

Implementation Stage Quality Assurance Report

Form Status: Under Review

Overall Rating:	Satisfactory
Decision:	Continue as planned: The project is of sufficient quality to continue as planned. All management actions must be addressed in a timely manner.
Portfolio/Project Number:	00100511
Portfolio/Project Title:	Access and Benefit Sharing
Portfolio/Project Date:	2021-11-08 / 2026-12-31

Strategic**Quality Rating: Exemplary**

1. Is the project pro-actively identifying changes to the external environment and incorporating them into the project strategy?

- 3: *The project team has identified relevant changes in the external environment that may present new opportunities or threats to the project's ability to achieve its objectives and the assumptions have been tested to determine if the project's strategy is still valid. There is evidence that the project board has considered the implications, and documented any changes needed to the project in response. (all must be true)*
- 2: The project team has identified relevant changes in the external environment that may present new opportunities or threats to the project's ability to achieve its objectives. There is some evidence that the project board discussed this, but relevant changes may not have been fully integrated in the project. (both must be true)
- 1: The project team may have considered relevant changes in the external environment since implementation began, but there is no evidence that the project team has considered changes to the project as a result.

Evidence:

The project design was presented during the National and Site Level Inception Workshops. Modifications on the baseline data, assumptions made and some recent developments were discussed with the stakeholders and presented also during the 1st Project Board meeting.

List of Uploaded Documents			
#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	FNL_NationalInception_2022June08_16353_201 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FNL_NationalInception_2022June08_16353_201.pdf)	maria.theresa.espino-yap@undp.org	4/5/2023 3:27:00 AM
2	2022-0726ABSPProjectStakeholderInceptionWorkshopReport-REGION3-FINAL_16353_201 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2022-0726ABSPProjectStakeholderInceptionWorkshopReport-REGION3-FINAL_16353_201.pdf)	maria.theresa.espino-yap@undp.org	4/5/2023 3:28:00 AM
3	2022-0728ABSPProjectStakeholderInceptionWorkshopReport-REGION5-FINAL_16353_201 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2022-0728ABSPProjectStakeholderInceptionWorkshopReport-REGION5-FINAL_16353_201.pdf)	maria.theresa.espino-yap@undp.org	4/5/2023 3:28:00 AM

2. Is the project aligned with the UNDP Strategic Plan?

- 3: *The project responds at least one of the development settings³ as specified in the Strategic Plan (SP) and adopts at least one Signature Solution⁴ and the project's RRF includes at all the relevant SP output indicators. (all must be true)*
- 2: The project responds to one of the three areas of **development work**¹ as specified in the Strategic Plan. The project's RRF includes at least one SP output indicator, if relevant. (both must be true)
- 1: While the project may respond to a partner's identified need, this need falls outside the UNDP Strategic Plan. Also select this option if none of the relevant SP indicators are included in the RRF.

Evidence:

The Project contributes to UNDP's signature solutions on poverty and inequality, environment and gender equality. On Strategic Plan, below are SP IRRF output indicators where the Project is contributing to:

4.1 Natural resources protected and managed to enhance sustainable productivity and livelihoods

4.1.1 No of people directly benefitting from initiatives to protect nature and provide sustainable use of resources

4.1.2 Natural resources that are managed under a sustainable use, conservation, access and benefit sharing regime

4.2 Public and private investment mechanisms mobilized for biodiversity, water, oceans and climate solutions

4.2.1 No of people directly benefitting from mechanisms for biodiversity, water, oceans and climate solutions funded by public and/or private sector resources

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Relevant

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

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

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

Evidence:

The Implementing Partner and the Project Team have commenced consultations with the Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities (IPLCs). A site selection process and criteria for the specific communities that will be potential partners for the actual Mutually Agreed Terms (MAT) that will be facilitated by the Project have also been approved by the Technical Working Group (TWG) and the Project Board. Visits to the target communities in Regions V and III have also been conducted as preliminary social mobilization activity and in preparation for the Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) process.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

4. Is the project generating knowledge and lessons learned (i.e., what has worked and what has not) and has this knowledge informed management decisions to ensure the continued relevance of the project towards its stated objectives, the quality of its outputs and the management of risk?

