

# PROGRAMME QA ASSESSMENT: STRENGTHENING DEVOLVED GOVERNANCE IN FRONTIER COUNTIES

## OVERALL PROGRAMME

EXEMPLARY (5) ●●●●●	HIGH (4) ●●●●○	SATISFACTORY (3) ●●●○○	NEEDS IMPROVEMENT (2) ●●○○○	INADEQUATE (1) ●○○○○
At least four criteria are rated Exemplary, and all criteria are rated High or Exemplary.	All criteria are rated Satisfactory or higher, and at least four criteria are rated High or Exemplary.	At least six criteria are rated Satisfactory or higher, and only one may be rated Needs Improvement. The Principled criterion must be rated Satisfactory or above.	At least three criteria are rated Satisfactory or higher, and only four criteria may be rated Needs Improvement.	One or more criteria are rated Inadequate, or five or more criteria are rated Needs Improvement.

## DECISION

- **APPROVE** – the project is of sufficient quality to be approved in its current form. Any management actions must be addressed in a timely manner.
- **APPROVE WITH QUALIFICATIONS** – the project has issues that must be addressed before the project document can be approved. Any management actions must be addressed in a timely manner.
- **DISAPPROVE** – the project has significant issues that should prevent the project from being approved as drafted.

## RATING CRITERIA

(For each question, select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the programme)

## STRATEGIC

**1. Does the project specify how it will contribute to higher level change through linkage to the programme's Theory of Change?**

- **3:** The project is clearly linked to the programme's theory of change. It has an explicit change pathway that explains how the project will contribute to outcome level change and why the project's strategy will likely lead to this change. This analysis is backed by credible evidence of what works effectively in this context and includes assumptions and risks.
- **2:** The project is clearly linked to the programme's theory of change. It has a change pathway that explains how the project will contribute to outcome-level change and why the project strategy will likely lead to this change.
- **1:** The project document may describe in generic terms how the project will contribute to development results, without an explicit link to the programme's theory of change.

\*Note: Projects not contributing to a programme must have a project-specific Theory of Change. See alternative question under the lightbulb for these cases.

3      2

1

### Evidence

Project Linked to CPD Outcome on 1 on Devolution. Some Outputs e.g. 1,2,3 are also linked to the CPD

