

PROJECT MONITORING QA: IMPLEMENTATION MONITORING STAGE

PROJECT ID: 00077556

PROJECT TITLE: Third National Communications / Biennial Update Report project

PROJECT QA ASSESSMENT: CLOSURE				
OVERALL PROJECT				
EXEMPLARY ●●●●●	HIGH ●●●●○	SATISFACTORY ●●●○○	NEEDS IMPROVEMENT ●●○○○	INADEQUATE ●○○○○
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.
RATING CRITERIA				
Select the option that best reflects the project				
STRATEGIC				
<p>1. Did the project identify changes to the external environment and did it incorporate them into the project strategy?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3: The project team has identified relevant changes in the external environment that may present new opportunities or threats to the project’s ability to achieve its objectives and the assumptions have been tested to determine iff the project’s strategy is still valid. There is evidence that the project board has considered the implications, and documented any changes needed to the project in response. <i>(all must be true)</i> 2: The project team has 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 may not have been fully integrated in the project. <i>(both must be true)</i> 1: The project team may have considered relevant changes in the external environment since implementation began, but there is no evidence that the project team has considered changes to the project as a result. 	3	2	1	
	Evidence			
	The project has effectively responded to changes in the external environment, with the most noticeable new development being the adoption of the Paris Agreement and the corresponding submission of Malaysia’s Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC), which occurred during the duration of the project. The project responded to this change by taking the opportunity to support the development of a Roadmap for NDC implementation and supporting monitoring and tracking of the NDC. These decisions were captured in project board meetings.			
<p>2. Was the project aligned with the UNDP Strategic Plan?</p>	3	2	1	
	Evidence			
	As outlined in the Project Document, the project responds to at least one of			

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3: The project responds at least one of the development settings¹ as specified in the Strategic Plan (SP) and adopts at least one Signature Solution². and the project's RRF includes at all the relevant SP output indicators. <i>(all must be true)</i> • 2: The project responds to one of the three areas of development work¹ as specified in the Strategic Plan. The project's RRF includes at least one SP output indicator, if relevant. <i>(both must be true)</i> • 1: While the project may respond to a partner's identified need, this need falls outside the UNDP Strategic Plan. Also select this option if none of the relevant SP indicators are included in the RRF. <p>*Note: Management Action must be taken for score of 1.</p>	the three areas of development work and includes at least one SP output indicator.
--	--

RELEVANT

<p>3. Were the project's targeted groups being systematically engaged, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized, to ensure the project remains relevant for them?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3: Systematic and structured feedback has been collected over the past two years 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 are 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. <i>(all must be true)</i> • 2: Targeted groups have been engaged in implementation and monitoring, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized. Beneficiary feedback, which may be anecdotal, has been collected over the past year to ensure the project is addressing local priorities. This information has been used to inform project decision making. <i>(all must be true)</i> • 1: Some beneficiary feedback may have been collected over the past year, but this information has not been used to inform project decision making. This option is also selected if no beneficiary feedback has been collected. <p>*Note: Management Action must be taken for a score of 1</p>	3	2
	1	
	<p>Evidence</p> <p>The project's decision making committees (the National Steering Committee and the Project Technical Committee) consist of a wide representation of stakeholders, both within the government and external stakeholders (e.g. NGOs). Consultations have also involved a wide range of stakeholders and their feedback has helped to inform decision making.</p>	

<p>4. Did the project generating 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?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 have been 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. <i>(both must be true)</i> • 2: Knowledge and lessons learned backed by relatively limited evidence, drawn mainly from within the project, have been considered by the project team. There is some evidence that changes were made to the project as a result to ensure its continued relevance. <i>(both must be true)</i> • 1: There is limited or no evidence that knowledge and lessons learned have been collected by the project team. There is little or no evidence that this has informed project decision making. <p>*Note: Management Action must be taken for a score of 1</p>	3	2
	1	
	<p>Evidence</p> <p>The project has generated significant knowledge, namely in the form of the final deliverables- the Third National Communication Report, the Biennial Update Report and the Roadmap for NDC implementation. Within these main deliverables, lessons learnt, gaps and needs, and achievements have been captured and shared as a key source of information on climate change in Malaysia.</p>	

