assessment for 15 countries;
- iv) a MTR was conducted;
- v) engagement with partners, and particularly the LEG was sustained throughout, which provided regular update on countries' support needs;
- vi) country case studies were documented;
- vii) pre-workshop surveys were administered to better capture countries learning needs and structure the workshops agenda accordingly. This set of activities have provided the needed evidence that allowed the project team to make adjustments to the project workplans to make sure that it is responsive and remains relevant to countries' needs.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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:

(1) The project was sufficiently at scale. As it aimed to facilitate effective mid-to-long term planning for climate change adaptation, its main beneficiaries were government officers within the key ministries (including planning, finance, and environment), supported through : institutional strengthening, identification of adaptation priorities, and leveraging of climate finance (outcome 1); development of tools and regional training (outcome 2); and knowledge production and dissemination (outcome 3).

(2) The project also fostered partnerships to scale up its support to LDCs. Furthermore, responsive to emerging countries’ needs conveyed, inter alia, by the LEG, the project further extended its scope to support adaptation policy development (NAP formulation). I

(3) In response to MTR, it also encouraged the participation of sub-national stakeholders in regional training workshops. These initial steps to foster locally-led adaptation could be scaled up in subsequent global projects.

(4) Any subsequent global project could focus on adaptation implementation building on the achievements of this project and drawing on its lessons learned.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Principled

Quality Rating: Highly 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 programme did not explicitly focus on gender. However, it purposely sought to increase gender equality and women empowerment, including by: i) encouraging participation of women at national, sub-national consultation workshops; ii) collaborating with one of its partners (NAP-Global Network) to include a gender analysis as part of the support to NAP formulation; iii) encouraging the participation of women at the regional training (in-person and virtually); and iv) including gender-sensitive content in its KM products.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

7. Were social and environmental impacts and risks successfully managed and monitored?

- 3: *Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. Appropriate assessments conducted where required (i.e., Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) for High risk projects and some level of social and environmental assessment for Moderate risk projects as identified through SESP). Relevant management plan(s) developed for identified risks through consultative process and implemented, resourced, and monitored. Risks effectively managed or mitigated. If there is a substantive change to the project or change in context that affects risk levels, the SESP was updated to reflect these changes. (all must be true)*
- 2: Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. Appropriate assessments conducted where required (i.e., Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) for High risk projects and some level of social and environmental assessment for Moderate risk projects as identified through SESP). Relevant management plan(s) developed, implemented and monitored for identified risks. OR project was categorized as Low risk through the SESP.
- 1: Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. For projects categorized as High or Moderate Risk, there was no evidence that social and environmental assessments completed and/or management plans or measures development, implemented or monitored. There are substantive changes to the project or changes in the context but SESP was not updated. (any may be true)

Evidence:

The programme was exempt from SESP at the time of design. The activities focused on development of capacities and institutional strengthening and not on the ground interventions which have risks more directly associated with Human Rights. At the national level, the programme worked with national steering committee and encouraged the engagement of a wide range of multi-stakeholder actors to mitigate these 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:

See response to 7

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Management & Monitoring**Quality Rating: Highly 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:

(1) These were reported on an annual basis in the Project Implementation Report to the donor and the report to the Board members. This is coherent with the frequency initially presented.

(2) A terminal evaluation (TE) will be conducted led by UNEP and based on decentralization evaluation principles. Sufficient budget has been allocated for the TE to ensure that it assesses policy and capacity changes supported by the project.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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:

- (1) The project board with UNEP, UNDP and the GEF operated very well and provided strategic guidance at every stage of the programme and met regularly (annually). Exchanges also happened via emails in-between board meetings, when necessary. This was the case in 2020 and 2021 to ensure swift project adjustments as the project was mitigating the COVID-19 impacts on the project delivery.
- (2) The minutes of all board meetings are available as well as related supportive documents.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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

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

Evidence:

There was no critical risk for the project but it was responsive to the changing needs of the stakeholders, and the evolution of the global context for climate change negotiations and climate finance. The major risk came with COVID-19. The project was responsive from the start of the pandemic and took adaptive management measures.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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:

The project was financed by the Least Developed Countries Fund. At approval, the donor provided 100% of the resources needed to achieve the intended results.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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

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

Evidence:

The programme regularly updated procurement plan and resource planning. Delivery was also regularly monitored.

