

Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

Form Status: Approved

Overall Rating:	Satisfactory
Decision:	
Portfolio/Project Number:	00088732
Portfolio/Project Title:	Van. Capacity Build. Phas 2-Cross-Cutting Capacities Dev.
Portfolio/Project Date:	2015-05-13 / 2021-06-30

Strategic

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

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:

On the project board meeting of 11 July 2018, the representative from the Department of Environment Protection and Conservation presented that they will be hiring a statistician to manage the EMIS database. This is an example of pro-actively identifying changes and incorporating this into the strategy.

The evidence of this is the incorporation of the use of the EMIS database into the Vanuatu National Sustainable Development Plan in the Environmental Pillar ENV. 5.6 on page 15 of the uploaded document.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	11JulyProjectBoardMeetingMinutes._5958_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/11JulyProjectBoardMeetingMinutes._5958_301.docx)	rusiate.ratuniata@undp.org	9/25/2020 10:18:00 AM
2	VanuatuNSDP2030-EN_5958_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/VanuatuNSDP2030-EN_5958_301.pdf)	rusiate.ratuniata@undp.org	9/25/2020 10:18:00 AM

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

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

Evidence:

The project aligns to the signature solution of 'Crisis Prevention and Increased Resilience' through the Vanuatu Country Programme Outcome (National, local and communities capacities to effectively plan and implement enhanced natural resource management, biodiversity conservation, climate change mitigation and disaster risk reduction are strengthened). The project also contributes to the SDG Integration Works streams, this is with Data and Analytics; the EMIS provides the link between the environmental data to the social and economic information to help the government of Vanuatu map out future development scenarios.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	5051_CCCD_Vanuatu_ProDoc.v01_5958_302 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/5051_CCCD_Vanuatu_ProDoc.v01_5958_302.docx)	loraini.sivo@undp.org	9/28/2020 4:47:00 AM

Relevant**Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory**

3. Were the project's targeted groups systematically identified and engaged, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized, to ensure the project remained relevant for them?

- 3: Systematic and structured feedback was collected over the project duration from a representative sample of beneficiaries, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized, as part of the project's monitoring system. Representatives from the targeted groups were active members of the project's governance mechanism (i.e., the project board or equivalent) and there is credible evidence that their feedback informs project decision making. (all must be true)
- 2: Targeted groups were engaged in implementation and monitoring, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized. Beneficiary feedback, which may be anecdotal, was collected regularly to ensure the project addressed local priorities. This information was used to inform project decision making. (all must be true to select this option)
- 1: Some beneficiary feedback may have been collected, but this information did not inform project decision making. This option should also be selected if no beneficiary feedback was collected
- Not Applicable**

Evidence:

This not applicable to this project because it an enabling activity project, with a set or pre-defined/pre-determined target beneficiaries. These were the governmental and NGO stakeholders that played a role in the collection and dissemination of environmental data, please see pages 24-29 and the table 4 on pages 47-47 of the uploaded project document.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	5051_CCCD_Vanuatu_ProDoc18Aug2015_5958_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/5051_CCCD_Vanuatu_ProDoc18Aug2015_5958_303.doc)	rusiate.ratuniata@undp.org	9/25/2020 10:57:00 AM

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:

In the uploaded 2018 APR under section iiiii (Project Implementation Challenges) clearly highlights project risks (Updated project risks and actions) and projects issues and the mitigation actions undertaken (Updated project issues and actions) to address these. These are evidences that changes were made to the project to ensure continued relevance.

TE - page 23. The project has documented some lessons learned to be able to understand the effectiveness and efficiency of the project interventions.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	5051_CCCD_Vanuatu_2018AnnualProjectReport-1_5958_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/5051_CCCD_Vanuatu_2018AnnualProjectReport-1_5958_304.docx)	rusiate.ratuniata@undp.org	9/25/2020 11:38:00 AM
2	VanuatuCB2Evaluation-Final-July1_5958_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/VanuatuCB2Evaluation-Final-July1_5958_304.pdf)	loraini.sivo@undp.org	9/28/2020 5:08:00 AM

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 was sufficiently at scale, with the establishment of the EMIS data base, the development and confirmation of the data sharing protocols and the MoUs between the IP and the relevant stakeholders on the sharing and accessing of environmental data.