<p>5. Was the project sufficiently at scale, or was there potential to scale up in the future, to meaningfully contribute to development change?</p>	3	2
	1	

¹ 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

² 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.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3: There is credible evidence that the project reached a 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 is currently not 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 is not at scale, and there are no plans currently to scale up the project in the future. 	<p style="text-align: center;">Evidence</p> <p>The project has managed to sufficiently reach out to beneficiaries- government agencies, private sector, communities, the public as the reports are accessible by all. Information about GHG inventories and trends, and mitigation pathways and recommendations have played a key role in informing policy and leading to real policy change. For example, the project led to the increased function of the Malaysian Green Technology Center to take on the role as a dedicated center on climate change, and the climate change reports are a key source of information for the development of a policy/legislative framework in Malaysia- the National Adaptation/ Mitigation Plans and the National Climate Change Act.</p>								
PRINCIPLED									
<p>6. Were the project’s measures (through outputs, activities, indicators) relevant to address gender inequalities, empower women and produce the intended effect? If not, evidence-based adjustments and changes have been made.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3: The project team has systematically 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. <i>(both must be true)</i> • 2: The project team has 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. <i>(both must be true)</i> • 1: The project team has 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. <p>*Note: Management Action must be taken for a score of 1</p>	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">1</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">Evidence</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2"> <p>The project has made attempts to address gender inequalities by providing a platform for women in consultations. Conscious effort has been made to gather disaggregated data according to gender.</p> </td> </tr> </table>	3	2	1		Evidence		<p>The project has made attempts to address gender inequalities by providing a platform for women in consultations. Conscious effort has been made to gather disaggregated data according to gender.</p>	
3	2								
1									
Evidence									
<p>The project has made attempts to address gender inequalities by providing a platform for women in consultations. Conscious effort has been made to gather disaggregated data according to gender.</p>									
<p>7. Were social and environmental impacts and risks being successfully managed and monitored?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3: Social and environmental risks are 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 has been a substantive change to the project or change in context that affects risk levels, the SESP is updated to reflect these changes. <i>(all must be true)</i> • 2: Social and environmental risks are 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 	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">1</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">Evidence</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2"> <p>As this project is mainly a climate change reporting project with deliverables in the form of reports submitted to the UNFCCC, there have not been any major social and environmental risks and no need for assessments. However, any risks have</p> </td> </tr> </table>	3	2	1		Evidence		<p>As this project is mainly a climate change reporting project with deliverables in the form of reports submitted to the UNFCCC, there have not been any major social and environmental risks and no need for assessments. However, any risks have</p>	
3	2								
1									
Evidence									
<p>As this project is mainly a climate change reporting project with deliverables in the form of reports submitted to the UNFCCC, there have not been any major social and environmental risks and no need for assessments. However, any risks have</p>									