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

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:

(1)The project ensured cost-efficiency, coherence in the approach, and maximization of impacts by cooperated with other projects, including: the now closed NAP-GSP for developing countries, funded by GEF-SCCF; the former NAP-Ag Programme (jointly managed by UNDP and FAO) and the follow-up programme SCALA (Scaling up Climate Ambition on Land Use and Agriculture through NDCs and National Adaptation Plans); the former Negotiators Project funded by the GEF-LDCF; and the UNDP-led Climate Promise.

(2) The project also took advantages of cost efficiencies by organizing back-to-back meetings and forums as well as mobilizing expertise across the projects.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Effective

Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory

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

- Yes
- No

Evidence:

Outcome 1 and 3, for which UNDP was responsible, are on track to achieve its expected results. The final Project Implementation Review showed that Outcome 1 has already been over-achieved. For Outcome 3, one of the targets has been already achieved and the other is to be verified through a survey.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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

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

Evidence:

In 2018, a full review of the workplan and strategic orientations was undertaken in a joint UNDP-UNEP retreat. In addition, throughout the project time, the project team met at least once a month to review progress in the workplan.

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:

As mentioned above in question 5, the main beneficiaries of the project were national-level government officers in LDCs engaged in adaptation planning across Ministries. There is evidence that this target was reached based on the results of the baseline assessments, stakeholders mapping, list of participants attending regional training workshops and global events. The events organized by the project, provided an opportunity to exchange with the beneficiaries and assess whether they benefitted from the project support. In addition, an end-of-project will be conducted to assess the usefulness and uptake of the knowledge produced and shared through the project activities.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Sustainability & National Ownership**Quality Rating: Needs Improvement**

18. Were stakeholders and national partners fully engaged in the decision-making, implementation and monitoring of the project?

- 3: Only national systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) were used to fully implement and monitor the project. All relevant stakeholders and partners were fully and actively engaged in the process, playing a lead role in project decision-making, implementation and monitoring. (both must be true)
- 2: *National systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) were used to implement and monitor the project (such as country office support or project systems) were also used, if necessary. All relevant stakeholders and partners were actively engaged in the process, playing an active role in project decision-making, implementation and monitoring. (both must be true)*
- 1: There was relatively limited or no engagement with national stakeholders and partners in the decision-making, implementation and/or monitoring of the project.
- Not Applicable

Evidence:

This is a DIM project so UNEP and UNDP management/procurement systems were used in combination with full engagement for project work-planning, reporting and review.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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

1) The project did not formally monitor the changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions. However, through the stocktaking exercise conducted in outcome 1 in 15 countries, and the NAP formulation support in 6 countries, it captured countries baseline information.

2) The end-of-project survey, which will feed into the TE, to be conducted by UNDP and UNEP in Q1 2022 will gauge the changes in perceived capacity based on the effects of knowledge dissemination. Sufficient budget has been put aside by UNEP the lead on the TE for this.

Management Response:

As a Global DIM project, working across multiple countries, the project continued to operate in that modality. Since no issues emerged related to this architecture, the implementation arrangements were not amended. National capacity building was part of the project activities and were monitored for the outcome of improved capacities and not for the aim to amend implementation arrangements.

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:

(1) The project had a plan for ensuring the sustainability and longevity of knowledge on NAPs.

(2) While the project had no formal plans for ensuring the sustainability of adaptation efforts at country level, its collaboration with other programmes (UNDP GCF readiness work, Climate Promise and the UNDP-FAO SCALA Programme) help ensure some continuity of support to countries.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments

In the March board meeting in 2021, the board approved the extension of the project till June 2021. The project has applied adaptive management continuously through the implementation since the start of the project as the project activities were designed to respond to country demands and the overall scope of the project influenced, and was influenced by, the global discourse on adaptation planning. While the impact of COVID-induced restrictions on face-to-face meetings and on international travels over nearly 1.5 years has been significant, it is important to recognize that the project already achieved many of the intended targets before the global pandemic had begun and the project was responding to the Board's request to expand and deepen its support to LDCs.

It is expected, therefore, that the second extension of the project until the end of 2021 would permit the project to improve its performance in light of continuing constraints on one hand, but emerging demand for support particularly in the lead up to the COP26.