Not only was the above explained established, the representatives of stakeholders and the pertinent people were trained on the use of the EMIS. They were also made aware of the significance of their data contributions to the country's state of the environment report as it informs the UNFCCC. The EMIS database is now embedded into the Vanuatu National Sustainable Development Plan under the Environmental Pillar ENV. 5.6 on page 15 of the uploaded document.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	VanuatuNSDP2030-EN_5958_305 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/VanuatuNSDP2030-EN_5958_305.pdf)	rusiate.ratuniata@undp.org	9/27/2020 1:24:00 AM

Principled**Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

6. Were the project's measures (through outputs, activities, indicators) to address gender inequalities and empower women relevant and produced the intended effect? If not, evidence-based adjustments and changes were made.

- 3: The project team gathered data and evidence through project monitoring on the relevance of the measures to address gender inequalities and empower women. Analysis of data and evidence were used to inform adjustments and changes, as appropriate. (both must be true)
- 2: *The project team had some data and evidence on the relevance of the measures to address gender inequalities and empower women. There is evidence that at least some adjustments were made, as appropriate. (both must be true)*
- 1: The project team had limited or no evidence on the relevance of measures to address gender inequalities and empowering women. No evidence of adjustments and/or changes made. This option should also be selected if the project has no measures to address gender inequalities and empower women relevant to the project results and activities.

Evidence:

The project through its capacity building component ensured that the representatives from the respective stakeholders had women represented. Please find this in the quarterly progress report (QPR) provided as disaggregated data for trainings and workshops. In the QPR for Q1, Q2 & Q3 2018 these can be found as the annex 1 in the three reports.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Quarter1reportingCB22018_5958_306 (http://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Quarter1reportingCB22018_5958_306.pdf)	rusiate.ratuniata@undp.org	9/27/2020 1:47:00 AM
2	Quarter2reportingCB22018_5958_306 (http://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Quarter2reportingCB22018_5958_306.pdf)	rusiate.ratuniata@undp.org	9/27/2020 1:48:00 AM
3	Quarter3reportingCB22018_5958_306 (http://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Quarter3reportingCB22018_5958_306.pdf)	rusiate.ratuniata@undp.org	9/27/2020 1:48:00 AM

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:

These were monitored in the APRs however there were no social and environmental risks highlighted as high risk to require further assessments.
Refer to APR already uploaded to earlier questions

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	5051VanuatuCCCDAPR2018_5958_307 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/5051VanuatuCCCDAPR2018_5958_307.pdf)	loraini.sivo@undp.org	9/28/2020 5:24:00 AM
2	5051_Van_CB2_2019APR_final_5958_307 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/5051_Van_CB2_2019APR_final_5958_307.pdf)	loraini.sivo@undp.org	9/28/2020 5:24:00 AM

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 board meeting has been an avenue to address project grievances over the years. The project did not have any high category risk in the SESP so there was no grievances mechanism in place. Any grievances however was dealt with at the board meeting levels.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	5051_CCCD_Vanuatu_ProDoc18Aug2015_5958_308 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/5051_CCCD_Vanuatu_ProDoc18Aug2015_5958_308.doc)	rusiate.ratuniata@undp.org	9/27/2020 3:08:00 AM
2	ProjectBoardmeetingminutes_July2018.kp_5958_308 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ProjectBoardmeetingminutes_July2018.kp_5958_308.docx)	loraini.sivo@undp.org	9/28/2020 5:35:00 AM
3	MinutesoftheProjectBoardmeeting13August2019_5958_308 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MinutesoftheProjectBoardmeeting13August2019_5958_308.docx)	loraini.sivo@undp.org	9/28/2020 5:39:00 AM
4	ProjectBoardmeetingminutes1_5958_308 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ProjectBoardmeetingminutes1_5958_308.docx)	loraini.sivo@undp.org	9/28/2020 5:40:00 AM

Management & Monitoring

Quality Rating: **Satisfactory**

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

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

Evidence:

The project had the periodic quarterly progress reports (QPRs) and the annual progress reports (APRs) documenting progress against the indicators in the Resource and Results Framework. These were the medium of measures through which the project's implementing unit and the UNDP Pacific Office monitored and evaluated the project's progress against the indicators and eventually against the end of the project targets. Please see the uploaded QPRs and APRs during implementation.