- 3: Knowledge and lessons learned from internal or external sources (gained, for example, from Peer Assists, After Action Reviews or Lessons Learned Workshops) backed by credible evidence from evaluation, corporate policies/strategies, analysis and monitoring have been discussed in project board meetings and reflected in the minutes. There is clear evidence that changes were made to the project to ensure its continued relevance. (both must be true)
- 2: *Knowledge and lessons learned backed by relatively limited evidence, drawn mainly from within the project, have been considered by the project team. There is some evidence that changes were made to the project as a result to ensure its continued relevance. (both must be true)*
- 1: There is limited or no evidence that knowledge and lessons learned have been collected by the project team. There is little or no evidence that this has informed project decision making.

Evidence:

The IP and the Project Team have been discussing with other Projects and UNDP on lesson learned and good practices in dealing with the National Commission on Indigenous Peoples (NCIP). Lessons learned on ABS in other countries have also been taken into account given the guidance from UNDP Regional Hub and learning discussions with the International ABS expert engaged by the Project.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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

- 3: There is credible evidence that the project is reaching a sufficient number of beneficiaries (either directly through significant coverage of target groups, or indirectly, through policy change) to meaningfully contribute to development change.
- 2: *While the project is currently not at scale, there are explicit plans in place to scale up the project in the future (e.g. by extending its coverage or using project results to advocate for policy change).*
- 1: The project is not at scale, and there are no plans currently to scale up the project in the future.

Evidence:

The government is committed to replicating and scaling-up project results to other sectors and species and is committing national resources to ensure project success. Several strategies for replication are embedded in the project design including in improved capacities of GR producers to negotiate based on increased ABS awareness as well as improved capacities of NCAs to implement NP ABS compliance through the use of a digital national clearinghouse, which should lead to additional agreements.

Upscaling comprises enabling existing markets to expand once enterprises have consolidated their supplies of TK-based products and then mainstreaming models of best practices across other regions of the country. Given that there are at least 110 indigenous peoples in the Philippines scattered in recognized ancestral lands that are very often in or near to KBAs, upscaling of this project has every chance of being successful provided the management of genetic resources is shown to be demonstrably sustainable based on rigorous monitoring and evaluation procedures. Upscaling of traditional knowledge-based enterprises is also a key component of the Philippine Wealth Creation Program and, therefore, will be an important contribution towards the attainment of the Program's objectives.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Principled**Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory**

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

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

Evidence:

A Gender Analysis and Action Plan has been developed for the Project during the Project Preparation Grant (PPG) phase. Stakeholder consultations have been completed to aid in the revisiting and updating of this Plan.

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

7. Are social and environmental impacts and risks being successfully managed and monitored?

- 3: Social and environmental risks are tracked in the risk log. Appropriate assessments conducted where required (i.e., Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) for Substantial and High risk projects and some level of social and environmental assessment for Moderate risk projects as identified through SESP). Relevant management plan(s) developed for identified risks through consultative process and implemented, resourced, and monitored. Risks effectively managed or mitigated. If there has been a substantive change to the project or change in context that affects risk levels, the SESP is updated to reflect these changes. (all must be true)
- 2: *Social and environmental risks are tracked in the risk log. Appropriate assessments conducted where required (i.e., Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) for Substantial and 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 is categorized as Low risk through the SESP.*
- 1: Social and environmental risks have not been tracked in the risk log. For projects categorized as High, Substantial, and Moderate Risk there is no evidence that social and environmental assessments have been completed and/or management plans or measures development, implemented or monitored. There have been substantive changes to the project or changes in the context but SESP has not been updated. (any may be true)

Evidence:

Social and environmental risks are regularly tracked and updated. These are also discussed during Project Board meetings. Due diligence assessments have also been completed for potential private sector partners of the project.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Revised-Final2023AWP-ABSProject_2023March07REVISED_16353_207 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Revised-Final2023AWP-ABSProject_2023March07REVISED_16353_207.pdf)	maria.theresa.espino-yap@undp.org	4/5/2023 5:33:00 AM
2	5a2022AnnualProgressReport_ABSProject_signed_16353_207 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/5a2022AnnualProgressReport_ABSProject_signed_16353_207.pdf)	maria.theresa.espino-yap@undp.org	4/5/2023 5:48:00 AM
3	2_ Attachment_1_Pharmalytics_Partnerships_UNDP_Private_Sector_Risk_Assessment_Tool_2016.docx_16353_207 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2_ Attachment_1_Pharmalytics_Partnerships_UNDP_Private_Sector_Risk_Assessment_Tool_2016.docx_16353_207.pdf)	maria.theresa.espino-yap@undp.org	4/5/2023 5:51:00 AM
4	ABS_Project_Private_Sector_Due_Diligence_Data_Sources.docx_16353_207 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ABS_Project_Private_Sector_Due_Diligence_Data_Sources.docx_16353_207.pdf)	maria.theresa.espino-yap@undp.org	4/5/2023 5:52:00 AM
5	ABS_Project_Private_Sector_Due_Diligence_Summary_Report_as_of_February_2023.docx_16353_207 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ABS_Project_Private_Sector_Due_Diligence_Summary_Report_as_of_February_2023.docx_16353_207.pdf)	maria.theresa.espino-yap@undp.org	4/5/2023 5:52:00 AM
6	Annex_1_Private_Sector_Partnership_Risk_Mitigation_Strategy_for_PIMS_6275_ABS_Project.docx_16353_207 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Annex_1_Private_Sector_Partnership_Risk_Mitigation_Strategy_for_PIMS_6275_ABS_Project.docx_16353_207.pdf)	maria.theresa.espino-yap@undp.org	4/5/2023 5:52:00 AM

7	Annex_2_Private_Sector_Partnership_Communications_Strategy_for_PIMS_6275_ABS_Projectdocx.docx_16353_207 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Annex_2_Private_Sector_Partnership_Communications_Strategy_for_PIMS_6275_ABS_Projectdocx.docx_16353_207.pdf)	maria.theresa.espino-yap@undp.org	4/5/2023 5:52:00 AM
8	Attachment_2_Herbanext_Partnerships_UNDP_Private_Sector_Risk_Assessment_Tool_2016.docx_16353_207 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Attachment_2_Herbanext_Partnerships_UNDP_Private_Sector_Risk_Assessment_Tool_2016.docx_16353_207.pdf)	maria.theresa.espino-yap@undp.org	4/5/2023 5:53:00 AM
9	Attachment_3_PhilPili_Partnerships_UNDP_Private_Sector_Risk_Assessment_Tool_2016.docx_16353_207 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Attachment_3_PhilPili_Partnerships_UNDP_Private_Sector_Risk_Assessment_Tool_2016.docx_16353_207.pdf)	maria.theresa.espino-yap@undp.org	4/5/2023 5:53:00 AM

8. Are grievance mechanisms available to project-affected people and are grievances (if any) addressed to ensure any perceived harm is effectively mitigated?

