**ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORT**

**YEAR 2018**

1. **BASIC INFORMATION**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project ID / Output ID** | **00103908 / 00105719**  | **Reporting** **Date**: | **11/30/2018** |
| **Full Title**:  | **NEDA-UNDP Strategic M&E Project:****Using Strategic Monitoring and Evaluation to Accelerate Implementation of the Philippine Development Plan 2017-2022** |
| **Start Date:**  | **12/9/2017** | **Completion Date**(and approved extension, if any)**:** | **12/31/209** |
| **Total Project Fund** (and fund revisions, if any)**:** | PHP 190,000,000.00[[1]](#footnote-1)USD 3,760,026.00[[2]](#footnote-2) | **Annual Project Fund:****AWP Budget (2018)** | PHP 53,582,000.00[[3]](#footnote-3)USD 1,000,000.00 |
| **Implementing Partner:**  | **National Economic and Development Authority (with Full UNDP Country Office Support)** |
| **Donor/s:** | **Government of the Philippines** |
| **Responsible Partner/s:** | **NEDA and UNDP** |
| **Project Description** | The National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Philippine country office have embarked on a partnership to strengthen the conduct of evaluations of priority government programs under the Philippine Development Program (PDP). Financed by NEDA and implemented with full UNDP country office support, the Strategic Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Project will help strengthen the M&E capacities of NEDA and key government agencies to support the achievement of the PDP and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) through evidence-based decision making. The project has the following components: 1) commissioning of evaluations on priority themes and programs under the PDP and SDGs; 2) assessment of national evaluation capacity and provision of learning opportunities to evaluation managers in government; 3) advisory services to the development of evaluation guidelines, an evaluation portal, and a community of practice; and 4) project management.  |
| **Target Group** | Others: public servants, civil society organizations, academe The evaluations will be relevant to various marginalized groups depending on the theme. |

1. **INDICATIVE/EMERGING RESULTS OF THE PROJECT and LESSONS LEARNED**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **B.1 CPD Outcome alignment** | 1: The most marginalized, vulnerable, and at-risk people and groups benefit from inclusive and quality services and live in a supportive environment wherein their nutrition, food security, and health are ensured/protected. |
| The project seeks to strengthen the capacity of NEDA and select government agencies to conduct evaluations that are linked to the PDP. Through evidence-based findings and actionable recommendations, the evaluations will be instrumental to improving the design and implementation of programs and projects that benefit various marginalized, vulnerable, and at-risk people and groups. E.g., the evaluation of the National Nutrition Program, which seeks to unbundle the governance and coordination mechanisms for the implementation of nutrition interventions, will be relevant to children who have suffered from stunting and wasting.  |
| **B.2 CPD Output indicator alignment***[Choose from 1-3 applicable indicators]* | *1.2.1 Number of UNDP-assisted NGAs and LGUs implementinbg reforms and innovations for delivery and monitoring of services, public finance management, or public procurement.**1.2.2 Number of NGAs and LGUs using the UNDP-assisted electronic-governance system [IRRF 2.2.1.1]* *1.3.1 Number of individuals and institutions engaged in NGAs and LGUs through UNDP-supported civic engagement mechanisms* |
| * *1.2.1 – Developing Capacity for Evaluation*
	+ *NEDA has been supported in boosting in capacity to design, tender, and manage evaluations: not only through the use of UNDP procurement systems but also by working closely with key staff of NEDA (MES, sector staff, and regional staff). In addition, a total of 16 government agencies have been engaged as part of the evaluation reference groups (ERGs) for the eight (8) evaluations.*
	+ *NEDA and DBM have been supported in developing the Guidelines to the National Evaluation Policy Framework (NEPF): a whole-of-government guidance document that seeks to help operationalize and institutionalize evaluations.*
	+ *The assessment of evaluation capacity and learning opportunities have however not yet been commenced.*
* *1.2.2 – Technology for Monitoring and Evaluation*
	+ *The development of the Government Evaluations Portal has not yet commenced due to delays in procurement. Once established, the Portal will support NEDA and at least ten (10) agencies in keeping track of evaluations.*
	+ *An additional component—development of PIPOL Delivers, a web-based monitoring and delivery system for priority infrastructure projects under the Philippine Investment Program (PIP)—has not yet been commenced as the fund contribution from the government has not yet been released.*
* *1.3.1 – Engaging Evaluation Stakeholders*
	+ *The 7th M&E Network Forum convened by NEDA with UNDP support on 20-21 November 2018 has provided a platform for more than 250 evaluation stakeholders from various sectors (government, academe, civil society, professionals, development partners) and belonging to* ***YYY*** *institutions to contribute to the development of the NEPF guidelines and help identify possibilities to move the M&E community of practice forward.*
* *Provide updates (quantitative or qualitative) for each CPD output indicator selected (e.g. No. and name of LGUs for indicator 1.1.1).*
* *Describe key CPD output level results that were achieved as planned*
* *Explain which output-level results were not achieved as planned*
* *Reflect on external factors that constrained performance*