**2. Is the project aligned with the UNDP Strategic Plan?**

3      2

1

### Evidence

The relevant CPD Outcome is linked to the SP. One Outcome level output on citizen perception is linked to SP Indicator.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>3:</b> The project responds to at least one of the development settings as specified in the Strategic Plan<sup>1</sup> and adapts at least one Signature Solution<sup>2</sup>. The project’s RRF includes all the relevant SP output indicators. <i>(all must be true)</i></li> <li>• <b>2:</b> The project responds to at least one of the development settings as specified in the Strategic Plan<sup>4</sup>. The project’s RRF includes at least one SP output indicator, if relevant. <i>(both must be true)</i></li> <li>• <b>1:</b> The project responds to a partner’s identified need, but 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. <b>1:</b> No analysis has been conducted on the role of other partners in the areas that the programme intends to work to inform the design of the role envisioned by UNDP and other partners through the programme.</li> </ul>		
<b>RELEVANT</b>		
<p><b>3. Does the project target groups left furthest behind?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>3:</b> The target groups are clearly specified, prioritising discriminated, and marginalized groups left furthest behind, identified through a rigorous process based on evidence.</li> <li>• <b>2:</b> The target groups are clearly specified, prioritizing groups left furthest behind.</li> <li>• <b>1:</b> The target groups are not clearly specified.</li> </ul> <p><i>*Note: Management Action must be taken for a score of 1. Projects that build institutional capacity should still identify targeted groups to justify support</i></p>	3	2
<p><b>4. Have knowledge, good practices, and past lessons learned of UNDP and others informed the project design?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>3:</b> Knowledge and lessons learned backed by credible evidence from sources such as evaluation, corporate policies/strategies, and/or monitoring have been explicitly used, with appropriate referencing, to justify the approach used by the project.</li> <li>• <b>2:</b> The project design mentions knowledge and lessons learned backed by evidence/sources, but have not been used to justify the approach selected.</li> <li>• <b>1:</b> There is little or no mention of knowledge and lessons learned informing the project design. Any references made are anecdotal and not backed by evidence.</li> </ul> <p><i>*Note: Management Action or strong management justification must be given for a score of 1</i></p>	3	2
<p><b>5. Does UNDP have a clear advantage to engage in the role envisioned by the project vis-à-vis national/regional/global partners and other actors?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>3:</b> An analysis has been conducted on the role of other partners in the area where the project intends to work, and credible evidence supports the proposed engagement of UNDP and partners through the project, including identification of potential funding partners. It is clear how results achieved by partners will complement the project’s intended results and a communication strategy is in place to communicate results and raise visibility vis-à-vis key partners. Options for south-south and triangular cooperation have been considered, as appropriate. <i>(all must be true)</i></li> <li>• <b>2:</b> Some analysis has been conducted on the role of other partners in the area where the project intends to work, and relatively limited evidence supports the proposed engagement of and division of labour between UNDP and partners through the project, with unclear funding and communications strategies or plans.</li> <li>• <b>1:</b> No clear analysis has been conducted on the role of other partners in the area that the project intends to work. There is risk that the project overlaps and/or does not coordinate with partners’</li> </ul>	3	2
	1	
	1	
	1	
	<p><b>Evidence</b></p> <p>Project focus is mostly the frontier counties that traditionally have been marginalized</p>	
	<p><b>Evidence</b></p> <p>There is limited reference on how lessons learnt from UNDP’s current Devolution Project has informed the current project design. E.g. Lessons on engaging in FCDC counties, resus to be scaled up.</p>	
	<p><b>Evidence</b></p> <p>Partnership and stakeholder analysis has been e.g. work with Amkeni project. But limited division of labour elaborated in the project.</p>	

<sup>1</sup> The three development settings in UNDP’s 2018-2021 Strategic Plan are: a) Eradicate poverty in all its forms and dimensions; b) Accelerate structural transformations for sustainable development; and c) Build resilience to shocks and crises

<sup>2</sup> The six Signature Solutions of UNDP’s 2018-2021 Strategic Plan are: a) Keeping people out of poverty; b) Strengthen effective, inclusive and accountable governance; c) Enhance national prevention and recovery capacities for resilient societies; d) Promote nature-based solutions for a sustainable planet; e) Close the energy gap; and f) Strengthen gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls.