Finally the terminal evaluation that has just been concluded, gave the project's final status in terms of implementation progress - pg 46

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Quarter2reportingCB22018_5958_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Quarter2reportingCB22018_5958_309.pdf)	rusiate.ratuniata@undp.org	9/27/2020 3:35:00 AM
2	Quarter3reportingCB22018_5958_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Quarter3reportingCB22018_5958_309.pdf)	rusiate.ratuniata@undp.org	9/27/2020 3:35:00 AM
3	Quarter1reportingCB22018_5958_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Quarter1reportingCB22018_5958_309.pdf)	rusiate.ratuniata@undp.org	9/27/2020 3:35:00 AM
4	5051_CCCD_Vanuatu_2018AnnualProjectReport-1_5958_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/5051_CCCD_Vanuatu_2018AnnualProjectReport-1_5958_309.docx)	rusiate.ratuniata@undp.org	9/27/2020 3:36:00 AM
5	Final5051_Van_CB2_2019APR_5958_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Final5051_Van_CB2_2019APR_5958_309.docx)	rusiate.ratuniata@undp.org	9/27/2020 3:36:00 AM
6	VanuatuCB2Evaluation-Final-July1_5958_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/VanuatuCB2Evaluation-Final-July1_5958_309.pdf)	loraini.sivo@undp.org	9/28/2020 5:45:00 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:

Yes, the project's governance mechanism was functional as prescribed in the project document's paragraphs 226-243, pages 61-63. Please see the examples project board meeting minutes (December 2017 and July 2018) uploaded.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	5051_CCCD_Vanuatu_ProDoc18Aug2015_5958_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/5051_CCCD_Vanuatu_ProDoc18Aug2015_5958_310.doc)	rusiate.ratuniata@undp.org	9/27/2020 3:44:00 AM
2	ProjectBoardmeetingminutes21Dec2017_5958_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ProjectBoardmeetingminutes21Dec2017_5958_310.docx)	rusiate.ratuniata@undp.org	9/27/2020 3:47:00 AM
3	11JulyProjectBoardMeetingMinutes._5958_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/11JulyProjectBoardMeetingMinutes._5958_310.docx)	rusiate.ratuniata@undp.org	9/27/2020 3:47:00 AM

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:

Please refer to the explanations in question 7 under the 'Principled' category above.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Efficient

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

12. Adequate resources were mobilized to achieve intended results. If not, management decisions were taken to adjust expected results in the project's results framework.

- Yes
- No

Evidence:

The EMIS database was established and is now operational. The stakeholders were trained to share and access environmental data/information. In relation to this the data sharing and accessing protocols, along with the MoUs with each of the relevant stakeholders were developed and finalised. Refer to APR 2019 already uploaded

On the above explained, the response is YES, adequate resources were mobilised to achieve the intended results.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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

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

Evidence:

Please see the QPRs uploaded for the project's merchandise to raise awareness on the project. Apart from this the project implementing unit's office equipment (laptop computers and office furniture) were procured in time. The above stated were the project's main procurement.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Quarter1reportingCB22018_5958_313 (http://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Quarter1reportingCB22018_5958_313.pdf)	rusiate.ratuniata@undp.org	9/27/2020 4:05:00 AM
2	Quarter2reportingCB22018_5958_313 (http://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Quarter2reportingCB22018_5958_313.pdf)	rusiate.ratuniata@undp.org	9/27/2020 4:05:00 AM
3	Quarter3reportingCB22018_5958_313 (http://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Quarter3reportingCB22018_5958_313.pdf)	rusiate.ratuniata@undp.org	9/27/2020 4:05:00 AM