- 3: *Project-affected people have been actively informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism (SRM/SECU) and how to access it. If the project is categorized as High, Substantial, or Moderate Risk through the SESP, a project-level grievance mechanism is in place and project affected people informed. If grievances have been received, they are effectively addressed in accordance with SRM Guidance. (all must be true)*
- 2: Project-affected people have been informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism and how to access it. If the project is categorized as Substantial or High Risk through the SESP, a project-level grievance mechanism is in place and project affected people informed. If grievances have been received they are responded to but face challenges in arriving at a resolution.
- 1: Project-affected people not informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism. If grievances have been received they are not responded to. (any may be true)

Evidence:

The stakeholders have been informed about UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism. The Project GRM has also been established and guidelines approved by the Project Board.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	GEFUNDPDENRABSProjectGrievanceRedressMechanismProceduralGuidelinesofSeptember072022_16353_208 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/GEFUNDPDENRABSProjectGrievanceRedressMechanismProceduralGuidelinesofSeptember072022_16353_208.docx)	maria.theresa.espino-yap@undp.org	4/5/2023 7:11:00 AM

Management & Monitoring

Quality Rating: **Highly Satisfactory**

9. Is the project's M&E Plan sufficient and adequately implemented?

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

Evidence:

A costed M and E Plan has been laid out in the ProDoc and included in the 2023 AWP. A detailed Performance Monitoring Plan has been drafted and undergoing review.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	20230327ABSPMP_draft_16353_209 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/20230327ABSPMP_draft_16353_209.docx)	maria.theresa.espino-yap@undp.org	4/5/2023 7:14:00 AM

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

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

Evidence:

The TWG and Project Board are functional and meeting regularly.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	SpecialOrderNo.2021-572_SIGNED_16353_210 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SpecialOrderNo.2021-572_SIGNED_16353_210.pdf)	maria.theresa.espino-yap@undp.org	4/5/2023 7:16:00 AM

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

- 3: *The project has actively monitored risks every quarter including consulting with key stakeholders, including security advisors, to identify continuing and emerging risks and to assess if the main assumptions remain valid. There is clear evidence that relevant management plans and mitigating measures are being fully implemented to address each key project risk, and have been updated to reflect the latest risk assessment. (all must be true)*
- 2: The project has monitored risks every year, as evidenced by an updated risk log. Some updates have been made to management plans and mitigation measures.
- 1: The risk log has not been updated as required. There may be some evidence that the project has monitored risks (including security risks or incidents) that may affect the project's achievement of results, but there is no explicit evidence that management actions have been taken to mitigate risks. In the case of a deteriorating security environment, no consultation has occurred with the UNDP Security Office on appropriate measures.

Evidence:

Project risks are monitored and updated quarterly. These are also discussed in the TWG and P B meetings.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	3bABSProject_Q3PR2022_FINAL5_16353_211 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/3bABSProject_Q3PR2022_FINAL5_16353_211.pdf)	maria.theresa.espino-yap@undp.org	4/5/2023 7:18:00 AM
2	2022Q2PR_BMBsigned_16353_211 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2022Q2PR_BMBsigned_16353_211.pdf)	maria.theresa.espino-yap@undp.org	4/5/2023 7:19:00 AM
3	5a2022AnnualProgressReport_ABSProject_signed_16353_211 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/5a2022AnnualProgressReport_ABSProject_signed_16353_211.pdf)	maria.theresa.espino-yap@undp.org	4/5/2023 7:20:00 AM

Efficient**Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory**

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

- Yes
 No

Evidence:

Resources needed to implement the activities are provided in Section IX of the ProDoc. USD21,631,787 co-financing have also been secured for this project.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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

- 3:** *The project has an updated procurement plan. Implementation of the plan is on or ahead of schedule. The project quarterly reviews operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addresses them through appropriate management actions. (all must be true)*
- 2:** The project has an updated procurement plan. The project annually reviews operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addresses them through appropriate management actions. (all must be true)
- 1:** The project does not have an updated procurement plan. The project may or may not have reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner, however management actions have not been taken to address them.

Evidence:

Yearly Procurement Plans of the Project are approved with the AWP. Regular check-in meetings are undertaken by UNDP CAPT, IP and Project Team. TWG meetings are also held to discuss resolution of Project concerns and issues.