<p>interventions in this area. Options for south-south and triangular cooperation have not been considered, despite its potential relevance.</p> <p>*Note: Management Action or strong management justification must be given for a score of 1</p>		
<b>SOCIAL &amp; ENVIRONMENTAL STANDARDS</b>		
<p><b>6. Does the project seek to further the realization of human rights using a human rights-based approach? (select from options 1-3 that best reflects this project)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>3:</b> Credible evidence that the project aims to further the realization of human rights, upholding the relevant international and national laws and standards in the area of the project. Any potential adverse impacts on enjoyment of human rights were rigorously identified and assessed as relevant, with appropriate mitigation and management measures incorporated into project design and budget. (all must be true to select this option)</li> <li>• <b>2:</b> Some evidence that the project aims to further the realization of human rights. Potential adverse impacts on enjoyment of human rights were identified and assessed as relevant, and appropriate mitigation and management measures incorporated into the project design and budget.</li> <li>• <b>1:</b> No evidence that the project aims to further the realization of human rights. Limited or no evidence that potential adverse impacts on enjoyment of human rights were considered.</li> </ul>	3	2
<p><b>7. Did the project consider potential environmental opportunities and adverse impacts, applying a precautionary approach? (select from options 1-3 that best reflects this project)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>3:</b> Credible evidence that opportunities to enhance environmental sustainability and integrate poverty-environment linkages were fully considered as relevant and integrated in project strategy and design. Credible evidence that potential adverse environmental impacts have been identified and rigorously assessed with appropriate management and mitigation measures incorporated into project design and budget. (all must be true to select this option).</li> <li>• <b>2:</b> No evidence that opportunities to strengthen environmental sustainability and poverty-environment linkages were considered. Credible evidence that potential adverse environmental impacts have been identified and assessed, if relevant, and appropriate management and mitigation measures incorporated into project design and budget.</li> <li>• <b>1:</b> No evidence that opportunities to strengthen environmental sustainability and poverty-environment linkages were considered. Limited or no evidence that potential adverse environmental impacts were adequately considered.</li> </ul>	3	2
<p><b>8. Has the Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) been conducted to identify potential social and environmental impacts and risks? [If yes, upload the completed checklist as evidence. If SESP is not required, provide the reason(s) for the exemption in the evidence section. Exemptions include the following:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Preparation and dissemination of reports, documents and communication materials</li> <li>- Organization of an event, workshop, training</li> <li>- Strengthening capacities of partners to participate in international negotiations and conferences</li> <li>- Partnership coordination (including UN coordination) and management of networks</li> <li>- Global/regional projects with no country level activities (e.g. knowledge management, inter-governmental processes)</li> <li>- UNDP acting as Administrative Agent</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes</li> <li>• No</li> <li>• SESP not required</li> </ul>	3	2
	<p>1</p> <p><b>Evidence</b></p> <p>Project Output 4, seeks to strengthen citizen engagement mechanisms in county processes hence give voice to the young people. A stronger rights-based approach should be applied during project implementation</p> <p><b>Evidence</b></p> <p>Project doesn't work on environmental issues, and there is no linkage created on poverty/environment.</p>	

## MANAGEMENT & MONITORING

### 9. Does the project have a strong results framework?

- **3:** The project's selection of outputs and activities are at an appropriate level. Outputs are accompanied by SMART, results-oriented indicators that measure the key expected development changes, each with credible data sources and populated baselines and targets, including gender sensitive, target group focused, sex-disaggregated indicators where appropriate. *(all must be true)*
- **2:** The project's selection of outputs and activities are at an appropriate level. Outputs are accompanied by SMART, results-oriented indicators, but baselines, targets and data sources may not yet be fully specified. Some use of target group focused, sex-disaggregated indicators, as appropriate. *(all must be true)*
- **1:** The project's selection of outputs and activities are not at an appropriate level; outputs are not accompanied by SMART, results-oriented indicators that measure the expected change and have not been populated with baselines and targets; data sources are not specified, and/or no gender sensitive, sex-disaggregation of indicators. *(if any is true)*

\*Note: Management Action or strong management justification must be given for a score of 1

3 2

1

#### Evidence

The indicators are robust, though some are missing baselines and targets, which are indicated as 'TBD'.

### 10. Is the project's governance mechanism clearly defined in the project document, including composition of the project board?

- **3:** The project's governance mechanism is fully defined. Individuals have been specified for each position in the governance mechanism (especially all members of the project board.) Project Board members have agreed on their roles and responsibilities as specified in the terms of reference. The ToR of the project board has been attached to the project document. *(all must be true)*.
- **2:** The project's governance mechanism is defined; specific institutions are noted as holding key governance roles, but individuals may not have been specified yet. The project document lists the most important responsibilities of the project board, project director/manager and quality assurance roles. *(all must be true)*
- **1:** The project's governance mechanism is loosely defined in the project document, only mentioning key roles that will need to be filled at a later date. No information on the responsibilities of key positions in the governance mechanism is provided.

