

Closure Stage Quality Assu

Form Status: Approved	
Overall Rating:	Needs Improvement
Decision:	
Portfolio/Project Number:	00064743
Portfolio/Project Title:	PIMS 4581_Conservation Biodiversity_Iona National Park
Portfolio/Project Date:	2012-01-30 / 2019-12-31

Strategic	Quality Rating:
<p>1. Did the project pro-actively identified changes to the external environment and incorporated them into the project strateg</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="radio"/> 3: The project team identified relevant changes in the external environment that may present new opportunities or three determine if the project’s strategy was valid. There is some evidence that the project board considered the implication <input checked="" type="radio"/> 2: <i>The project team identified relevant changes in the external environment that may present new opportunities or three project board discussed this, but relevant changes did not fully integrate in the project. (both must be true)</i> <input type="radio"/> 1: The project team considered relevant changes in the external environment since implementation began, but there i <p>Evidence:</p> <div style="border: 1px solid #ccc; padding: 10px; margin-top: 10px;"> <p>In the second half of 2017, some delays in the implementation of activities were caused by concerns about a funding gap following the discovery by UNDP in August 2017 that the variation of the exchange rate of Euro to US\$ had not been correctly tracked by UNDP’s financial system (see footnote 2 on page 6). It turned out that adjustments of some intended activities were needed for other reasons. For example, resistance in the community and its traditional leaders in Helola made it unwise to proceed with the construction of a ranger post, camp site and water access point in that part of the Park, and suitable locations for camp site and water access point in Monte Negro were located outside the Park boundaries and therefore ineligible for Project funding.</p> <p>See final report attached.</p> </div>	

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name
1	FinalReportIona_24Aug2018_291_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FinalReportIona_24Aug2018_291_301.pdf)

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 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'
- 1: While the project may have responded to a partner's identified need, this need falls outside of the UNDP Strategic I RRF.

Evidence:

UNDP Strategic Plan Environment and Sustainable Development Primary Outcome:
Strengthen national capacity to manage the environment in a sustainable manner while ensuring adequate protection of the poor. Mobilizing environmental financing. UNDP Strategic Plan
Secondary Outcome: Mainstreaming environment and energy. Link to UNDP's Biodiversity and Ecosystems Global Framework (2012-2020):
Signature Programme #2: Unlocking the potential of protected areas (PAs), including indigenous and community conserved areas, to conserve biodiversity while contributing to sustainable development.

See Prodoc attached

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name
1	PIMS_4581AngolaIonaConservation_PRODUC_FINAL060213post_DOAFINAL_291_302 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PIMS_4581AngolaIonaConservation_PRODUC_FINA)

Relevant

Quality Rating:

3. Were the project's targeted groups systematically identified and engaged, with a priority focus on the discriminated and r

- 3: Systematic and structured feedback was collected over the project duration from a representative sample of beneficiary project’s monitoring system. Representatives from the targeted groups were active members of the project’s governance and 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 ensure the project addressed local priorities. This information was used to inform project decision making. (all must be true)*
- 1: Some beneficiary feedback may have been collected, but this information did not inform project decision making. T
- Not Applicable

Evidence:

The Project succeeded in engaging a local tourism operator (Yona Safaris) to involve communities in setting out tourism activities (i.e. campsites). The tourism activities in the Park are continuing after the Project has ended.

See Final Report

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name
---	-----------

No documents available.

4. Did the project generate knowledge, and lessons learned (i.e., what has worked and what has not) and has this knowledge 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, corporate policies/strategies, analysis and monitoring were discussed in project board meetings and reflected in project management 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 collected 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 evidence of knowledge and lessons learned being used to improve project management.

Evidence:

The lessons learned from the implementation of this project are being used in the GEF-5 project and in the management of Bicular, Quiçama, Cangandala, Maiombe National Parks and Luando Nature Reserve.

See Terminal Evaluation attached

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name
---	-----------

1	PIMS4581IonaTEFinalreport16May2018_291_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PIMS4581IonaTEFinalreport16May2018_291_304.pdf)
---	---

5. Was the project sufficiently at scale, or is there potential to scale up in the future, to meaningfully contribute to development?

- 3: There was credible evidence that the project reached sufficient number of beneficiaries (either directly through sign 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 (*
- 1: The project was not at scale, and there are no plans to scale up the project in the future.

Evidence:

This project was specifically designed to and does contribute to the GEF-4 biodiversity strategy long term objective 1 (to catalyze sustainability of protected area systems) and its strategic program 3 (strengthening terrestrial protected area networks), by investing GEF resources in improving the planning and operational management of the protected area system in Angola. This strategic focus is continued in GEF-5 and GEF-6.

See Final Report

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name
No documents available.	

Principled

Quality Rating:

6. Were the project’s measures (through outputs, activities, indicators) to address gender inequalities and empower womer changes were made.

- 3: The project team gathered data and evidence through project monitoring on the relevance of the measures to addr 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 an appropriate. (both must be true)
- 1: *The project team had limited or no evidence on the relevance of measures to address gender inequalities and emp also be selected if the project has no measures to address gender inequalities and empower women relevant to the p*

Evidence:

Gender did not figure prominently in project design, there were no gender sensitive indicators in the logical framework. During implementation period two women were recruited as field rangers but failed to perform their tasks due to social and family issues such as pregnancies and subsequent child care.

