

Implementation and Monitoring Stage Quality Assurance Report

Overall Project 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.

Project Number : 00082143

Project Title : Current dry forests and the ecosystem goods and services in 13 Community Forests maintained through legalization of Community Forests. Adaptation of Sustainable Land and Forest Management supported.

Project Date : 01-Jul-2014

Strategic

Quality Rating: **Highly Satisfactory**

1. Is the project pro-actively taking advantage of new opportunities, adapting its theory of change to respond to changes in the development context, including changing national priorities? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects this project)

☐ 3: The project team completed and documented a horizon scanning exercise in the past year to identify new opportunities and changes in the development context that require adjustments in the theory of change. There is clear evidence that the project board has considered the implications, and documented changes to the project's theory of change, RRF, partnerships, etc. made in response, as appropriate. (both must be true to select this option)

☒ 2: *The project team has undertaken some horizon scanning in the past year to identify new opportunities and changes in the development context. The project board discussed the scanning and its implications for the project, as reflected in the board minutes. There is some evidence that the project took action as a result, but changes may not have been fully integrated in the project's theory of change, RRF, partnerships, etc.*

☐ 1: The project team may have considered new opportunities and changes in the development context since implementation began, but this has not been discussed in the project board. There is limited to no evidence that the project team has considered changes to the project as a result. This option would also be selected if no horizon scanning has been done to date during project implementation.

Evidence

Based on the recommended Theory Of Change (ToC) emanating from the Mid Term Review (MTR) exercise there is evidence of using the new opportunities and changes in development context. Reference can be made to the Final MidTerm Review (page 8) which outlines the reconstructed ToC

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)

☒ 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 [areas](#); implementation is consistent with the issues-based analysis incorporated into the project design; and the project's RRF includes all the relevant SP output indicators. (all 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, if relevant. (both must be true to select this option)

☐ 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 sectorial approach without addressing the complexity of the development issue. None of the relevant SP indicators are included in the RRF. This option is also selected if the project does not respond to any of the three SP areas of development work.

Evidence

Yes it is aligned with Output 1.3. and to new emerging areas of natural resources management for Community Forests.

Management Response

3. Evidence generated through the project has been explicitly used to confirm or adjust the programme/CPD's theory of change.

☒ **Yes**

☐ No

Evidence

The new CPD is yet to be developed, however the evidence from the project will be used during the new CDP 2019 =2023. A reconstructed Theory of Change (TOC) has been developed for the project based on the initial design, and been discussed and verified with project partners as noted in the August 2017 Mid Term Review (MTR) on page 8 of the attached Final MTR

Relevant

Quality Rating: **Satisfactory**

4. Are the project's targeted groups being systematically engaged, with a priority focus on the excluded and marginalized, to ensure the project remains relevant for them? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

☐ 3: Systematic and structured feedback has been collected over the past year from a representative sample of beneficiaries, with a priority focus on the excluded 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 to select this option)

☒ 2: Targeted groups have been engaged in implementation and monitoring, with a priority focus on the excluded 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 to select this option)

☐ 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

Management Response

The excluded and marginalized are not fully involved in project activities with the exception of three areas where they are in the majority. According to the rapid gender assessment this was cited as an area deserving targeted support.

5. Is the project generating knowledge – particularly lessons learned (i.e., what has worked and what has not) – and has this knowledge informed management decisions and changes/course corrections to ensure the continued relevance of the project towards its stated objectives, the quality of its outputs and the management of risk? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

☐ 3: Knowledge and lessons learned backed (gained, for example, from Peer Assists, After Action Reviews or Lessons Learned Workshops) 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 the project's theory of change has been adjusted, as needed, and changes were made to the project to ensure its continued relevance. (both must be true to select this option)

☒ 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 to select this option)

☐ 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

Management Response

Several reports are available, however they are not compiled together as one package to inform decision making. Based on the Final MTR

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. (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

☐ 3: The project team has systematically gathered data and evidence through project monitoring on the relevance of the measures to address gender inequalities and empowering women. Analysis of data and evidence were used to inform adjustments and changes, as appropriate. (both must be true to select this option)

☒ 2: The project team has some data and evidence on the relevance of the measures to address gender inequalities and empowering women. There is evidence that at least some adjustments were made, as appropriate. (both must be true to select this option)

☐ 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 being made. This option should also be selected if the project has no measures to address gender inequalities and empowering women relevant to the project results and activities.