\*Note: Management Action or strong management justification must be given for a score of 1

3 2

1

### 11. Have the project risks been identified with clear plans stated to manage and mitigate each risk?

- **3:** Project risks related to the achievement of results are fully described in the project risk log, based on comprehensive analysis drawing on the programme's theory of change, Social and Environmental Standards and screening, situation analysis, capacity assessments and other analysis such as funding potential and reputational risk. Risks have been identified through a consultative process with key internal and external stakeholders, including consultation with the UNDP Security Office as required. Clear and complete plan in place to manage and mitigate each risk, including security risks, reflected in project budgeting and monitoring plans. *(both must be true)*
- **2:** Project risks related to the achievement of results are identified in the initial project risk log based on a minimum level of analysis and consultation, with mitigation measures identified for each risk.
- **1:** Some risks may be identified in the initial project risk log, but no evidence of consultation or analysis and no clear risk mitigation measures identified. This option is also selected if risks are not clearly identified, no initial risk log is included with the project document and/or no security risk management process has taken place for the project.

\*Note: Management Action must be taken for a score of 1

3 2

1

#### Evidence

The Risk Log has been identified and risk matrix tied to the project. Consultation with other actors e.g. Close consultation with UNDSS required to enable smooth implementation of activities.

EFFICIENT							
<p><b>12. Have specific measures for ensuring cost-efficient use of resources been explicitly mentioned as part of the project design? This can include, for example: i) using the theory of change analysis to explore different options of achieving the maximum results with the resources available; ii) using a portfolio management approach to improve cost effectiveness through synergies with other interventions; iii) through joint operations (e.g., monitoring or procurement) with other partners; iv) sharing resources or coordinating delivery with other projects, v) using innovative approaches and technologies to reduce the cost of service delivery or other types of interventions.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes</li> <li>• No</li> </ul> <p><i>(Note: Evidence of at least one measure must be provided to answer yes for this question)</i></p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">1</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2"> <b>Evidence</b>            Collaboration with other entities and linkage to the proposed JP indicated.         </td> </tr> </table>	3	2	1		<b>Evidence</b> Collaboration with other entities and linkage to the proposed JP indicated.	
	3	2					
	1						
<b>Evidence</b> Collaboration with other entities and linkage to the proposed JP indicated.							
<p><b>13. Are explicit plans in place to ensure the project links up with other relevant on-going projects and initiatives, whether led by UNDP, national or other partners, to achieve more efficient results (including, for example, through sharing resources or coordinating delivery?)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes</li> <li>• No</li> </ul>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">1</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2"> <b>Evidence</b> </td> </tr> </table>	3	2	1		<b>Evidence</b>	
	3	2					
	1						
<b>Evidence</b>							
<p><b>14. Is the budget justified and supported with valid estimates?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>3:</b> The project's budget is at the activity level with funding sources, and is specified for the duration of the project period in a multi-year budget. Realistic resource mobilisation plans are in place to fill unfunded components. Costs are supported with valid estimates using benchmarks from similar projects or activities. Cost implications from inflation and foreign exchange exposure have been estimated and incorporated in the budget. Adequate costs for monitoring, evaluation, communications and security have been incorporated.</li> <li>• <b>2:</b> The project's budget is at the activity level with funding sources, when possible, and is specified for the duration of the project in a multi-year budget, but no funding plan is in place. Costs are supported with valid estimates based on prevailing rates.</li> <li>• <b>1:</b> The project's budget is not specified at the activity level, and/or may not be captured in a multi-year budget.</li> </ul>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">1</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2"> <b>Evidence</b>            There is budget gap of approx. US\$ 7million. This needs to be fully elaborated and resource mobilization measures put in place.         </td> </tr> </table>	3	2	1		<b>Evidence</b> There is budget gap of approx. US\$ 7million. This needs to be fully elaborated and resource mobilization measures put in place.	
	3	2					
	1						
<b>Evidence</b> There is budget gap of approx. US\$ 7million. This needs to be fully elaborated and resource mobilization measures put in place.							
EFFECTIVE							
<p><b>15. Is the chosen implementation modality most appropriate? (select from options 1-3 that best reflects this project)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3: The required implementing partner assessments (capacity assessment, HACT micro assessment) have been conducted, and there is evidence that options for implementation modalities have been thoroughly considered. There is a strong justification for choosing the selected modality, based on the development context. (both must be true to select this option)</li> <li>• 2: The required implementing partner assessments (capacity assessment, HACT micro assessment) have been conducted and the implementation modality chosen is consistent with the results of the assessments.</li> <li>• 1: The required assessments have not been conducted, but there may be evidence that options for implementation modalities have been considered.</li> </ul>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">1</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2"> <b>Evidence</b>            As this is DIM project, HACT modalities may not be fully applicable. However, in cases where direct engagement with County Governments are considered, consultations need to take place on modalities of support under DIM.         </td> </tr> </table>	3	2	1		<b>Evidence</b> As this is DIM project, HACT modalities may not be fully applicable. However, in cases where direct engagement with County Governments are considered, consultations need to take place on modalities of support under DIM.	
	3	2					
	1						
<b>Evidence</b> As this is DIM project, HACT modalities may not be fully applicable. However, in cases where direct engagement with County Governments are considered, consultations need to take place on modalities of support under DIM.							
<p><b>16. Have targeted groups, prioritizing marginalized and excluded populations that will be affected by the project, been engaged in the design of the project in a way that addresses any underlying causes of exclusion and discrimination?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3: Credible evidence that all targeted groups, prioritising marginalized and excluded populations that will be involved in or affected by the project, have been actively engaged in the design of the project. Their views, rights and any constraints have been analysed and</li> </ul>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">1</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2"> <b>Evidence</b>            Women and youth are some of the target groups identified. However, greater analysis on how         </td> </tr> </table>	3	2	1		<b>Evidence</b> Women and youth are some of the target groups identified. However, greater analysis on how	
	3	2					
	1						
<b>Evidence</b> Women and youth are some of the target groups identified. However, greater analysis on how							