*[500 characters max. per CPD output]* |
| **B.3 SP Output Alignment** | *1.1.1. Capacities developed at national and sub-national levels strengthened to promote inclusive local economic development and deliver basic services including HIV and related services – Number of countries where national and subnational governments have improved capacities to plan, budget, manage, and monitor basic services.*  |

|  |
| --- |
| **B.4 Top three key results achieved in 2018*****Guidance:*** *Use the following criteria for selection of key project outcome/output-level results i) results that directly contribute to CPD outputs; ii) results that contribute to gender equality; iii) results that contribute to capacity development or policy making; iv) result in which significant proportion of the annual budget is spent; and v)) any other result that is important for the project for that year. In selecting key results, think about what your team is most proud of achieving during the year. Disaggregated data (sex, age, social group, etc.) must be used to the extent possible when reporting on beneficiaries. [1,000 characters max. per key result]* *Key Results:* Click here to enter text.Click here to enter text.Click here to enter text. |
| **B.5 Lessons learned and ways forward*****Guidance:*** *Mention the key lessons learned during the implementation of the project in 2018, as how these lessons will guide us in the future. Please mention any “best” practices which UNDP should be aware of. Please be specific and focus on 2018. [1,000 characters max.]* |

1. **TECHNICAL ACCOMPLISHMENTS**
* *Evidence-based reporting – include relevant reports/publications and/or photo-documentation (description, date, location) as an annex.*
* *Quarterly financial performance is reported in the FACE Form. Please ensure consistency of technical accomplishments with the submitted Quarter FACE form and the AWP.*
* *Interim annual financial performance data is reported in the APR.*

|  |
| --- |
| **EXPECTED OUTPUTS****Output 1. Management of the NEDA M&E Fund – Commissioning of Evaluation Studies** |
| **OUTPUT NARRATIVE***Guidance: Highlight results achieved from outputs* *below. If the result for output indictors are not met /achieved, please explain the probable reasons behind this result. [1,500 characters]* |
| **Project Output Indicator/s[[4]](#footnote-4)** | **Baseline** | **Annual****Result[[5]](#footnote-5)** | **Annual****Target****(Annual)** | **Cumulative Result** **(from Start Year)****Start year: 2018** | **Cumulative Target** **(from Start Year)****Start year: 2018** | **End-of-Project Target****End year: 2019** |
| 1.1 Percent of planned evaluation studies (national & regional) commissioned & completed\* to assess the performance of selected development plans, programs, policies & projects [Modified]\**Assumes final draft report pending consideration of management response* | 2016 | 0% | Commissioned: 12.5% (1 of 8)Completed: 12.5% (1 of 8) | Commissioned:100% (8 of 8)Completed:38% (3 of 8) | Commissioned: 12.5% (1 of 8)Completed: 12.5% (1 of 8) | Commissioned:100% (8 of 8)Completed:38% (3 of 8) | Commissioned:100% (8 of 8)Completed:100% (8 of 8) |
| 1.2 Extent to which a pipeline of evaluation studies aligned to the PDP are developed and approved by the M&E Fund Steering Committee [Originally 1.3 in Project Document] | 2016 | Pipeline not yet developed | Initial Pipeline developed & approved | Pipeline developed & approved | Initial Pipeline developed & approved | Pipeline developed & approved | Pipeline updated & approved |
| 1.3 Number of evaluation studies which have accompanying information, education, and communication actions [New] | 2016 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 8 |
| 1.4 Extent to which a roster of potential evaluators is developed [New] | 2016 | None | Initial Roster Developed | Roster developed | Initial Roster Developed | Roster developed | Roster updated |