<p>identified through SESP). Relevant management plan(s) developed, implemented and monitored for identified risks. <u>OR</u> project is categorized as Low risk through the SESP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1: Social and environmental risks have not been tracked in the risk log. For projects categorized as High or Moderate Risk there is no evidence that social and environmental assessments have been completed and/or management plans or measures development, implemented or monitored. There have been substantive changes to the project or changes in the context but SESP has not been updated. <i>(any may be true)</i> 	<p>been tracked in the risk log and managed.</p>								
<p>8. Were grievance mechanisms available to project-affected people and are grievances (if any) addressed to ensure any perceived harm is effectively mitigated?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3: Project-affected people have been actively informed of UNDP’s Corporate Accountability Mechanism (SRM/SECU) and how to access it. If the project is categorized as High or Moderate Risk through the SESP, a project -level grievance mechanism is in place and project affected people informed. <u>If</u> grievances have been received, they are effectively addressed in accordance with SRM Guidance. <i>(all must be true)</i> • 2: Project-affected people have been informed of UNDP’s Corporate Accountability Mechanism and how to access it. If the project is categorized as High Risk through the SESP, a project -level grievance mechanism is in place and project affected people informed. <u>If</u> grievances have been received they are responded to but face challenges in arriving at a resolution. • 1: Project-affected people not informed of UNDP’s Corporate Accountability Mechanism. <u>If</u> grievances have been received they are not responded to. <i>(any may be true)</i> 	<table border="1"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">1</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">Evidence</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2"> <p>No grievances have been received. Project is low risk.</p> </td> </tr> </table>	3	2	1		Evidence		<p>No grievances have been received. Project is low risk.</p>	
3	2								
1									
Evidence									
<p>No grievances have been received. Project is low risk.</p>									
MANAGEMENT & MONITORING									
<p>9. Was the project’s M&E Plan sufficient and adequately implemented?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3: The project has a comprehensive and costed M&E plan. Baselines, targets and milestones are fully populated. Progress data against indicators in the project’s RRF is being 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, including during evaluations and/or After Action Reviews, are used to take corrective actions when necessary. <i>(all must be true)</i> • 2: The project has a costed M&E Plan, and most baselines and targets are populated. Progress data against indicators in the project’s RRF is collected on a regular basis, although there may be some slippage in following the frequency stated in the Plan and data sources are not always reliable. Any evaluations conducted, if relevant, meet most decentralized evaluation standards. Lessons learned have been captured but may not have been used to take corrective actions yet. <i>(all must be true)</i> • 1: The project has an M&E Plan, but costs are not clearly planned and budgeted for, or are unrealistic. Progress data is not being regularly collected against the indicators in the project’s RRF. Evaluations may not meet decentralized evaluation standards. Lessons learned are rarely captured and used. Select this option also if the project does not have an M&E plan. <p>*Note: Management Action must be taken for a score of 1</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">1</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">Evidence</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2"> <p>The project’s M&E plan was mentioned and costed for in the project document. The project regularly monitored and tracked its results and these have been collected half-yearly and shared with partners, according to the frequency highlighted in the Project Document. The Mid-Year Progress Reports and Annual Progress Reports includes a section on achievements, challenges and corrective actions to be taken.</p> </td> </tr> </table>	3	2	1		Evidence		<p>The project’s M&E plan was mentioned and costed for in the project document. The project regularly monitored and tracked its results and these have been collected half-yearly and shared with partners, according to the frequency highlighted in the Project Document. The Mid-Year Progress Reports and Annual Progress Reports includes a section on achievements, challenges and corrective actions to be taken.</p>	
3	2								
1									
Evidence									
<p>The project’s M&E plan was mentioned and costed for in the project document. The project regularly monitored and tracked its results and these have been collected half-yearly and shared with partners, according to the frequency highlighted in the Project Document. The Mid-Year Progress Reports and Annual Progress Reports includes a section on achievements, challenges and corrective actions to be taken.</p>									
<p>10. Did the project’s governance mechanism (i.e., the project board or equivalent) function as intended?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 are 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 uses evidence, including progress data, knowledge, lessons and evaluations, as the basis for informing management decisions (e.g., change in strategy, approach, work plan.) <i>(all must be true to select this option)</i> • 2: The project’s governance mechanism met in the agreed frequency and the minutes of the meeting are on file. A project progress report has been submitted to the project board or equivalent at least once in the past year, covering results, risks and opportunities. <i>(both must be true to select this option)</i> 	<table border="1"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">1</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">Evidence</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2"> <p>The project’s governance mechanism consisted of the National Steering Committee, Project Technical Committee, and Sub-Working Groups which all met at the frequency outlined in the project document (at least twice a year or more frequently as necessary). Progress reports have been prepared as mentioned under #9.</p> </td> </tr> </table>	3	2	1		Evidence		<p>The project’s governance mechanism consisted of the National Steering Committee, Project Technical Committee, and Sub-Working Groups which all met at the frequency outlined in the project document (at least twice a year or more frequently as necessary). Progress reports have been prepared as mentioned under #9.</p>	
3	2								
1									
Evidence									
<p>The project’s governance mechanism consisted of the National Steering Committee, Project Technical Committee, and Sub-Working Groups which all met at the frequency outlined in the project document (at least twice a year or more frequently as necessary). Progress reports have been prepared as mentioned under #9.</p>									