<p>incorporated into the root cause analysis of the theory of change which seeks to address any underlying causes of exclusion and discrimination and the selection of project interventions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2: Some evidence that key targeted groups, prioritising marginalized and excluded populations that will be involved in the project, have been engaged in the design of the project. Some evidence that their views, rights and any constraints have been analysed and incorporated into the root cause analysis of the theory of change and the selection of project interventions.</li> <li>1: No evidence of engagement with marginalized and excluded populations that will be involved in the project during project design. No evidence that the views, rights and constraints of populations have been incorporated into the project.</li> <li>Not Applicable</li> </ul>	<p>benefits through county level support will reach different categories of people would be useful.</p>								
<p><b>17. Does the project plan for adaptation and course correction if regular monitoring activities, evaluation, and lesson learned demonstrate there are better approaches to achieve the intended results and/or circumstances change during implementation?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Yes</li> <li>No</li> </ul>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">1</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2"><b>Evidence</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">An elaborate Monitoring plan has been put in place. However, there is need to develop an Evaluation Plan and ensure that there is provision for M&amp;E support to the project.</td> </tr> </table>	3	2	1		<b>Evidence</b>		An elaborate Monitoring plan has been put in place. However, there is need to develop an Evaluation Plan and ensure that there is provision for M&E support to the project.	
3	2								
1									
<b>Evidence</b>									
An elaborate Monitoring plan has been put in place. However, there is need to develop an Evaluation Plan and ensure that there is provision for M&E support to the project.									
<p><b>18. The gender marker for all project outputs are scored at GEN2 or GEN3, indicating that gender has been fully mainstreamed into all project outputs at a minimum.</b></p> <p><small>*Note: Management Action or strong management justification must be given for a score of “no”</small></p>	<p>NO gender marker indicated. Include the gender marker for the project.</p>								
<b>SUSTAINABILITY &amp; NATIONAL OWNERSHIP</b>									
<p><b>19. Have national/regional/global partners led, or proactively engaged in, the design of the project?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3: National partners (or regional/global partners for regional and global projects) have full ownership of the project and led the process of the development of the project jointly with UNDP.</li> <li>2: The project has been developed by UNDP in close consultation with national/regional/global partners.</li> <li>1: The project has been developed by UNDP with limited or no engagement with national partners.</li> </ul>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">1</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2"><b>Evidence</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">Turkana County and engagement through on-going work with FCDC counties has taken place.</td> </tr> </table>	3	2	1		<b>Evidence</b>		Turkana County and engagement through on-going work with FCDC counties has taken place.	
3	2								
1									
<b>Evidence</b>									
Turkana County and engagement through on-going work with FCDC counties has taken place.									
<p><b>20. Are key institutions and systems identified, and is there a strategy for strengthening specific/comprehensive capacities based on capacity assessments conducted?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3: The project has a strategy for strengthening specific capacities of national institutions and/or actors based on a completed capacity assessment. This strategy includes an approach to regularly monitor national capacities using clear indicators and rigorous methods of data collection, and adjust the strategy to strengthen national capacities accordingly.</li> <li>2: A capacity assessment has been completed. There are plans to develop a strategy to strengthen specific capacities of national institutions and/or actors based on the results of the capacity assessment.</li> <li>1: Capacity assessments have not been carried out.</li> </ul>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">1</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2"><b>Evidence</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">Capacity assessment of county governments not undertaken. This should be planned for the next CPD cycle, including for relevant RPs envisaged under the project.</td> </tr> </table>	3	2	1		<b>Evidence</b>		Capacity assessment of county governments not undertaken. This should be planned for the next CPD cycle, including for relevant RPs envisaged under the project.	
3	2								
1									
<b>Evidence</b>									
Capacity assessment of county governments not undertaken. This should be planned for the next CPD cycle, including for relevant RPs envisaged under the project.									
<p><b>21. Does the programme include a strategy for using nationally-owned data sources and working with partners to strengthen national statistical systems and capacities?</b></p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>3</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2">1</td> </tr> </table>	3	2	1					
3	2								
1									