**[**

|  | **Physical Performance** | **Financial Performance** |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity/Sub-Activity Description** | **Activity Target[[6]](#footnote-6)** | **Accomplishment for the Year** | **Status of Activity[[7]](#footnote-7)** | **Planned Budget** | **Donor and Budget Code** | **Expenditure** | **Delivery Rate***(cumulative expenditure/**planned budget) \*100* | **REMARKS*** *Explain if expenditure and budget deviation exceeds 10%*
* *Mention bottlenecks and plans to address them*
* *Explain why activity indicator targets were not met*
 |
| **Planned Activity 1.1** [New] Technical services, procurement, and coordination for the Evaluation Studies |  |  | ***GREEN: Completed*** |   |  |  |  |  |
| **Planned Activity 1.2**Communication and dissemination of evaluation studies. |  |   | ***YELLOW: Ongoing*** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Planned Activity 1.3**Evaluation studies conducted to assess the performance of selected development plans, programs, policies, and projects\* |  |  | ***RED: Delayed*** |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **EXPECTED OUTPUTS****Output 2. Evaluation Capacity Assessment and Learning** |
| **OUTPUT NARRATIVE***Guidance: Highlight results achieved from outputs* *below. If the result for output indictors are not met /achieved, please explain the probable reasons behind this result. [1,500 characters]* |
| **Project Output Indicator/s[[8]](#footnote-8)** | **Baseline** | **Annual****Result[[9]](#footnote-9)** | **Annual****Target****(Annual)** | **Cumulative Result** **(from Start Year)****Start year: 2018** | **Cumulative Target** **(from Start Year)****Start year: 2018** | **End-of-Project Target****End year: 2019** |
| 2.1 Evaluation capacity assessment report produced for 10 pilot agencies, including NEDA central and regional offices and an agreed set of national government agencies, and presented to the M&E Fund Steering Committee | 2016 | Evaluation capacity assessment report not yet produced | Deep dive assessment not yet conducted | Assessment conducted and presented to SC |  |  |  |
| 2.2 Percent of planned Evaluation Capacity Development activities carried out to further develop the evaluation capacity of NEDA and other government agencies [modified] | 2016 | 0% | 0% | CapDev Plan Produced |  |  |  |
| 2.3 Percent of training participants from NEDA and the M&E units of select agencies who have been able to apply their new knowledge to their work [new]  | 2016 | 0% | 0% | 0% |  |  |  |
| 2.4 Extent to which the NEDA is capable of setting policy, planning, managing, and assuring the quality of evaluations vis-à-vis other oversight agencies [new] | 2016 | *Baseline to be set after assessment*  | Deep dive assessment not yet conducted | Assessment conducted |  |  |  |
| 2.5 Extent to which a competency framework and a certification program on evaluation is developed and implemented in NEDA and the M&E units of select agencies. [new] | 2016 | NEPF competencies not yet fleshed out  | Initial detailed competency framework  | Developed and presented to SC |  |  |  |