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

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

- 3: There is evidence that the project regularly reviews costs against relevant comparators (e.g., other projects or country offices) or industry benchmarks to ensure the project maximizes results that can be delivered with given resources. The project actively coordinates with other relevant ongoing projects and initiatives (UNDP or other) to ensure complementarity and seek efficiencies wherever possible (e.g. joint activities.) (both must be true)
- 2: *The project monitors its own costs and gives anecdotal examples of cost efficiencies (e.g., spending less to get the same result,) but there is no systematic analysis of costs and no link to the expected quality of results delivered. The project coordinates activities with other projects to achieve cost efficiency gains.*
- 1: There is little or no evidence that the project monitors its own costs and is considering ways to save money beyond following standard procurement rules.

Evidence:

The financial resources of the Project are monitored quarterly. With the initial stage of Project implementation, however, the cost efficiencies have not been comprehensively analyzed.

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

Effective

Quality Rating: Needs Improvement

15. Is the project is on track to deliver its expected outputs?

- Yes
- No

Evidence:

The delay is caused by the slow procurement processes for Project staff, Individual Consultants and firms. Processing of procurement items are with the same IP. Bulk of the resources programme for this year are for the conduct of assessments and contracting of firms and NGOs. The delayed progress of work with NCIP has affected the work at the site level.

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

16. Have there been regular reviews of the work plan to ensure that the project is on track to achieve the desired results, and to inform course corrections if needed?

- 3: *Quarterly progress data has informed regular reviews of the project work plan to ensure that the activities implemented are most likely to achieve the desired results. There is evidence that data and lessons learned (including from evaluations and/or After Action Reviews) have been used to inform course corrections, as needed. Any necessary budget revisions have been made. (both must be true)*
- 2: There has been at least one review of the work plan per year to assess if project activities are on track to achieving the desired development results (i.e., outputs.) There may or may not be evidence that data or lessons learned has been used to inform the review(s). Any necessary budget revisions have been made.
- 1: While the project team may have reviewed the work plan at least once over the past year to ensure outputs are delivered on time, no link has been made to the delivery of desired development results. Select this option also if no review of the work plan by management has taken place over the past year.

Evidence:

Regular check-in meetings are held among UN DP CAPT, IP and the Project Team. TWG Meetings are also held which serve as platforms for reviewing the progress of the Project's milestones.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

17. Are targeted groups being systematically identified and engaged, prioritizing the marginalized and excluded, to ensure results are achieved as expected?

- 3: *The project is targeting 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 are being reached as intended. The project has engaged regularly with targeted groups over the past year to assess whether they are benefiting as expected and adjustments were made if necessary to refine targeting. (all must be true)*
- 2: The project is targeting 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 has been some engagement with beneficiaries in the past year to assess whether they are benefiting as expected. (all must be true)
- 1: The project does not report on specific targeted groups. There is no evidence to confirm that project beneficiaries are deprived and/or excluded from development opportunities relevant to the project area of work. There may have been some engagement with beneficiaries to assess whether they are benefiting as expected, but it has been limited or has not occurred in the past year.
- Not Applicable

Evidence:

The site selection process and criteria of communities that will serve as direct beneficiaries of the Project have been approved by the Project board. Stakeholder consultations are being undertaken to formalize the process of matching the communities with the potential private sector partners.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	1.1stPB_SCMminutes_FINAL_16353_217 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/1.1stPB_SCMminutes_FINAL_16353_217.pdf)	maria.theresa.espino-yap@undp.org	4/5/2023 8:53:00 AM

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

18. Are 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.) are used to fully implement and monitor the project. All relevant stakeholders and partners are 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.) are used to implement and monitor the project, but other support (such as country office support or project systems) may also be used if necessary. All relevant stakeholders and partners are fully and actively engaged in the process, playing an active role in project decision-making, implementation and monitoring. (both must be true)*
- 1: There is relatively limited or no engagement with national stakeholders and partners in the decision-making, implementation and/or monitoring of the project.
- Not Applicable

Evidence:

Direct payment modality is undertaken for this Project. As mentioned, the TWG and PB are fully functional and take part in the decision-making process.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	SIGNED_PIMS6275_ABSLOA_2021May_16353_218 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SIGNED_PIMS6275_ABSLOA_2021May_16353_218.pdf)	maria.theresa.espino-yap@undp.org	4/5/2023 8:57:00 AM

19. There is regular monitoring of changes in capacities and performance of institutions and systems relevant to the project, as needed. The [implementation arrangements](#)⁵ have been adjusted according to changes in partner capacities.

