Design & Appraisal Stage Quality Assurance Report

Overall Project Rating: Highly Satisfactory

Decision: Approve: The project is of sufficient quality to continue as planned. Any management actions must be addressed in a timely manner

Project Number: 00099244

Project Title: The development challenge that the Fiji Parliament Support Project – Phase II seeks to address is that Parliament has limited capacities to discharge

its mandate in relation to legislation, oversight and representation.

Project Date: 01-Jan-2017

Strategic Quality Rating: Satisfactory

1. Does the project's Theory of Change specify how it will contribute to higher level change? (Select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

- the best approach at this point in time. specified in the programme/CPD, backed by credible evidence of what works effectively in this context. The project document clearly describes why the project's strategy is 3: The project has a theory of change with explicit assumptions and clear change pathway describing how the project will contribute to outcome level change as
- project strategy is the best approach at this point in time, but is backed by limited evidence 2: The project has a theory of change. It has an explicit change pathway that explains how the project intends to contribute to outcome-level change and why the
- without specifying the key assumptions. It does not make an explicit link to the programme/CPD's theory of change. 1: The project does not have a theory of change, but the project document may describe in generic terms how the project will contribute to development results,

Evidence Management Response

Proc Doc pp6-9

2. Is the project aligned with the thematic focus of the UNDP Strategic Plan? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

select this option) areas; an issues-based analysis has been incorporated into the project design; and the project's RRF includes all the relevant SP output indicators. (all must be true to 3: The project responds to one of the three areas of development work as specified in the Strategic Plan; it addresses at least one of the proposed new and emerging

- if relevant. (both must be true to select this option) 2: The project responds to one of the three areas of development work as specified in the Strategic Plan. The project's RRF includes at least one SP output indicator,
- addressing the complexity of the development issue. None of the relevant SP indicators are included in the RRF. This answer is also selected if the project does not respond to any of the three areas of development work in the Strategic Plan. 1: While the project may respond to one of the three areas of development work as specified in the Strategic Plan, it is based on a sectoral approach without

Evidence

Proc Doc pp6

Relevant Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory

- 3. Does the project have strategies to effectively identify, engage and ensure the meaningful participation of targeted groups/geographic areas with a priority focus on the excluded and marginalized? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects this project)
- this option) groups/geographic areas throughout the project, including through monitoring and decision-making (such as representation on the project board) (all must be true to select process based on evidence (if applicable.)The project has an explicit strategy to identify, engage and ensure the meaningful participation of specified target 3: The target groups/geographic areas are appropriately specified, prioritising the excluded and/or marginalised. Beneficiaries will be identified through a rigorous
- identified, engaged and how meaningful participation will be ensured throughout the project. (both must be true to select this option) 2: The target groups/geographic areas are appropriately specified, prioritising the excluded and/or marginalised. The project document states how beneficiaries will be
- identify or engage or ensure the meaningful participation of the target groups/geographic areas throughout the project. 1: The target groups/geographic areas are not specified, or do not prioritize excluded and/or marginalised populations. The project does not have a written strategy to

Not Applicable

Evidence

Management Response

Because this is Phase II of the FPSP project, it therefore does not have a strategy to identify beneficiaries through a rigorous process based on evidence. The beneficiaries are not also included in the M&E and decision making.

However the key target groups that the project is intending to engage with is

identified in Section 3: Results and Partnerships, Pg10

project) 4. Have knowledge, good practices, and past lessons learned of UNDP and others informed the project design? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects this

- monitoring have been explicitly used, with appropriate referencing, to develop the project's theory of change and justify the approach used by the project over alternatives 3: Knowledge and lessons learned (gained e.g. through peer assist sessions) backed by credible evidence from evaluation, corporate policies/strategies, and
- not sufficient to justify the approach selected over alternatives 2: The project design mentions knowledge and lessons learned backed by evidence/sources, which inform the project's theory of change but have not been used/are
- 1: There is only scant or no mention of knowledge and lessons learned informing the project design. Any references that are made are not backed by evidence

Wanagement Response

It was noted that the Pacific office has extensive experience working with parliaments across the region and the consultant Frank Feulner, along with the project team in the Pacific Office has extensive experience of working on parliamentary development issues in dozens of countries.

Prodoc peer reviewed by Regional Technical Adviser. Backed by evidence from 2013 Fiji Parliament Needs Assessment and 2015 Mid-term Evaluation, UNDP Strategic Note

- 5. Does the project use gender analysis in the project design and does the project respond to this gender analysis with concrete measures to address gender inequities and empower women? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects this project)
- women and men, and it is fully integrated into the project document. The project establishes concrete priorities to address gender inequalities in its strategy. The results framework includes outputs and activities that specifically respond to this gender analysis, with indicators that measure and monitor results contributing to gender equality (all must be true to select this option) 3: A participatory gender analysis on the project has been conducted. This analysis reflects on the different needs, roles and access to/control over resources of
- specifically respond to this gender analysis, with indicators that measure and monitor results contributing to gender equality. (all must be true to select this option) Gender concerns are integrated in the development challenge and strategy sections of the project document. The results framework includes outputs and activities that 2: A gender analysis on the project has been conducted. This analysis reflects on the different needs, roles and access to/control over resources of women and men

men, but the constraints have not been clearly identified and interventions have not been considered 1: The project design may or may not mention information and/or data on the differential impact of the project's development situation on gender relations, women and

Evidence Management Response

Members agreed with a rating to remain at 2 as the project did not conduct its own specific gender analysis. However the project is relying on the gender analysis undertaken in 2016 by the Inter Parliamentary Union (IPU) and the Gender Toolkit developed by the project in Phase I in developing measures to address gender inequalities, to empower women and therefore mainstream gender throughout the work of parliament

- 6. Does UNDP have a clear advantage to engage in the role envisioned by the project vis-à-vis national partners, other development partners, and other actors? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects this project)
- engagement of UNDP and partners through the project. It is clear how results achieved by relevant partners will contribute to outcome level change complementing the project's intended results. If relevant, options for south-south and triangular cooperation have been considered, as appropriate. (all must be true to select this option) 3: An analysis has been conducted on the role of other partners in the area where the project intends to work, and credible evidence supports the proposed
- developed during project design, even if relevant opportunities have been identified engagement of and division of labour between UNDP and partners through the project. Options for south-south and triangular cooperation may not have not been fully 2: Some analysis has been conducted on the role of other partners where the project intends to work, and relatively limited evidence supports the proposed
- Options for south-south and triangular cooperation have not been considered, despite its potential relevance proposed engagement of UNDP and partners through the project. There is risk that the project overlaps and/or does not coordinate with partners' interventions in this area 1: No clear analysis has been conducted on the role of other partners in the area that the project intends to work, and relatively limited evidence supports the

Evidence **Wanagement Response**

This is clear in UNDP's mandate and regional and global activities

Prodoc Sections on Partnerships and South-south cooperation, pp. 11-12.

Social & Environmental Standards

Quality Rating: Exemplary

7. Does the project seek to further the realization of human rights using a human rights based approach? (select from options 1-3 that best reflects this project)

- measures incorporated into project design and budget. (all must be true to select this option) the project. Any potential adverse impacts on enjoyment of human rights were rigorously identified and assessed as relevant, with appropriate mitigation and management 3: Credible evidence that the project aims to further the realization of human rights, upholding the relevant international and national laws and standards in the area of
- assessed as relevant, and appropriate mitigation and management measures incorporated into the project design and budget. 2: Some evidence that the project aims to further the realization of human rights. Potential adverse impacts on enjoyment of human rights were identified and
- were considered 1: No evidence that the project aims to further the realization of human rights. Limited or no evidence that potential adverse impacts on enjoyment of human rights

Evidence Management Response

Project does not have activities that impact on the realization of human rights, but it creates space for parliament to engage with citizens to improve their social, economic and political rights and freedoms

8. Did the project consider potential environmental opportunities and adverse impacts, applying a precautionary approach? (select from options 1-3 that best reflects this project)

- management and mitigation measures incorporated into project design and budget. (all must be true to select this option). integrated in project strategy and design. Credible evidence that potential adverse environmental impacts have been identified and rigorously assessed with appropriate 3: Credible evidence that opportunities to enhance environmental sustainability and integrate poverty-environment linkages were fully considered as relevant, and
- adverse environmental impacts have been identified and assessed, if relevant, and appropriate management and mitigation measures incorporated into project design and 2: No evidence that opportunities to strengthen environmental sustainability and poverty-environment linkages were considered. Credible evidence that potential
- adverse environmental impacts were adequately considered 1: No evidence that opportunities to strengthen environmental sustainability and poverty-environment linkages were considered. Limited or no evidence that potential

Management Response

Pro doc Section on Expected Results pp. 9-10

9. Has the Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) been conducted to identify potential social and environmental impacts and risks? The SESP is the reason for the exemption in the evidence section.] meetings, conferences and/or communication materials and information dissemination. [If yes, upload the completed checklist. If SESP is not required, provide not required for projects in which UNDP is Administrative Agent only and/or projects comprised solely of reports, coordination of events, trainings, workshops,

Yes

8

SESP not required

Evidence

List of Uploaded Documents

File Name Modified By Modified

FPSP Social and Environmental Screening 10 Oct 2016.docx nanise.saune@undp.org 10/26/2016 3:36:25 AM

Management & Monitoring **Quality Rating: Exemplary**

10. Does the project have a strong results framework? (select from options 1-3 that best reflects this project)

- baselines and targets, including gender sensitive, sex-disaggregated indicators where appropriate. (all must be true to select this option) SMART, results-oriented indicators that measure all of the key expected changes identified in the theory of change, each with credible data sources, and populated 3: The project's selection of outputs and activities are at an appropriate level and relate in a clear way to the project's theory of change. Outputs are accompanied by
- sex-disaggregated indicators, as appropriate. (all must be true to select this option) accompanied by SMART, results-oriented indicators, but baselines, targets and data sources may not yet be fully specified. Some use of gender sensitive 2: The project's selection of outputs and activities are at an appropriate level, but may not cover all aspects of the project's theory of change. Outputs are
- an appropriate level and do not relate in a clear way to the project's theory of change; outputs are not accompanied by SMART, results-oriented indicators that measure the expected change, and have not been populated with baselines and targets; data sources are not specified, and/or no gender sensitive, sex-disaggregation of indicators. 1: The results framework does not meet all of the conditions specified in selection "2" above. This includes: the project's selection of outputs and activities are not at

evaluation of the project? 11. Is there a comprehensive and costed M&E plan with specified data collection sources and methods to support evidence-based management, monitoring and

- Yes
- R

Evidence

Pro. doc pp. 18-27 for M&E Plan and Multi-Year Work Plan

that best reflects this project) 12. Is the project's governance mechanism clearly defined in the project document, including planned composition of the project board? (select from options 1-3

- project board has been attached to the project document. (all must be true to select this option). (especially all members of the project board.) Project Board members have agreed on their roles and responsibilities as specified in the terms of reference. The ToR of the 3: The project's governance mechanism is fully defined in the project document. Individuals have been specified for each position in the governance mechanism
- select this option) have been specified yet. The prodoc lists the most important responsibilities of the project board, project director/manager and quality assurance roles. (all must be true to 2: The project's governance mechanism is defined in the project document; specific institutions are noted as holding key governance roles, but individuals may not
- on the responsibilities of key positions in the governance mechanism is provided 1: The project's governance mechanism is loosely defined in the project document, only mentioning key roles that will need to be filled at a later date. No information

Evidence Wanagement Response

Pro doc Governance & Management Arrangements, p. 28, and Annex 4 Project Board ToR.

13. Have the project risks been identified with clear plans stated to manage and mitigate each risks? (select from options 1-3 that best reflects this project)

- each risk. (both must be true to select this option) Social and Environmental Standards and screening, situation analysis, capacity assessments and other analysis. Clear and complete plan in place to manage and mitigate 3: Project risks related to the achievement of results are fully described in the project risk log, based on comprehensive analysis drawing on the theory of change
- 2: Project risks related to the achievement of results identified in the initial project risk log with mitigation measures identified for each risk
- risks are not clearly identified and no initial risk log is included with the project document 1: Some risks may be identified in the initial project risk log, but no evidence of analysis and no clear risk mitigation measures identified. This option is also selected if

Evidence Management Response

Pro doc Annex 3 Risk Log

Efficient Quality Rating: Exemplary

to improve cost effectiveness through synergies with other interventions; iii) through joint operations (e.g., monitoring or procurement) with other partners. theory of change analysis to explore different options of achieving the maximum results with the resources available; ii) using a portfolio management approach 14. Have specific measures for ensuring cost-efficient use of resources been explicitly mentioned as part of the project design? This can include: i) using the

* Yes

Š

Evidence

Pro doc Section IV, Cost Efficiency and Effectiveness, p. 13.

to achieve more efficient results (including, for example, through sharing resources or coordinating delivery?) 15. Are explicit plans in place to ensure the project links up with other relevant on-going projects and initiatives, whether led by UNDP, national or other partners,

Yes

O

Evidence

Pro Doc Partnership Section p. 11; Cost Efficiency & Effectiveness Section p. 13.

16. Is the budget justified and supported with valid estimates?

- incorporated in the budget with valid estimates using benchmarks from similar projects or activities. Cost implications from inflation and foreign exchange exposure have been estimated and 3: The project's budget is at the activity level with funding sources, and is specified for the duration of the project period in a multi-year budget. Costs are supported
- supported with valid estimates based on prevailing rates. 2: The project's budget is at the activity level with funding sources, when possible, and is specified for the duration of the project in a multi-year budget. Costs are
- 1: The project's budget is not specified at the activity level, and/or may not be captured in a multi-year budget

Evidence

Project budget costed at activity level and full Multi-Year Work Plan provided pp. 21-27.

17. Is the Country Office fully recovering the costs involved with project implementation?

- policies (i.e., UPL, LPL.) administration, issuance of contracts, security, travel, assets, general services, information and communications based on full costing in accordance with prevailing UNDP services related to strategic country programme planning, quality assurance, pipeline development, policy advocacy services, finance, procurement, human resources, 3: The budget fully covers all direct project costs that are directly attributable to the project, including programme management and development effectiveness
- 2. The budget covers significant direct project costs that are directly attributable to the project based on prevailing UNDP policies (i.e., UPL, LPL) as relevant.
- project budget revisions 1: The budget does not reimburse UNDP for direct project costs. UNDP is cross-subsidizing the project and the office should advocate for the inclusion of DPC in any

Evidence Management Response

The project budget fully covers all DPC.

Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory

Effective

18. Is the chosen implementation modality most appropriate? (select from options 1-3 that best reflects this project)

- implementation modalities have been thoroughly considered. There is a strong justification for choosing the selected modality, based on the development context. (both must be true to select this option) 3: The required implementing partner assessments (capacity assessment, HACT micro assessment) have been conducted, and there is evidence that options for
- consistent with the results of the assessments 2: The required implementing partner assessments (capacity assessment, HACT micro assessment) have been conducted and the implementation modality chosen is
- 1: The required assessments have not been conducted, but there may be evidence that options for implementation modalities have been considered

Evidence Management Response

N/A since DIM has worked in the first phase and Parliament has requested continuation.

way that addresses any underlying causes of exclusion and discrimination? 19. Have targeted groups, prioritizing marginalized and excluded populations that will be affected by the project, been engaged in the design of the project in a

- engaged in the design of the project. Their views, rights and any constraints have been analysed and incorporated into the root cause analysis of the theory of change which seeks to address any underlying causes of exclusion and discrimination and the selection of project interventions. 3: Credible evidence that all targeted groups, prioritising marginalized and excluded populations that will be involved in or affected by the project, have been actively
- selection of project interventions the project. Some evidence that their views, rights and any constraints have been analysed and incorporated into the root cause analysis of the theory of change and the 2: Some evidence that key targeted groups, prioritising marginalized and excluded populations that will be involved in the project, have been engaged in the design of
- and constraints of populations have been incorporated into the project 1: No evidence of engagement with marginalized and excluded populations that will be involved in the project during project design. No evidence that the views, rights

Not Applicable

Ţ
4
Ξ
2
6
-
-
¢
۲

Target groups identified during the scoping and design mission based on Parliament Outreach Unit. Key targets identified in stakeholder section p. 12.

or Lessons Learned Workshops), timed to inform course corrections if needed during project implementation? 20. Does the project conduct regular monitoring activities, have explicit plans for evaluation, and include other lesson learning (e.g. through After Action Reviews

* Yes

No

Evidence

See M&E Plan pp. 18-19 and Evaluation Plan p. 20.

minimum. 21. The gender marker for all project outputs are scored at GEN2 or GEN3, indicating that gender has been fully mainstreamed into all project outputs at a

* Yes

No

Evidence

Management Response

Project is GEN2. See, Expected Results pp. 9-11.

reflects this project) 22. Is there a realistic multi-year work plan and budget to ensure outputs are delivered on time and within allotted resources? (select from options 1-3 that best

- 3: The project has a realistic work plan & budget covering the duration of the project at the activity level to ensure outputs are delivered on time and within the allotted
- 2: The project has a work plan & budget covering the duration of the project at the output level.

1: The project does not yet have a work plan & budget covering the duration of the project

Evidence

Multi-Year Work Plan, pp. 21-27.

Sustainability & National Ownership

Quality Rating: Exemplary

23. Have national partners led, or proactively engaged in, the design of the project?

- 3: National partners have full ownership of the project and led the process of the development of the project jointly with UNDP.
- 2: The project has been developed by UNDP in close consultation with national partners.
- 1: The project has been developed by UNDP with limited or no engagement with national partners

Not Applicable

Evidence

Concept Note discussed jointly. Partners engaged in meetings.

conducted? (select from options 0-4 that best reflects this project) 24. Are key institutions and systems identified, and is there a strategy for strengthening specific/ comprehensive capacities based on capacity assessments

- the strategy to strengthen national capacities accordingly, has been completed. This strategy includes an approach to regularly monitor national capacities using clear indicators and rigorous methods of data collection, and adjust 3: The project has a comprehensive strategy for strengthening specific capacities of national institutions based on a systematic and detailed capacity assessment that
- but these activities are not part of a comprehensive strategy to monitor and strengthen national capacities 2.5: A capacity assessment has been completed. The project document has identified activities that will be undertaken to strengthen capacity of national institutions,
- on the results of the capacity assessment 2: A capacity assessment is planned after the start of the project. There are plans to develop a strategy to strengthen specific capacities of national institutions based

- strategy development are planned. 1.5: There is mention in the project document of capacities of national institutions to be strengthened through the project, but no capacity assessments or specific
- 1: Capacity assessments have not been carried out and are not foreseen. There is no strategy for strengthening specific capacities of national institutions.

Not Applicable

Evidence

Assessments have been conducted (i.e. committee assessment)

the extent possible? 25. Is there is a clear strategy embedded in the project specifying how the project will use national systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluations, etc..) to

Yes

N_O

Not Applicable

Evidence

DIM Modality

mobilisation strategy)? 26. Is there a clear transition arrangement/ phase-out plan developed with key stakeholders in order to sustain or scale up results (including resource

Yes

Z

Evidence

Pro doc: Sustainability and Scaling Up, p. 13.

Quality Assurance Summary/PAC Comments

Multi Year Budgets and Work Plan

- Ensure that the budget total per year is inserted into the multiyear work plan.
- Planned activities within the Multi Year Work Plan should be clustered. There should be no more than 4 activities per Output.

Results Framework

• Indicators for Outcome 2.1: It was recommended by the members that the project develop its own indicators on how it will measured. This will assist the project in its reporting under this outcome to donors.

Budget Cover Page - Total Resources Required

- The project team to get approval from DFAT and NZ MFAT to reflect their current financial commitments to the project on the cover page.
 Only the confirmed financial commitments are to be reflected on the cover page. Therefore only the DFAT and NZ MFAT financial resources will reflected.
- The project team to confirm with Australia the in kind contribution to be received under the Pacific Parliament Partnership (PPP) Programme. This amount to be reflected in the cover pages as well.

List of Uploaded Documents

Annex B pre-PAC Minutes.pdf	FPSP Phase2 Prodoc Draft 25 Oct 2016.doc	File Name
nanise.saune@undp.org	nanise.saune@undp.org	Modified By
10/26/2016 3:47:19 AM	10/26/2016 3:50:30 AM	Modified

OFFICES UNDP PUBLIC WEBSITE FJ Parliament Phase II > ProposalQAHomeV2 DECISIONS **KNOWLEDGE NETWORKING** SOLUTIONS HELP **UNDP INTRANET** Yammer OneDrive Sites Search this site Nanise Saune Q

Documents Calendar View Other Units

Quality Assurance

Profile

Project Quality Assurance and SESP

Quality Assurance (QA)

2017 Design and Appraisal QA 2018 Implementation and Monitoring QA 2019 2020 Closure QA 2021 2022

Appr	Desig	Qua Ass
aisal	Design and	Quality Assurance
0101	2016	Year
2016	Oct 26,	Date
and	View	
Review	Under	Status
Strategic	Overall Rating	Rating
Satisfactory	Highly Satisfactory	
The project	Approve:	Decision

Sustainability	Effective	Efficient	Management & Monitoring	Social & Envir	Relevant
Sustainability & National Ownership Exemplary	Highly Satisfactory	Exemplary	& Monitoring Exemplary	Social & Environmental Standards Exemplary	Highly Satisfactory

Start New Project Design and Appraisal

Social and Environmental Screening Procedure

	Low	FPSP Social and Environmental Screening 10 Oct 2016.docx	Oct 26, 2016
Relevant Requirements	Overall Risk Category	SES Document	Date

Upload Completed SESP Download SESP Template

© 2015 United Nations Development Programme

2 of 2