**[**

|  | **Physical Performance** | **Financial Performance** |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity/Sub-Activity Description** | **Activity Target[[10]](#footnote-10)** | **Accomplishment for the Year** | **Status of Activity[[11]](#footnote-11)** | **Planned Budget** | **Donor and Budget Code** | **Expenditure** | **Delivery Rate***(cumulative expenditure/**planned budget) \*100* | **REMARKS*** *Explain if expenditure and budget deviation exceeds 10%*
* *Mention bottlenecks and plans to address them*
* *Explain why activity indicator targets were not met*
 |
| **Planned Activity 2.1** Evaluation capacity assessment for NEDA Central and Regional Offices and national government agencies (NGAs) |  |  | ***GREEN: Completed*** |   |  |  |  |  |
| **Planned Activity 2.2**Learning activities to develop national evaluation capacity in NEDA and NGAs |  |   | ***YELLOW: Ongoing*** |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Planned Activity 2.3**Development of web-based training and certification modules |  |  | ***RED: Delayed*** |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **EXPECTED OUTPUTS****Output 3. Advisory Services for the National Evaluation Policy Framework – Evaluation Guidelines, Portal Development, and Stakeholder Outreach** |
| **OUTPUT NARRATIVE***Guidance: Highlight results achieved from outputs* *below. If the result for output indictors are not met /achieved, please explain the probable reasons behind this result. [1,500 characters]* |
| **Project Output Indicator/s[[12]](#footnote-12)** | **Baseline** | **Annual****Result[[13]](#footnote-13)** | **Annual****Target****(Annual)** | **Cumulative Result** **(from Start Year)****Start year: 2018** | **Cumulative Target** **(from Start Year)****Start year: 2018** | **End-of-Project Target****End year: 2019** |
| 3.1 Extent to which the evaluability criteria is developed for the NEPF and approved by the M&E Fund Steering Committee  | 2016 | Evaluability criteria not yet produced | Draft parameters developed | Developed and approved  |  |  |  |
| 3.2 Extent to which a proposed National Evaluation Agenda for 2018-2022 is developed and approved by the M&E Fund Steering Committee  | 2016 | Agenda not yet produced | Draft parameters developed | Developed and approved  |  |  |  |
| 3.3 Extent to which draft institutional and operational guidelines for the NEPF are developed and approved by the M&E Fund Steering Committee, including sector-specific evaluation questions, evaluation terms of reference checklist, and other resources [Modified to include indicator 1.4 of ProDoc] | 2016 | Guidelines not yet produced | Draft submitted to NEDA, for consultation | Developed, approved, and launched |  |  |  |
| 3.4 Extent to which a pilot online knowledge sharing platform for government agency evaluations is developed, including a management dashboard to track and monitor progress on all evaluations  | 2016 | Online platform not yet developed | Ongoing procurement of the evaluations portal | Online knowledge platform designed & beta-developed |  |  |  |
| 3.5 No. of M&E Summits organized by the project [Originally 1.2 in ProDoc] | 2016 | 1 | Planning ongoing | 1 |  |  |  |
| 3.6 Percent of other planned outreach activities are carried out to expand the M&E Network and reach more evaluation stakeholders [New] | 2016 | None | Mapping of stakeholders ongoing | 50% |  |  |  |

**[**

|  | **Physical Performance** | **Financial Performance** |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity/Sub-Activity Description** | **Activity Target[[14]](#footnote-14)** | **Accomplishment for the Year** | **Status of Activity[[15]](#footnote-15)** | **Planned Budget** | **Donor and Budget Code** | **Expenditure** | **Delivery Rate***(cumulative expenditure/**planned budget) \*100* | **REMARKS*** *Explain if expenditure and budget deviation exceeds 10%*
* *Mention bottlenecks and plans to address them*
* *Explain why activity indicator targets were not met*
 |
| **Planned Activity 3.1** [Modified] Development of proposed National Evaluation Agenda for 2018-2022, including pipeline of evaluation studies aligned to the PDP |  |  |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| **Planned Activity 3.2**[Modified to include Activity 1.1 of ProDoc] Development of institutional and operational guidelines for the NEPF and M&E Fund |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Planned Activity 3.3**[Revised] Development of online knowledge sharing platform for NEDA evaluations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Planned Activity 3.4**3.4 [Revised] Technical & coordination support to revitalizing the M&E Network as a vehicle for engagement with stakeholders and as a community of practice on National Evaluation Policy |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Planned Activity 3.5**Conduct of 2018 M&E Summit |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **EXPECTED OUTPUTS****Output 4. Project Management** |
| **OUTPUT NARRATIVE***Guidance: Highlight results achieved from outputs* *below. If the result for output indictors are not met /achieved, please explain the probable reasons behind this result. [1,500 characters]* |
| **Project Output Indicator/s[[16]](#footnote-16)** | **Baseline** | **Annual****Result[[17]](#footnote-17)** | **Annual****Target****(Annual)** | **Cumulative Result** **(from Start Year)****Start year: 2018** | **Cumulative Target** **(from Start Year)****Start year: 2018** | **End-of-Project Target****End year: 2019** |
| 4.1 Extent to which a functional project management team is established | 2016 | PMT not yet established | Largely – all PMT members engaged | Largely – all PMT members engaged |  |  |  |
| 4.2 Percentage of required progress, financial, and monitoring reports are completed and delivered in a timely manner | 2016 | N.A. | Initial APR Submitted | 100% |  |  |  |

