

# Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

**Form Status: Approved**

<b>Overall Rating:</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<b>Decision:</b>	
<b>Portfolio/Project Number:</b>	00081592
<b>Portfolio/Project Title:</b>	Sustainable land management
<b>Portfolio/Project Date:</b>	2015-01-01 / 2021-12-31

**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:**

Since its preparation in 2012, the project has actively been participating and engaging in new developments and opportunities emerging in relation to the National Roadmap for De-pollution of the Qaraoun Watershed and specifically related to achieving sustainable land management. This has been further strengthened through the project's direct efforts in the adoption of Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) through participation in the national target setting exercise. Additionally, the project is engaging in on-going efforts to change national legislation by supporting the MoA for amendment of the forest and rangelands law. Additionally, and considering the multitude of stakeholders in the area with activities supporting displaced Syrians and host communities, the project was forced to reach out to additional stakeholders to ensure synergies and mainstreaming in the on-going and/or planned activities.

Moreover, during this year, the project identified an opportunity for the recruitment of an additional staff member as "Project Secretary" mainly to provide operational and administrative support in implementing project activities and validate many of the non-official data acquired through the collaborators.

**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 settings<sup>1</sup> 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 responds to the area of the UNDP Strategic Plan Environment and Sustainable Development Primary Outcome 1 related to "Growth and development are inclusive and sustainable, incorporating productive capacities that create employment and livelihoods for the poor and excluded." More specifically, the project is in line with output 1.3 "Solutions developed at national and sub-national levels for sustainable management of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste" that has indicator 1.3.2 "Number of jobs and livelihoods created through management of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste, disaggregated by sex, and rural and urban." This serves the project's aim which is to alleviate land degradation, maintain ecosystem services and improve livelihoods.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

**Relevant****Quality Rating: Exemplary**

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:**

During the inception phase, the team undertook an exhaustive assessment to identify relevant target groups to engage them in the project and ensure their participation to integrate SLM considerations in development and planning. Government institutions such as the MoE, MoA, CDR, MOPWT-DGUP, unions of municipalities and municipalities are directly engaged through their various departments in continuous meetings. Additionally, the project advisory board being the Qaraoun Committee formed by the Council of Ministers decision number 32 dated 9/5/2014 to supervise the implementation of the road map to combat the de-pollution of the Qaraoun Lake, the project is also using this channel to integrate the project results into nationally adopted plans and most importantly to communicate to relevant stakeholders upcoming activities and results. It is worthwhile noting that the Project Board Meeting for 2017 was organized under the 31st Qaraoun committee meeting, which allowed the project to present the latest on the project components in the presence of municipalities, governmental and non governmental organization, donor agencies and active projects in the area and allow for exchange among actors.

**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 benefited from lessons learned generated through the implementation of previous UNDP completed and ongoing projects, in addition to similar projects in the project target areas related to sustainable land management, reforestation, agricultural and land reclamation. On the other hand, the project also generated knowledge through developing a methodology and descriptors to be adopted for the ecological assessment at the levels of Zahle, West Beka, and Rachaya, to be further expanded to the national level in future assessments by the Ministry of Environment and/or Ministry of Agriculture. In particular, descriptors for forestlands assessment, mushroom survey and ecological profiling, and riparian ecosystem, wetlands and canals were developed. Also, descriptors for belt transects and permanent quadrats have been developed for future productivity and carrying capacity assessments and possibly integrated in rangelands management planning. descriptors for forestlands, mushrooms and ecological profiling, and riparian ecosystem, wetlands and canals. It also have been developed and could be shared at the national level for future assessments. descriptors for belt transects and permanent quadrats have been developed and could be shared at the national level for future productivity and carrying capacity assessments. These would also be shared at the national level for future assessments along with guidelines for Sustainable Rangeland Management. These results were shared at the national level and specifically with NGOs applying similar methodologies in different localities.

**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:**

The project has potential to scale up in the future and contribute to development change through continuous targeting of relevant beneficiaries from local and national scales in a participative manner. Evidence for scaling up is identified through the following:

- Activation of Qaraoun and SLM Committees: provides a platform for collaboration/partnership to exchange experiences and lessons learned to further strengthen sustainable land management considerations at the national level.
- Project efforts to change national legislation: Integration of SLM measures in the update of the Forest law, including rangelands management provisions (as part of the same text or separately).
- Coordination with other NGOs to replicate and scale-up project activities and initiatives in other areas.