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1: The project's governance mechanism has not met in the frequency stated in the project document over the past year and/or the project board or equivalent is not functioning as a decision-making body for the project as intended. <p>*Note: Management Action must be taken for a score of 1</p>		
<p>11. Were risks to the project adequately monitored and managed?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3: The project has actively monitored risks every quarter including consulting with key stakeholders, including security advisors, to identify continuing and emerging risks and to assess if the main assumptions remain valid. There is clear evidence that relevant management plans and mitigating measures have been fully implemented to address each key project risk, and have been updated to reflect the latest risk assessment. <i>(all must be true)</i> • 2: The project has monitored risks every year, as evidenced by an updated risk log. Some updates have been made to management plans and mitigation measures. • 1: The risk log has not been updated as required. There may be some evidence that the project has monitored risks (including security risks or incidents) that may affect the project's achievement of results, but there is no explicit evidence that management actions have been taken to mitigate risks. In the case of a deteriorating security environment, no consultation has occurred with the UNDP Security Office on appropriate measures. <p>*Note: Management Action must be taken for a score of 1</p>	3	2
1		
Evidence		
The project has monitored its risks in the risk log.		
EFFICIENT		
<p>12. Adequate resources have been mobilized to achieve intended results. If not, management decisions were taken to adjust expected results in the project's results framework.</p>	Yes (3)	No (1)
<p>13. Were project inputs procured and delivered on time to efficiently contribute to results?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3: The project had an updated procurement plan. Implementation of the plan was on or ahead of schedule. The project quarterly reviews operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addresses them through appropriate management actions. <i>(all must be true)</i> • 2: The project had an updated procurement plan. The project annually reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addresses them through appropriate management actions. <i>(all must be true)</i> • 1: The project did not have an updated procurement plan. The project may or may not have reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner, however management actions have not been taken to address them. <p>*Note: Management Action must be taken for a score of 1</p>	3	2
1		
Evidence		
Project procurement was implemented on a timely basis and project procurement plans were prepared beforehand with approvals from project board.		
<p>14. Was there regular monitoring and recording of cost efficiencies taken into account the expected quality of results?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 maximizes results that can be delivered with given resources. The project actively coordinated with other relevant ongoing projects and initiatives (UNDP or other) to ensure complementarity and seek efficiencies wherever possible (e.g. joint activities.) <i>(both must be true)</i> • 2: The project monitored its own costs and gives 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. 	3	2
1		
Evidence		
The project regularly reviewed costs against other projects within the country office and coordinated with other ongoing initiatives. For example, the Roadmap on NDC Implementation was parked under the governance structure of this project to ensure efficiency and complementarity.		
EFFECTIVE		
<p>15. Was the project <u>on track</u> to deliver its expected outputs?</p>	Yes (3)	No (1)
	3	2
1		