|  | **Physical Performance** | **Financial Performance** |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity/Sub-Activity Description** | **Activity Target[[18]](#footnote-18)** | **Accomplishment for the Year** | **Status of Activity[[19]](#footnote-19)** | **Planned Budget** | **Donor and Budget Code** | **Expenditure** | **Delivery Rate***(cumulative expenditure/**planned budget) \*100* | **REMARKS*** *Explain if expenditure and budget deviation exceeds 10%*
* *Mention bottlenecks and plans to address them*
* *Explain why activity indicator targets were not met*
 |
| **Planned Activity 4.1** UNDP advisory services to NEDA |  |  |   |   |  |  |  |  |
| **Planned Activity 4.2-4.3**Project management team |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Planned Activity 4.4-4.5**Direct Project Costing for overall guidance, procurement support, and oversight services |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Planned Activity 4.6-4.7**Communication, equipment, supplies, & miscellaneous expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Planned Activity 4.8**Audit exercise |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Planned Activity 4.9**Meetings with M&E fund steering committee and NEPF evaluation board |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. **PARTNERSHIPS**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name of Partner** | **Type** | **Description of partnership and how it has contributed to project results or sustainability** |
|  | *Select type.* |  |
|  | *Select type.* |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Was South-South and Triangular Cooperation promoted and utilized through the project?** | [ ]  **Yes** [ ]  **No** |
| **If yes, briefly explain how. List down countries engaged.** | **[500 characters]** |

1. **INFORMATION, COMMUNICATION, EDUCATION, AND KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **IEC/Knowledge Product Produced in 2016** | **Type** | **Date Published/Produced** | **Target audience** | **Link** (if available) |
|  | *Select type.* | *Click here to enter date.* |  |  |
|  | *Select type.* | *Click here to enter date.* |  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Was the project cited/quoted/featured in media reports/articles?***If yes, please provide link to article/video.* |  |

1. **ACTIONS TAKEN REGARDING AUDIT AND/OR SPOT CHECK FINDINGS**

*Describe actions taken to address the findings from the audit/spot check as applicable.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Audit/Spot Check Recommendation/s** | **Action Taken** | **Responsible Person** | **Implementation Date** |
|  |  |  | *Click here to enter date.* |
|  |  |  | *Click here to enter date.* |

1. **RISK LOG UPDATE**
* *Assess identified risks and record new risks that may affect project implementation.*
* *Include risks identified in the Project’s Social and Environmental Screening, if any.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Description** | **Date Identified** | **Type** | **Status** | **Countermeasures/Management Response***(What actions have been taken/will be taken to counter this risk)* |
| 1 |  | *Click here to enter date.* | *Select risk type.* |  |  |

1. **MONITORING & EVALUATION**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Total Spent on Monitoring in Reporting Year*****Guidance:*** *Costs associated with UNDP/project staff, consultants, project partners, supporting national statistical systems in designing project specific data collection methodologies (qualitative and quantitative), monitoring methods including stakeholder surveys and other qualitative methods, collection of data, analysis and dissemination of the findings to inform a project, either with project partners or to fulfill specific UNDP/project requirements (preferably the former).*  | *Enter amount* | **Total spent on Decentralized Evaluations in Reporting Year****(Mid Term / Final)*****Guidance:*** *Costs associated in designing, implementing and disseminating evaluations for specific projects* | *Enter amount* |
| Is the project’s M&E Plan being adequately implemented? Are progress data against indicators in the project’s RRF being reported regularly using credible data sources and collected according to the frequency stated in the M&E Plan? | [ ]  **Yes** [ ]  **No** |

1. **QUALITY OF RESULTS**

*Please answer when applicable to the project of concern.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Sustainability:** *Do the benefits of the achieved results have potential to last?* | **[500 characters max]** |
| **National Capacity:** *Did the project help strengthen national institutions?*  | **[500 characters max]** |
| **Civic Engagement:** *Please select the type of civic engagement promoted.* | [ ]  Civic engagement in policy and legislative processes[ ]  Civic engagement to promote accountability of state institutions[ ]  Civic engagement for service delivery[ ]  Civic engagement for advocacy and/or to raise awareness and promote social norm/behaviour change  |
| **Youth Opportunities:** *How did the project support youth in contributing to sustainable human development and peace?* | [ ]  Supported youth civic engagement and political participation [ ]  Supported youth economic empowerment[ ]  Supported youth as agents for community resilience and peacebuilding [ ]  Supported the involvement of young people as partners in SDG implementation, monitoring and accountability |