Management R

A Human Right community me social status, p water to local made by wom

See Terminal I

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name
---	-----------

No documents available.

7. Were social and environmental impacts and risks successfully managed and monitored?

- 3: Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. Appropriate assessments conducted where required (i.e. level of social and environmental assessment for Moderate risk projects as identified through SESP). Relevant management plans implemented, resourced, and monitored. Risks effectively managed or mitigated. If there is a substantive change to the project, these changes. (all must be true)
- 2: *Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. Appropriate assessments conducted where required (i.e. level of social and environmental assessment for Moderate risk projects as identified through SESP). Relevant management plans were 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, the management plans or measures development, implemented or monitored. There are substantive changes to the project.

Evidence:

See SESP and Risk log attached

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name
---	-----------

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1 | SESP_Iona_gs_291_307 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SESP_Iona_gs_291_307.d) |
| 2 | RiskLog_Iona_Aword00064743_July2017_291_307 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/RiskLog_Iona_Aword00064743_July2017_291_307.c) |

8. Were grievance mechanisms available to project-affected people and were grievances (if any) addressed to ensure any

- 3: Project-affected people actively informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism (SRM/SECU) and how to access it. A project-level grievance mechanism was in place and project affected people informed. If grievances were received, they were responded to.
- 2: *Project-affected people informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism and how to access it. If the project-level grievance mechanism was in place and project affected people informed. If grievances were received, they were responded to.*
- 1: Project-affected people was not informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism. If grievances were received, they were not responded to.

Evidence:

No grievances were received.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name
---	-----------

No documents available.

Management & Monitoring

Quality Rating:

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. Primary credible data sources and collected according to the frequency stated in the Plan, including sex disaggregated data at national standards, including gender UNEG standards. Lessons learned, included during evaluations and/or After-Action Reviews.
- 2: *The project costed M&E Plan, and most baselines and targets were populated. Progress data against indicators in line with the frequency stated in the Plan and data sources was not always reliable. Any evaluations conducted 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 did not meet decentralized evaluation standards. Lessons learned were rarely captured and used. Select this option also if the project had no M&E Plan.

Evidence:

The project Mid-term review and Final Evaluation were carried out by independent parties. Several monitoring missions were carried out by the project team, IP, UNDP and donor.

See Final Report and Terminal Evaluation report

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name
---	-----------

No documents available.

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 and minutes of the meeting are on file. There was regular (at least annual) progress reporting to the project board or equivalent on results, risks and opportunities, as the basis for informing management decisions (e.g., change in strategy, change in priorities, change in resources, change in scope).
- 2: *The project's governance mechanism met in the agreed frequency and minutes of the meeting are on file. A project board or equivalent was established, 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 for the project as intended.

Evidence:

Attached Steering committee meetings and technical meetings minutes

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name
1	ActadeReuniãodoComitePilotagem_27Julho2016_291_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ActadeReuniãodoComitePilotagem_27Julho2016_291_310)
2	ActadeReuniãodoComiteSupervisão_08_2015_AP_291_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ActadeReuniãodoComiteSupervisão_08_2015_AP_291_310)
3	SCmeetings_Attendeeslist_2015_291_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SCmeetings_Attendeeslist_2015_291_310.pdf)
4	ACTAN.2_291_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ACTAN.2_291_310.pdf)
5	ACTAN°16draft_291_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ACTAN°16draft_291_310.d)

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 clear evidence that relevant management plans and mitigating measures were fully implemented to address each key risk.
- 2: *The project monitored risks every year, as evidenced by an updated risk log. Some updates were made to manage risks.*
- 1: The risk log was not updated as required. There may be some evidence that the project monitored risks that management actions were taken to mitigate risks.

Evidence:

Risk log attached

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name
1	RiskLog_Iona_Aword00064743_July2017_291_311 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/RiskLog_Iona_Aword00064743_July2017_291_311.c)

Efficient

Quality Rating:

12. Adequate resources were mobilized to achieve intended results. If not, management decisions were taken to adjust exp

- Yes
- No

Evidence:

In the second half of 2017, some delays in the implementation of activities were caused by concerns about a funding gap following the discovery by UNDP in August 2017 that the variation of the exchange rate of Euro to US\$ had not been correctly tracked by UNDP's financial system. It turned out that adjustments of some intended activities were needed for other reasons. These necessary changes in Project activities were subsequently approved by the EU.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name
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 procurement management actions. (all must be true)
- 2: The project had updated procurement plan. The project annually reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs (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 taken to address them.*

Evidence:

As a government agency, MINAMB's procurement, recruitment and disbursement needed lengthy ministerial authorization process, which affected the effectiveness and efficiency of the project.

Management Response:

The biodiversity procurement process was...

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name
No documents available.	

14. Was there regular monitoring and recording of cost efficiencies, taking into account the expected quality of results?