<p>16. Have there been 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?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3: Quarterly progress data has informed regular reviews of the project work plan to ensure that the activities implemented are most likely to achieve the desired results. There is evidence that data and lessons learned (including from evaluations and/or After Action Reviews) have been used to inform course corrections, as needed. Any necessary budget revisions have been made. <i>(both must be true)</i> • 2: There has been at least one review of the work plan per year to assess if project activities are on track to achieving the desired development results (i.e., outputs.) There may or may not be evidence that data or lessons learned has been 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 are delivered on time, no link has been made to the delivery of desired development results. Select this option also if no review of the work plan by management has taken place over the past year. <p>*Note: Management Action must be taken for a score of 1</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Evidence</p> <p>Work plans were regularly reviewed every quarterly with corrective actions taken to revise budget and activities.</p>	
<p>17. Were targeted groups systematically identified and engaged, prioritizing the marginalized and excluded, to ensure results were achieved as expected?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 have been reached as intended. The project has regularly engaged with targeted groups over the past year to assess whether they are benefiting as expected and adjustments were made if necessary to refine targeting. <i>(all must be true)</i> • 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 were members of the targeted groups. There has been some engagement with beneficiaries in the past year to assess whether they are benefiting as expected. <i>(all must be true)</i> • 1: The project did not report on specific targeted groups. There is no evidence to confirm that project beneficiaries are deprived and/or excluded from development opportunities relevant to the project area of work. There may have been some engagement with beneficiaries to assess whether they are benefiting as expected, but it has been limited or has not occurred in the past year. 	<p style="text-align: center;">3</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">2</p>
<p>1</p>		
<p style="text-align: center;">Evidence</p> <p>Vulnerability assessments were conducted for certain geographic areas with recommendations on climate change adaptation actions highlighted .</p>		
<p>SUSTAINABILITY & NATIONAL OWNERSHIP</p>		
<p>18. Were stakeholders and national partners fully engaged in the decision-making, implementation and monitoring of the project?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3: Only national systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) have been used to fully implement and monitor the project. All relevant stakeholders and partners have been fully and actively engaged in the process, playing a lead role in project decision-making, implementation and monitoring. <i>(both must be true)</i> • 2: National systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) were used to implement and monitor the project, but other support (such as country office support or project systems) may also be used if necessary. All relevant stakeholders and partners were fully and actively engaged in the process, playing an active role in project decision-making, implementation and monitoring. <i>(both must be true)</i> • 1: There has been relatively limited or no engagement with national stakeholders and partners in the decision-making, implementation and/or monitoring of the project. <p>*Note: Management Action must be taken for a score of 1</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">3</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">2</p>
<p>1</p>		
<p style="text-align: center;">Evidence</p> <p>National systems were used in procurement, monitoring and evaluation and stakeholders including the IP have been fully committed. Besides the procurement of the project manager, all procurement was done through the IP.</p>		
<p>19. There was regular monitoring of changes in capacities and performance of institutions and systems relevant to the project, as needed. The implementation arrangements³ have been adjusted according to changes in partner capacities.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">3</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">2</p>
<p>1</p>		
<p style="text-align: center;">Evidence</p>		

³ Responsible Parties, Direct Country Office Support (DCOS), MOUs/LOAs

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 3: In the past two years, changes in capacities and performance of institutions and systems have been comprehensively assessed/monitored using clear indicators, rigorous methods of data collection and credible data sources including relevant HACT assurance activities. Implementation arrangements have been formally reviewed and adjusted, if needed, in agreement with partners according to changes in partner capacities. <i>(both must be true)</i> ● 2: In the past two years, aspects of changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems have been monitored by the project using indicators and reasonably credible data sources including relevant HACT assurance activities. Some adjustment has been made to implementation arrangements if needed to reflect changes in partner capacities. <i>(both must be true)</i> ● 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. <p>*Note: Management Action must be taken for a score of 1</p>	<p>Capacities and performance of all partner institutions which were contracted to deliver outputs were monitored and quality assured to ensure that the best results were delivered.</p>								
<p>20. The transition and phase-out arrangements have been reviewed regularly and adjusted according to progress (including financial commitments and capacity).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 3: The project’s governance mechanism has reviewed the project’s sustainability plan, including arrangements for transition and phase-out, to ensure the project is on track in meeting the requirements set out by the plan. The plan has been adjusted according to progress as needed. <i>(both must be true)</i> ● 2: There has been a review of the project’s sustainability plan, including arrangements for transition and phase-out, to ensure the project is on track in meeting the requirements set out by the plan. ● 1: The project may have a sustainability plan, but there has not been a review of this strategy since it was developed. Also select this option if the project does not have a sustainability strategy. <p>*Note: Management Action must be taken for a score of 1</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">1</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2" style="text-align: center;">Evidence</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="2"> <p>The governance mechanism of the project was reviewed during the course of the project and a modified version was proposed and endorsed to ensure that the project was delivering according to UNFCCC requirements.</p> </td> </tr> </table>	3	2	1		Evidence		<p>The governance mechanism of the project was reviewed during the course of the project and a modified version was proposed and endorsed to ensure that the project was delivering according to UNFCCC requirements.</p>	
3	2								
1									
Evidence									
<p>The governance mechanism of the project was reviewed during the course of the project and a modified version was proposed and endorsed to ensure that the project was delivering according to UNFCCC requirements.</p>									