The project is also looking into mainstreaming the concept of SLM in educational curricula (technical schools, university specialized curricula, etc.)

Project activities include also capacity development and awareness to local stakeholders (including municipalities, farmers, herders, bee-keepers etc.) on sustainable land management practices and natural resources protection.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

**Principled**

**Quality Rating: Exemplary**

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:**

Gender equality and women's empowerment were mainstreamed into project activities ensuring that women have a real voice in project's decision making and governance as well as during the implementation phase.

It is intended that women be consulted so as to obtain their input into the design of management mechanisms and identify any gender-based potential impacts: Women will be part of working groups, participatory workshops to ensure that women's input is captured and their opinion and needs taken into consideration, in particular in view of their use of forest resources and the potential impacts that project activities may bring about and in the management of agricultural activities.

Thus, the project as a whole takes into consideration UNDP's commitment to gender equality and women's empowerment not only as human rights, but also because they are a pathway to achieving project's goals of sustainable land management.

**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:**

There was no such a risk during the project.

**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:**

The project did not experience unanticipated grievance.



**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

**Management & Monitoring****Quality Rating: Exemplary**

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

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

**Evidence:**

The project has a comprehensive and standard M&E plan adapted to UNDP & GEF requirements. Progress data against indicators/targets are monitored on a quarterly basis by the programme team, through the quarterly reporting.

Expenditure for M&E plan for activities is not identified specifically in the budget but covered under various items in project management costs. At inception phase, a Monitoring and Evaluation work plan and budget was agreed on and scheduled. This is followed by quarterly monitoring to monitor progress using the UNDP Enhanced Results Based Management Platform and risks will be regularly updated. Any new risks will be flagged and amended accordingly. In addition, the Land Degradation Focal Area Portfolio Monitoring and Assessment Tool (PMAT) serves as a tracking tool to capture the necessary data and information during project design and implementation. A first completed Tracking Tool for the project was done in the design phase; thus, it will be repeated at Mid-Term Evaluation and again at Final Evaluation. Missing information will be collected by the consultants at the inception stage of the project.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	TEReport_SLMQProject2021-09-2200_59_56_9698_309 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/TEReport_SLMQProject2021-09-2200_59_56_9698_309.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/TEReport_SLMQProject2021-09-2200_59_56_9698_309.pdf</a> )	noritaka.hara@undp.org	9/22/2021 3:23:00 AM

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

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

**Evidence:**

The project governance mechanisms operated very well and as stipulated in the project document (minutes of meetings are attached for 2016 and 2017). There is quarterly reporting completed on Atlas (including review of risks when relevant) in addition to the annual reporting to GEF, and the board is regularly informed of project workplans elaborated at the beginning of each year. Inputs and recommendations are taken into account in the finalization of the workplans. The project didn't face major risks that affected any change in the approach nor the workplan.

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

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

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

**Evidence:**

The project risks are continuously monitored by the project team and discussed with the minister and U NDP management in order to adequately resolve. Concerning addressing the risks, the annual project plans usually take into account the risks when elaborated at the beginning of each year, especially when they might affect the implementation of the project activities; those plans are updated when necessary and relevance (timeframe, target, alignment of the activities within the year). The risks are uploaded on ATLAS on a quarterly basis and include management responses.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

**Efficient****Quality Rating: Exemplary**

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:**

Human and financial resources were adequately mobilized to achieve the project's intended results. The team was complemented by the recruitment of a Project secretary to support with data collection and processing. The project and the programme monitor the budget on a regular basis and undertake a multiyear budget revision at least once a year. Budget and expenditures are also monitored by GEF.

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

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

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

**Evidence:**

The project issues all the needed plans in a timely manner, including the procurement and recruitment plan which includes detailed financial resources required. The plans are generally followed however, delays in the processing of the procurement were encountered and managed in cooperation with the Programme team at the Country Office and remedial actions/solutions were taken accordingly.