- 3: *In the past two years, changes in capacities and performance of institutions and systems have been comprehensively assessed/monitored using clear indicators, rigorous methods of data collection and credible data sources including relevant HACT assurance activities. Implementation arrangements have been formally reviewed and adjusted, if needed, in agreement with partners according to changes in partner capacities. (both must be true)*
- 2: In the past two years, aspects of changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems have been monitored by the project using indicators and reasonably credible data sources including relevant HACT assurance activities. Some adjustment has been made to implementation arrangements if needed to reflect changes in partner capacities. (both 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:

Required quality assurance activities have been conducted for the Project, including spot checks, audits and programme visits.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	ABS_2022ProgrammeMonitoringReport_10March2023_16353_219 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAForDocuments/ABS_2022ProgrammeMonitoringReport_10March2023_16353_219.pdf)	maria.theresa.espino-yap@undp.org	4/5/2023 9:00:00 AM

20. The transition and phase-out arrangements are reviewed regularly and adjusted according to progress (including financial commitments and capacity).

- 3: The project's governance mechanism has reviewed the project's sustainability plan, including arrangements for transition and phase-out, to ensure the project is on track in meeting the requirements set out by the plan. The plan has been adjusted according to progress as needed. (both must be true)
- 2: *There has been a review of the project's sustainability plan, including arrangements for transition and phase-out, to ensure the project is on track in meeting the requirements set out by the plan.*
- 1: The project may have a sustainability plan, but there has not been a review of this strategy since it was developed. Also select this option if the project does not have a sustainability strategy.

Evidence:

The basis for the environmental sustainability of the project's outcomes lies mainly in the improved capacity of national and local stakeholders to utilize the ABS mechanism to support biodiversity conservation and its sustainable use. The project will support pilot initiatives to develop products derived from the utilization of genetic resources, which will generate monetary and non-monetary benefits to be used to support conservation efforts in the areas with KBAs. In addition, the project will consolidate a local base that will be essential for the long-term conservation of the biological and genetic resources present in these areas. This will be achieved by working closely with the local communities and IPs, who have a significant amount of traditional knowledge about these areas, and through the fair and equitable sharing of benefits derived from the utilization of genetic resources.

- Institutional sustainability will be achieved through the improved capacity of the stakeholders associated with ABS across the Philippines (government agencies, public and private research organizations, the private sector and key industries, and local communities/IPs) to effectively manage access to genetic resources and ensure the distribution of benefits. The establishment of fundamental and functional institutional arrangement for ABS management with involvement of national and local institutions associated both with access to biological resources and related traditional knowledge will provide an institutional structure that will be expected to provide the backbone for future ABS in the Philippines. At the national level, strengthening the national framework for implementing ABS in accordance with the NP will greatly contribute to change the way access and sharing benefit of genetic resources is managed in the Philippines, leading to a more equitable, fair and sustainable use of genetic resources. After the completion of the project, awareness and capacity of all stakeholders on implementation, compliance, monitoring and tracking of the national ABS framework will be significantly enhanced. Providers will better understand the value of genetic resources they own and become more capable of negotiating with the user on benefit sharing in accordance with the ABS principles. Users will be more aware of their responsibility to share benefits of genetic resources with the providers, thus creating a legal MAT for clarification and transparency related to use of genetic resources for commercial and research purposes. as well as ensuring be

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
---	-----------	-------------	-------------

No documents available.

QA Summary/Project Board Comments