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>3:</b> The RRF includes some relevant country-specific outcome and output indicators that will be monitored using nationally-owned data sources. The M&amp;E section includes an analysis of the availability and quality of existing national data sources and states clear plans for how UNDP will work with partners to strengthen national M&amp;E and statistical systems where needed, in a way that contributes towards sustainable country capacities.</li> <li>• <b>2:</b> The RRF includes some relevant country-specific outcome and output indicators that will be monitored using nationally-owned data sources. The M&amp;E section includes some consideration of the quality of relevant national data sources and states plans for how UNDP will work with partners to strengthen these, with some consideration of building sustainable country capacities.</li> <li>• <b>1:</b> The RRF does not include relevant country-specific outcome or output indicators or does not identify relevant national sources to be used in monitoring. The M&amp;E section may include some plans to develop M&amp;E systems required for programme monitoring, but does not address weaknesses in the broader national statistical system or capacities.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Evidence</b></p> <p>National level data from GoK entities have been included.</p>
<p><b>22. Is there is a clear strategy embedded in the project specifying how the project will use national systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluations, etc.,) to the extent possible?</b></p> <p>Yes</p> <p><b>No</b></p>	<p>The project is a DIM hence will be implemented mainly through UNDP systems.</p>
<p><b>23. Is there a clear transition arrangement/ phase-out plan developed with key stakeholders in order to sustain or scale up results (including resource mobilisation and communications strategy)?</b></p> <p>Yes</p> <p>No</p>	<p>Alignment to NCBF is mentioned. Would be good to review the applicability of the same is the current devolution context.</p>