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:**

The project costs and expenditures are monitored at two levels: project team level and country office level (in addition to donors through reporting). The project uses a portfolio management approach to improve cost effectiveness through synergies with other ongoing projects such as the Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) target setting exercise. Finally, the project operates per UNDP rules and regulations for all procurement and recruitment actions which promote cost-efficiency, transparency, competitiveness and value for money.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

**Effective**

**Quality Rating: Exemplary**

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

- Yes
- No

**Evidence:**

The project completed all the planned activities.

**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 line with the reporting requirements of the project document, quarterly progress reports (reflecting face d issues if any) are prepared and submitted (reported on Atlas). The Programme also uses the quarterly reporting (financial and narrative) to track the project progress towards its target: The reporting is cross checked with the set annual targets/planned activities and annual workplan; budget revisions are undertaken at least annually, in order to adjust the budget to the expected targets/expenditures.

### 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 previously mentioned, the target groups are continuously being engaged in the project to ensure their participation and mainstream SLM considerations at national level. Stakeholders include both private and public institutions in the related fields of agriculture, forests and rangelands management. Moreover, the project directly addresses the needs of the Ministry of Environment, the primary beneficiary of the project, with on-going efforts to mainstream SLM concepts in development projects. The project coordinates with the Ministry regular basis through the National Focal Point of the Department of Natural Resources Protection.



**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

**Sustainability & National Ownership****Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

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

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

**Evidence:**

The government of Lebanon signed a Letter of Agreement with UNDP delegating the implementation to the latter; thus the project is implemented through the support to National Implementation Modality (NIM), where the implementation (procurement, recruitment, monitoring etc.) is governed by UNDP rules and regulations. However, this does not mean that the Government was not engaged in the project implementation and decision making. The Ministry of Environment (Implementing Partner) is an active member of the project board which approves the project plans (workplans, procurement plans, recruitment plans, reporting plans, communication plans, travel plans); On the other hand, the project team liaise with the National Focal Points (Public Servants) on a daily basis. Physically, the project office is located at the Ministry's premises. Furthermore, and to ensure the project outputs are absorbed, the Ministry of Agriculture and the Ministry of Public Works and Transportation – Directorate General of Urban Planning are engaged in and coordinated with the relevant project activities.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

19. Were there regular monitoring of changes in capacities and performance of institutions and systems relevant to the project, as needed, and were the implementation [arrangements](#)<sup>8</sup> adjusted according to changes in partner capacities?

- 3: Changes in capacities and performance of national institutions and systems were assessed/monitored using clear indicators, rigorous methods of data collection and credible data sources including relevant HACT assurance activities. Implementation arrangements were formally reviewed and adjusted, if needed, in agreement with partners according to changes in partner capacities. (all must be true)
- 2: *Aspects of changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems were monitored by the project using indicators and reasonably credible data sources including relevant HACT assurance activities. Some adjustment was made to implementation arrangements if needed to reflect changes in partner capacities. (all must be true)*
- 1: Some aspects of changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems may have been monitored by the project, however changes to implementation arrangements have not been considered. Also select this option if changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems have not been monitored by the project.
- Not Applicable

**Evidence:**

The country office in Lebanon does not use the HACT modality based on an evaluation undertaken earlier. The support to NIM modality is being used in line with the approval received from headquarters and attached herewith.

Changes in capacities and performance of relevant institutions and systems have not yet been assessed since they will be initiated in 2018.

**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:**

The project's sustainability vision is clearly set since the initiation of the project. It includes, but not limited to the following activities:

- Capacity building and trainings for local authorities (municipalities and unions of municipalities) and local stakeholders (farmers, herders, bee-keepers, women etc.) on SLM practices related to agriculture, forests and rangelands.
- Development of methodologies and tools for the baseline assessments that will serve to monitor progress at later stages. The MoE which is the national beneficiary and other administrations will adopt the same methodologies and indicators in the future that serve for up-scaling and replication SLM measures in other areas.
- Development of land use plans in agreement with the local authorities will serve as tools for SLM and local authorities will be trained on using LUIMS.
- Activation of the Qararoun and SLM committees which provides an opportunity for scaling-up at national level and mainstreaming SLM concepts.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

**QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments**

The project's QA is satisfactory.