1. **INNOVATION**

*Were innovation initiatives implemented in the project? (ROAR F.3.1)*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| What innovative methods were applied or tested? | [ ]  Alternative Finance (including Social Impact Investment/Pay for Success)☐ Behavioural Insights ☐ Blockchain☐ Challenge Prizes ☐ Crowdsourcing[ ]  Crowdfunding☐ Foresight[ ]  Games for Social Good[ ]  Hackathon[ ]  Human-Centered Design | [ ]  Innovation Camp[ ]  Innovation Lab☐ Micronarratives☐ Mobile-Based Feedback Mechanism☐ Positive Deviance☐ New and Emerging Data (including Big Data)☐ Randomized Controlled-Trial/Parallel Testing[ ]  Real-Time Monitoring[ ]  Remote Sensing/Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs) ☐ Other (please specify) |

1. **MAINSTREAMING GENDER EQUALITY (Reported Annually in the APR)**

*Incorporation of gender perspectives in various outputs and activities by giving emphasis on gender-sensitive concerns especially in leadership roles, decision-making processes, capacity-building and protection of women, including the children and elderly*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **UNDP Gender Marker** | Choose an item. |

1. **Classification of Gender responsiveness[[20]](#footnote-20)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Classification of gender-responsiveness:****Project Implementation, Management, Monitoring and Evaluation (PIMME)***Select one* |  | **A:** Project is **gender-responsive** (15.0-20.0) |
|  | **B:** Project is **gender-sensitive** (8.0-14.9) |
|  | **C:** Project has **promising** GAD prospects (4.0-7.9) |
|  | **D:** Gender and development (GAD) is **invisible** in the proposed project (0-3.9) |

1. **Qualitative description**

|  |
| --- |
| * + - **In Governance Mechanisms** (participation in project board, including representation of PCW, TWGs, experts’ group and other governance mechanisms set up by the project, e.g. national multi-sectoral committees)
 |
| * + - **In Capacity Building and Policy, Planning and Programming**
 |
| * + - **Women’s Empowerment Key Results**

**Guidance:** Describe results achieved by the project in promoting gender equality and women’s empowerment. Please highlight gender results achieved which have brought about changes in men’s and women’s lives, gender relations, gender roles and division of labor, status of inequality and exclusion of specific groups, etc.. Please provide quantitative data wherever possible. Include qualitative case studies and success stories to illustrate the most significant changes brought about by your project’s contributions.  |

1. **Gender issues**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Gender issues identified** | **How the project is addressing identified gender issues** |
| 1 |  |  |
| 2 |  |  |

1. **Disaggregation of data of Beneficiaries/Participants of Activities conducted under the Project**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Activities**  | **Number of beneficiaries/participants**  | **Gender disaggregation**  | **Remarks (if any)** |
| *Trainings/Consultations/Workshops/ Surveys* |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Prepared by: \_Francis Y. Capistrano\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 Project Manager/Coordinator

Noted by: \_Dir. Violeta S. Corpus, NEDA-MES\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 National Project Director

 Implementing Partner

Noted by: \_Ma. Luisa Lim-Jolongbayan, UNDP-MSU\_\_ Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 Programme Team Leader