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 QPRs submitted with the funding authorisation and certificate of expenditures (FACE) form were the proxy of measure used to analyse the project cost efficiencies. Please find the quarterly FACE forms uploaded with their respective QPRs.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Quarter3reportingCB22018_5958_314 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Quarter3reportingCB22018_5958_314.pdf)	rusiate.ratuniata@undp.org	9/27/2020 4:14:00 AM
2	Q318_FR_VNCB2_VT3256277_5958_314 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Q318_FR_VNCB2_VT3256277_5958_314.pdf)	rusiate.ratuniata@undp.org	9/27/2020 4:14:00 AM
3	Quarter2reportingCB22018_5958_314 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Quarter2reportingCB22018_5958_314.pdf)	rusiate.ratuniata@undp.org	9/27/2020 4:14:00 AM
4	Van_CB2sSignedFFCWPforQ2_5958_314 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Van_CB2sSignedFFCWPforQ2_5958_314.pdf)	rusiate.ratuniata@undp.org	9/27/2020 4:15:00 AM
5	Quarter1reportingCB22018_5958_314 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Quarter1reportingCB22018_5958_314.pdf)	rusiate.ratuniata@undp.org	9/27/2020 4:15:00 AM
6	Copyof2018-Q1-FR-VANCB2-VATU4303626 Final_5958_314 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Copyof2018-Q1-FR-VANCB2-VATU4303626Final_5958_314.xlsx)	rusiate.ratuniata@undp.org	9/27/2020 4:15:00 AM

Effective**Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

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

- Yes
- No

Evidence:

Please see the explanations for question 12 under the 'Efficient' category. Please read the executive summary of the 2019 APR uploaded.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Final5051_Van_CB2_2019APR_5958_315 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QA/FormDocuments/Final5051_Van_CB2_2019APR_5958_315.docx)	rusiate.ratuniata@undp.org	9/27/2020 4:20:00 AM

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:

The annual work plans were reviewed once per year, a month from the year end project board meeting. This gave the opportunity for the project implementing unit in consultation with the UNDP Pacific Office to review the project's activities and outputs achieved and to effectively programme funds/resources into the subsequent years. Please find uploaded the annual work plans for the years 2015, 2016, 2017 and 2018, these will assist in the appreciation of the above explained.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	AWP2015_5958_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/AWP2015_5958_316.pdf)	rusiate.ratuniata@undp.org	9/27/2020 4:29:00 AM
2	VanuatuCB2CCCD_signed2016AWP_GoV-UNDP_5958_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/VanuatuCB2CCCD_signed2016AWP_GoV-UNDP_5958_316.pdf)	rusiate.ratuniata@undp.org	9/27/2020 4:30:00 AM
3	VanuatuCBD2-CCCD_2017AWP_endorsed_5958_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/VanuatuCBD2-CCCD_2017AWP_endorsed_5958_316.pdf)	rusiate.ratuniata@undp.org	9/27/2020 4:31:00 AM
4	SignedVanuatuCB22018AWP_5958_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SignedVanuatuCB22018AWP_5958_316.pdf)	rusiate.ratuniata@undp.org	9/27/2020 4:31:00 AM

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:

This not applicable to this project because it an enabling activity project, with a set or pre-defined/pre-determined target beneficiaries. These were the governmental and NGO stakeholders that played a role in the collection and dissemination of environmental data, please see pages 24-29 and the table 4 on pages 47-47 of the uploaded project document.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	5051_CCCD_Vanuatu_ProDoc18Aug2015_5958_317 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/5051_CCCD_Vanuatu_ProDoc18Aug2015_5958_317.doc)	rusiate.ratuniata@undp.org	9/27/2020 4:39:00 AM

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:

Yes, the project's governance mechanism (project document's paragraphs 226-243, pages 61-63) was the enabling factor in ensuring the full engagement of all stakeholders in the decision-making for the project. Please see the examples project board meeting minutes (December 2017 and July 2018) uploaded.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	ProjectBoardmeetingminutes21Dec2017_5958_318 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ProjectBoardmeetingminutes21Dec2017_5958_318.docx)	rusiate.ratuniata@undp.org	9/27/2020 4:44:00 AM
2	11JulyProjectBoardMeetingMinutes._5958_318 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/11JulyProjectBoardMeetingMinutes._5958_318.docx)	rusiate.ratuniata@undp.org	9/27/2020 4:45:00 AM

19. Were there regular monitoring of changes in capacities and performance of institutions and systems relevant to the project, as needed, and were the implementation **arrangements**⁸ adjusted according to changes in partner capacities?