- 3: *There is evidence that the project regularly reviewed costs against relevant comparators (e.g., other projects or countries with given resources. The project actively coordinated with other relevant ongoing projects and initiatives (UNDP or other organizations.) (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 expected quality of results delivered. The project coordinated activities with other projects to achieve cost efficiency goals)
- 1: There is little or no evidence that the project monitored its own costs and considered ways to save money beyond the budget

Evidence:

All project activities were contracted using public tenders or making a cost-effectiveness analysis.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name
---	-----------

No documents available.

Effective

Quality Rating:

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

- Yes
- No*

Evidence:

Both outcomes one and two were affected by lengthy contractual processes at MINAMB and the contracting of companies without adequate technical expertise to deliver satisfactory quality of deliverables.
The project delivered the main outputs of Component 1 but not from Component 2.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name
---	-----------

No documents available.

16. Were there regular reviews of the work plan to ensure that the project was on track to achieve the desired results, and i

- 3: Quarterly progress data informed regular reviews of the project work plan to ensure that the activities implemented learned (including from evaluations /or After-Action Reviews) were used to inform course corrections, as needed. Any
- 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 evidence that data or lessons learned were used to inform the review(s). Any necessary budget revisions have been i*
- 1: While the project team may have reviewed the work plan at least once over the past year to ensure outputs were d
Select this option also if no review of the work plan by management took place.

Evidence:

A work plan was prepared for each year with updated activities and budget.

See AWP attached

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name
1	AWP_2017_Iona_291_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/AWP_2017_Iona_291_316)
2	AWP_2018_Iona_291_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/AWP_2018_Iona_291_316)

17. Were the targeted groups systematically identified and engaged, prioritizing the marginalized and excluded, to ensure r

- 3: The project targeted specific groups and/or geographic areas, identified by using credible data sources on their capacity and needs in the project's area of work. There is clear evidence that the targeted groups were reached as intended. The project engaged them as intended and 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, development opportunities and constraints in the project area of work. Some evidence is provided to confirm that project beneficiaries are members of the targeted groups. There were no exclusions of project beneficiaries. (all must be true)*
- 1: The project did not report on specific targeted groups. There is no evidence to confirm that project beneficiaries are members of the targeted groups. There are no development opportunities relevant to the project area of work. There is some engagement with beneficiaries to assess whether the project is meeting their needs.
- Not Applicable

Evidence:

One of the main activities of the Project during its final year was the implementation of a community-based tourism strategy whose outlines had been developed in the second half of 2016 on the basis of the community study, the management plan, and a strategy meeting in Namibe in September 2016 that included local tour operators as well as the municipal administration of Tombwa and local NGOs.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name
1	EstudodasComunidades_FINAL_SOAPRO_291_317 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/EstudodasComunidades_FINAL_SOAPRO_291_317)

Sustainability & National Ownership**Quality Rating:**

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 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 (relevant stakeholders and partners were actively engaged in the process, playing an active role in project decision-making)*
- 1: There was relatively limited or no engagement with national stakeholders and partners in the decision-making, implementation and monitoring.
- Not Applicable

Evidence:

Project implementation was overseen by Steering Committee meetings chaired by the Minister of the Environment, which however occurred too infrequently. The low frequency of the SC meetings was partly compensated by meetings of the Technical Committee of the Project, which were held at approximately quarterly intervals. Another important Project management tool were the supervision missions to Iona National Park that were organized twice per year with participation from INBAC, MINAMB, MINPLAN, EU and UNDP.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name
No documents available.	

19. Were there regular monitoring of changes in capacities and performance of institutions and systems relevant to the project changes in partner capacities?

- 3: Changes in capacities and performance of national institutions and systems were assessed/monitored using clear and relevant HACT assurance activities. Implementation arrangements were formally reviewed and adjusted, if needed, in line with the HACT assurance activities.
- 2: *Aspects of changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems were monitored by HACT assurance activities. Some adjustment was made to implementation arrangements if needed to reflect changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems.*
- 1: Some aspects of changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems may have not been considered. Also select this option if changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems were not monitored.
- Not Applicable

Evidence:

See HACT assessment attached

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name
1	AnnexK.HACTmicroassessmentoftheImplementingPartner_291_319 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/AnnexK.HACTmicroassessmentoftheImplementingPartner_291_319)

20. Were the transition and phase-out arrangements were reviewed and adjusted according to progress (including financial and technical progress)?

- 3: The project's governance mechanism regularly reviewed the project's sustainability plan, including arrangements for requirements set out by the plan. The plan was implemented as planned by the end of the project, taking into account
- 2: *There was a review of the project's sustainability plan, including arrangements for transition and phase-out, to ensure*
- 1: The project may have had a sustainability plan but there was no review of this strategy after it was developed. Also

Evidence:

From early 2017, Project technical meetings were often personally chaired by the General Director of INBAC who, from then on, also engaged more directly in Project decisions. It is likely that the long-term financial sustainability of Iona National Park will depend on MINAMB's ability to attract external investors in the Park's tourism opportunities in the form of concessions and potentially a co-management agreement with an organization with access to external funding.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name
---	-----------

No documents available.

QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments

