

Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

Form Status: Approved

Overall Rating:	Satisfactory
Decision:	
Portfolio/Project Number:	00078275
Portfolio/Project Title:	Solomon Islands Water Sector Adaptation Project
Portfolio/Project Date:	2014-07-01 / 2020-03-20

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:

During the course of project implementation relevant changes in the external environment that may have present new opportunism or threats have been social issues relating to land disputes and social disruptions undermining cultural norms posing threat to project implementation. For example Ferafalu pilot site in current land disputes, and social disruptions occurred at Santa Catalina, another pilot site. The project has settled this issues through discussions with local community members, and discussions at the board level were also conducted, resulting in UNDP and the government focusing on two other sites of Fiu and Kwai, both within Malaita Province.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	FinalProjectBoardminute28Feb2018_287_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FinalProjectBoardminute28Feb2018_287_301.docx)	joanne.aihunu@undp.org	7/30/2019 6:14:00 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 was aligned to UNDP Strategic Plan E& SD Primary Outcome:Outcome 1: Growth is inclusive and sustainable, incorporating productive capacities that create employment and livelihoods for the poor and excluded . It is also aligned to the United Nations Pacific Strategy Outcome 1 focusing on Climate Change, Disaster Resilience and Environment Protection and also is aligned to Outcome 4 (Equitable basic services) and Outcome 5 (Governance and community engagement).

4. With respect to the UNDP Strategic Plan: 2014-2017, the project is aligned with:

a) Outcome 1, ““Growth is inclusive and sustainable, incorporating productive capacities that create employment and livelihoods for the poor and excluded”; and

b) Outcome 3, “Countries have strengthened institutions to progressively deliver universal access to basic services”.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Relevant

Quality Rating: 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:

SIWSAP's target groups constituted of local community people that were vulnerable to the impacts of climate change on water resources, particularly men, women and children as key role water collection for household use. Consultations were conducted at the community level through the vulnerability assessment and water sector climate change adaptation response plans to capture the priorities and needs of the targeted groups. They were however not directly involved in the project governance aspect of the project.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
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 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:

Knowledge and lessons learned relating to land rights and socio cultural norms provided lessons for the project as well as for future projects to draw on. Particularly that land rights need to be properly addressed for successful and continuity of project implementation in rural communities in Solomon Islands. Secondly, socio cultural norms of the local community as well UNDP corporate accountable and SESP guideline's need to adhered to whenever there is a external people going into a rural community to implement project activities.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	NWCCFReport_full_DRAFT_287_304 (http://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/NWCCFReport_full_DRAFT_287_304.docx)	joanne.aihunu@undp.org	7/30/2019 2:28:00 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:

Project interventions of resilient water resources and systems was focus on twelve(12) communities, out of the 5,000 or more vulnerable communities in the Solomon islands who are also experiencing water-stresses and water scarcity. The project has also received strong support from the government and strong interest from the private sector due to the high impacts that the project have achieved. Therefore, there is strong potential to scale up and replicate to other communities across the Solomon Islands. Discussions on a scale up of this project are ongoing between government and UNDP.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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:

There is some evidence of disaggregated data for male and female that have directly benefitted from the project. A tracking tool has been developed and this has been updated to provide the disaggregated data as baselines. This was updated during the mid term review, and at completion, of the total of more than 21,000 people that directly benefitted from this project, 50 % of these are female.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	CopyofGEFCycle5AMAT_041017_287_306 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QA/FormDocuments/CopyofGEFCycle5AMAT_041017_287_306.xlsx)	joanne.aihunu@undp.org	8/1/2019 7:58:00 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 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 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 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 was categorized as Low risk through the SESP.*
- 1: Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. For projects categorized as High, Substantial, 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:

Social and environmental risks relating to land rights disputes and breach to sociocultural norms were documented in the project document SESP. Plans for mitigating the risks has also been articulated in the SESP and risks has been categorized as low risks in the SESP. These risks became apparent during the course of the project implementation as document in project board meeting and final termination report, and to which the project board had discussions based on site selection criterias to leave land disputed site and provide interventions in two sites of Kwai and Fiu, Malaita Province. Plans are also in place to address the social cultural norms issues.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Annex14-UNDPEnvironmentandSocialScreening_287_307 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Annex14-UNDPEnvironmentandSocialScreening_287_307.pdf)	joanne.aihunu@undp.org	7/30/2019 2:45:00 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, Substantial, 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 Substantial or 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 has a risk log in Atlas, allowing the project to monitor risks on a regular basis. However, in the case of the risk logs not being updated as in the case of this project, it misses out on the opportunity to inform project affected people of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism and how to access it. In one of SIWSAP's pilot communities social disruptions were identified by the draft terminal evaluation report, however as project team failed to update risk log in atlas, information were provided to the affected community people when the event occurred. However, there are now plans in place to update the risk log and give opportunity for this project affected people of Santa Catalina to access UNDP corporate accountability services and SESP and guidelines through a mission to the site in August 2019.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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 Document (ProDoc) and its Project Results Framework (PRF) included a comprehensive, well developed M&E Plan with clearly articulated baselines and end-of-project targets and embracing both quantitative and qualitative indicators. The M&E framework set out in the PRF was aligned with the GEF Climate Change Adaptation Tracking Tool (the Adaptation Monitoring & Assessment Tool - AMAT) and broader UNDP M&E Frameworks. The M&E plan included using the UNDP ATLAS system to regularly update the Project risk analysis and to identify, report and act on any increasing risks, including financial risks. However, a recent check on the risk log in Atlas has identified risks have not been updated, and there were no programmatic visits by RSD Unit to the pilot and replica sites.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
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 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:

SIWSAP's project board was convened on an average of two times a year. For example in 2019 two meetings were held, one in February and one in July. Minutes for the meetings has been recorded and circulated before sign off. A project progress update and report was usually presented to the project board. A detail summary is then circulated to board members as part of information sharing.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	PBMinute23February2017_287_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PBMinute23February2017_287_310.pdf)	joanne.aihunu@undp.org	8/1/2019 9:13:00 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:

Risks logs were not updated, resulting key risks not identified so that it could be mitigated as early as possible.

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:

In the course of implementation it became evident that additional resources were required, and management decisions were based on the finding of a UNDP audit including on recommendations on improvements focusing on programme management, finance and assets management. Particularly, budget vs. actual expenditure; over & underutilization of individual budget heads and overall rate of delivery; prior year's expenditure; advance settlement; physical verification of assets by project staff; and assets not found during verification.

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:

The project has an updated procurement plan using the PROMPT system.

List of Uploaded Documents			
#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
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 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:

In December 2018, the PMU developed the Annual Work Plan for 2019 for \$818,000 based on remaining project balance after AWP 2018 was to be completed. However, when the financial reports for 2018 were finalized it was realized that the balance for the LDCF resources for the project was \$195,000. There were multiple analyses conducted to understand why there was such a discrepancy and it was realized that in the last quarter of 2018 some POs that had been open from 2017 were closed incurring additional expenditure. These PO figures were not incorporated in the 2018 AWP. Furthermore, there appeared to be overspent in the travel budget code due to higher travel costs than anticipated. The issue was discussed with the Project Board members to arrive at a solution.

To remedy the issue, multiple steps were taken and an AWP 2019 of \$457,000 was approved by the Project Board on 29 January 2019. This figure includes:

- \$195,000 LDCF funds
- \$413,000 from UNDP resources
- Additional reductions in AWP through activities worth SBD 1m (approx. \$125K) covered by Government contributions and therefore did not require LDCF/UNDP funds
- Further reductions in costs for AWP activities related to staff and other project management costs
- Negotiations with contractors to reduce costs of some of the activities

List of Uploaded Documents

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

No documents available.

Effective

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

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

- Yes
- No

Evidence:

The project with the support of additional UNDP Trac resources and Solomon Islands Government resources would be able to complete interventions comprising of rainwater harvesting, desalination installations in four replica sites.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
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 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:

To date, an annual progressive report has been completed by the project team providing updates of the completion of activities according to project outcomes and outputs and targets. A number of budget revisions were conducted in 2019, based on an adhoc basis.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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:

The targeted specific groups in the project's six pilot sites were targeted based on criteria's developed by the Solomon Islands government on their vulnerability in terms of water resources and scarcity as per technical reports of the Solomon Islands government, t hereby informing a selection criteria developed by th e project team.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Annex3_Criteriaforpilotsiteelection_287_317 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QA/FormDocuments/Annex3_Criteriaforpilotsiteelection_287_317.pdf)	joanne.aihunu@undp.org	7/30/2019 5:50:00 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:

SIWSAP implementation follows the Nationally Impl ementation Modality , with the UNDP SOI CO provid ing support services interms of procurement, monito ring, evaluation through a letter of agreement(LOA). Throughout the implementation the government play ed an active role as the permanent secretary of Mini stry of Mines, Energy and Rural Electrification was t he chair of the project board, as well as decisions ar e based on consensus from technical directors from Water Resources Divisions, Climate Change Divisio n, Under Secretary Technical (MECDM) as the GEF operational focal point, and representation from Mini stry of National Planning and Development Coordina tion.

List of Uploaded Documents

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

No documents available.

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:

There were aspect of changes that were made due to HACT conducted for the SIWSAP implementing partner , Ministry of Mines and Energy and Rural Electrification and based on this assessments , future projects delivered in partnership with this ministry would be implemented as DIM.

List of Uploaded Documents

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

No documents available.

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:

A sustainability plan was developed and now the on us is on the government to revise and implement.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Agendaitem8a.SIWSAPimpactandsustainability_strategyandactionplan_287_320 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Agendaitem8a.SIWSAPimpactandsustainability_strategyandactionplan_287_320.docx)	joanne.aihunu@undp.org	7/30/2019 6:02:00 AM

QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments

Key comments from the board meeting include:

- the project did well in demonstrating improvement of resilience of water resources to vulnerable water scarce communities, hence need to be upscaled and replicated in other communities across the Solomon Islands.