 UNDP

**ANNEX**

1. **SAMPLE RISK LOG UPDATE**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Issue Log** | **Risk Category** | **Likelihood** | **Impact** | **Proposed Mitigation Measure** |  **Proposed Risk Response** |
| 1. | (list/cluster) | (choose from list) | (1-5) | (1-5, comment) | (list) | (terminate, transfer, mitigate, tolerate) |
| 2. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. **Reference: Types of Risks[[21]](#footnote-21)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Environmental** | **Financial** | **Organizational** | **Political** | **Operational** | **Regulatory** | **Strategic** | **Other** |
| Natural Disasters: storms, flooding, earthquakes | EXTERNAL economic factors: interest rates, exchange rate fluctuation, inflation | Institutional Arrangements | Corruption | Complex Design (size: larger/multi-country project; technical complexity; innovativeness, multiple funding sources) | New unexpected regulations, policies | Partnerships failing to deliver | Other risks that do not fit in any of the other categories |
| Pollution incidents | INTERNAL:  | Institutional/ Execution Capacity | Government Commitment | Project Management | Critical policies or legislation fails to pass or progress in the legislative process | Strategic Vision, Planning and Communication | Might refer to socioeconomic factors such as: population pressures; encroachment – illegal invasions; poaching/illegal hunting or fishing |
| Social and Cultural | Co-financing difficulties | Implementation arrangements | Political Will  | Human Error/Incompetence |  | Leadership and Management |  |
| Security/Safety | Use of financing mechanisms | Country Office Capacity (specific elements limiting CO capacity) | Political Instability | Infrastructure Failure |  | Programme Alignment |  |
| Economic | Funding (Financial Resources) | Governance | Change in Government | Safety being compromised  |  | Competition |  |
|  | Reserve Adequacy | Culture, Code of Conduct and Ethics | Armed Conflict and Instability | Poor monitoring and evaluation |  | Stakeholder Relations |  |
|  | Currency | Accountability and Compensation | Adverse Public opinion/media intervention | Delivery |  | Reputation |  |
|  | Receivables | Succession Planning and Talent Management |  | Programme Management |  | UN Coordination |  |
|  | Accounting/Financial Reporting | Human resources Processes and Procedures |  | Process Efficiency |  | UN Reform |  |
|  | Budget Allocation and Management |  |  | Internal Controls |  |  |  |
|  | Cash Management/Reconciliation |  |  | Internal and External Fraud |  |  |  |
|  | Pricing/Cost Recovery |  |  | Compliance and Legal  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Procurement |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Technology |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Physical Assets |  |  |  |

1. Total Peso value remitted by GPH (NEDA) to UNDP as recorded in Atlas. Equivalent PHP amount based on prevailing exchange rate (US$1 = PHP53.582 per November 2018 UNORE) is $3,545,966.93 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Fund value as recorded in Atlas, given that the contribution was remitted by NEDA in staggered tranches throughout 2018. *See note #2 above.*  [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Revised downward from the original PHP 158,241,990.00 (US$ 3,169,975.16). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Please ensure consistency with ProDoc and AWP indicators. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Use traffic light to indicate progress vis-à-vis annual output targets in AWP: Green (Completed), Yellow (Ongoing), Red (Delayed/Not started). Data provided can be qualitative or quantitative based on the nature of the output indicator [UNDP PHL CO Data Clean-up Guidelines]. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Specify units, e.g., number of trainings, number of participants, number of travel, etc. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Use traffic light to indicate progress vis-à-vis timelines assigned for planned activities. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Please ensure consistency with ProDoc and AWP indicators. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Use traffic light to indicate progress vis-à-vis annual output targets in AWP: Green (Completed), Yellow (Ongoing), Red (Delayed/Not started). Data provided can be qualitative or quantitative based on the nature of the output indicator [UNDP PHL CO Data Clean-up Guidelines]. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Specify units, e.g., number of trainings, number of participants, number of travel, etc. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Use traffic light to indicate progress vis-à-vis timelines assigned for planned activities. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Please ensure consistency with ProDoc and AWP indicators. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. Use traffic light to indicate progress vis-à-vis annual output targets in AWP: Green (Completed), Yellow (Ongoing), Red (Delayed/Not started). Data provided can be qualitative or quantitative based on the nature of the output indicator [UNDP PHL CO Data Clean-up Guidelines]. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. Specify units, e.g., number of trainings, number of participants, number of travel, etc. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. Use traffic light to indicate progress vis-à-vis timelines assigned for planned activities. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. Please ensure consistency with ProDoc and AWP indicators. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. Use traffic light to indicate progress vis-à-vis annual output targets in AWP: Green (Completed), Yellow (Ongoing), Red (Delayed/Not started). Data provided can be qualitative or quantitative based on the nature of the output indicator [UNDP PHL CO Data Clean-up Guidelines]. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. Specify units, e.g., number of trainings, number of participants, number of travel, etc. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. Use traffic light to indicate progress vis-à-vis timelines assigned for planned activities. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. Scoring based on Box 16 and 17 of the Harmonized Gender and Development Guidelines on Project Development, Implementation, Monitoring, and Evaluation, 2nd ed. (download [here](http://pcw.gov.ph/sites/default/files/documents/resources/harmonized-gad-guidelines-2nd_ed_0.pdf)). [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. UNDP Programme and Operations Policies and Procedures (POPP) [↑](#footnote-ref-21)