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

Evidence:

As earlier alluded, the periodic submission of the FACE form and the complementary QPR narrative provided the necessary monitoring window against the original HACT assessment findings for the implementing partner, Vanuatu's Ministry of Climate Change. Please see the uploaded FACE forms and their complementary QPR.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Quarter1reportingCB22018_5958_319 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Quarter1reportingCB22018_5958_319.pdf)	rusiate.ratuniata@undp.org	9/27/2020 4:57:00 AM
2	Quarter2reportingCB22018_5958_319 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Quarter2reportingCB22018_5958_319.pdf)	rusiate.ratuniata@undp.org	9/27/2020 4:59:00 AM
3	Quarter3reportingCB22018_5958_319 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Quarter3reportingCB22018_5958_319.pdf)	rusiate.ratuniata@undp.org	9/27/2020 5:00:00 AM
4	Copyof2018-Q1-FR-VANCB2-VATU4303626Final_5958_319 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Copyof2018-Q1-FR-VANCB2-VATU4303626Final_5958_319.xlsx)	rusiate.ratuniata@undp.org	9/27/2020 5:02:00 AM
5	Van_CB2sSignedFFCWPforQ2_5958_319 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Van_CB2sSignedFFCWPforQ2_5958_319.pdf)	rusiate.ratuniata@undp.org	9/27/2020 5:02:00 AM
6	Q318_FR_VNCB2_VT3256277_5958_319 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Q318_FR_VNCB2_VT3256277_5958_319.pdf)	rusiate.ratuniata@undp.org	9/27/2020 5:02:00 AM

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 consistency in review are captured in the explanations in response to questions 18 & 19 of this category, responses to question 12 and 14 under the project's 'Efficient' category and in response to question 16 under the project's 'Effective' category.

The above combined, contributed to the transition and phase-out arrangements evidenced in the inclusion of the EMIS in Vanuatu's National Development Strategic Plan - 2030. Please find this uploaded.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	VanuatuNSDP2030-EN_5958_320 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/VanuatuNSDP2030-EN_5958_320.pdf)	rusiate.ratuniata@undp.org	9/27/2020 5:17:00 AM

QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments

The following below is a summary of what was discussed and agreed at the board:

1. The lessons learned from the project and its implementation with results/achievements were acknowledged by the board members and each gave a positive feedback from the deliverables of the project how the project has contributed to link up and established a dedicated EIMS (Database Management System). The project did offer the platform (Hardware) system database and accessories to link other stakeholders into the EIMS system and made this a reality in strengthening the environmental information management in Vanuatu for the first time ever, and it provides the basis to pull in all the partners in their efforts to coordinate the ad hoc (Scattered information) across all the sectors and this was an achievement for the project. And as part of lessons learned, the current EIMS should be scaled up within all the key stakeholders involved in environmental management and the coordination efforts should be strengthened further with other programs and projects;
2. Findings from the Terminal Evaluation Report: Although the report concludes that with the achievements, the computer program running the EIMS is outdated, we need to identify with IT experts, how to transfer the current program and its data sets into a most adaptable and reliable database system. There are local IT experts in the country who are capable to install and transfer the EIMS into a more user friendly program to be used for the database system. Board members acknowledge the recommendations from the TE report and review the management response for each of the recommendations. The timeframe for each of the recommendations may defer based on the nature of what is required to address the issues raised.
3. The Board emphasizes the point of recruiting international consultants for project based activities. And based on recommendation 6, such TA could be sourced locally at cheaper cost and generally for IT experts, the establishment of the TA EIMS system could have been sourced locally to avoid the deficiencies identified on the Dev-infor program for the EIMS;
4. The PMB recommended that acceptance of CB3 should be on the pipeline development for UNDP for which the government of Vanuatu is looking forward to endorse in collaboration with UNDP in the near future to continue to build on the current strengths that CB2 has delivered on and what is rather crucial is to strengthen the linkages among the stakeholders having environmental data to have a dedicated and approved repository at national level to collate/analyze and store the data for official use by policy makers in the Government system. The EIMS could be an element in the whole package of a national environmental database system linking up all other sectors under the NSDP environment pillar so to maintain a line of reporting across all sectors contributing to the overall national outcome.