Evidence

Management Response

A rapid gender assessment was conducted giving recommendations on improvements empower women and the marginalized

7. Is the project sufficiently at scale, or is there potential to scale up in the future, to meaningfully contribute to development change? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

☒ 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

Upload documents of direct and indirect beneficiaries compared to the baseline

Social & Environmental Standards

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

8. 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)

- ☐ 3: Credible evidence that the project furthers the realization of human rights, on the basis on applying a human rights based approach. Any potential adverse impacts on enjoyment of human rights are actively identified, managed and mitigated through the project's management of risks. (all must be true to select this option)
- ☒ 2: *Some evidence that the project furthers the realization of human rights. Potential adverse impacts on the enjoyment of human rights have been identified, and are adequately mitigated through the project's management of risks.*
- ☐ 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 are managed.

Evidence

Management Response

Community forestry is aimed at facilitating equitable access to natural resources for all inhabitants of the community forest and the project is helping to attain this objective

9. Are social and environmental impacts and risks (including those related to human rights, gender and environment) being successfully managed and monitored in accordance with project document and relevant action plans? (for projects that have no social or environmental risks the answer is "Yes")

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

Evidence

The project had commissioned a dedicated Gender Assessment of community involvement was conducted, as a recommendation from the Midterm Review of August 2017. Certain corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project have been recommended as per the MTR.

10. Are unanticipated social and environmental issues or grievances that arise during implementation assessed and adequately managed, with relevant management plans updated? (for projects that have not experienced unanticipated social and environmental risks or grievances the answer is "Yes")

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

Evidence

The project has not experienced unanticipated social and environmental risks or grievances.

Management & Monitoring

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

11. Is the project's M&E Plan being adequately implemented? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

- ☐ 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 to select this option)
- ☒ 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 to select this option)*
- ☐ 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

Management Response

The project has an M&E plan but systematic approach to its implementation and lessons have not been adequately captured. Recommendations from the MTR indicate that the M&E plan is now costed and progress is being made against the data in the results framework. pg. 4 (MTR)

12. Is project's governance mechanism (i.e., the project board or equivalent) functioning as intended? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

☐ 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

Management Response

Meeting (twice a year) regularly but improvements are needed on decision making on results, risks and opportunities could be improved. Email correspondence and minutes of meetings are shared in line with the frequency as stated in the prodoc. However the PSC met only four times and PSC does NOT include representatives from the CFs although the project document identifies them as Responsible Parties. (Page 21 - MTR)

13. Are risks to the project adequately monitored and managed? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

☒ 3: *The project has actively monitored risks every quarter including consulting with key stakeholders at least once in the past year to identify continuing and emerging risks to project implementation 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 to select this option)*

☐ 2: The project has monitored risks every quarter, 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 every quarter as required. There may be some evidence that the project has monitored risks that may affect the project's achievement of results, but there is no explicit evidence that management actions have been taken to mitigate risks.

Evidence

Management Response

Update risk matrix tabled and discussed as previous PSC meeting

Efficient

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

14. 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

Following the MTR, agreements have been reached between UNDP and MAWF, for the ministry to provide additional resources that are needed complete the construction of the marketing facility

15. Are project inputs procured and delivered on time to efficiently contribute to results? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

☐ 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 to select this option)

☒ 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 to select this option)

☐ 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

Updated Annual Procurement Plan was developed and attached for reference.

Management Response

Update the procurement plan on quarterly basis

16. Is there regular monitoring and recording of cost efficiencies taking into account the expected quality of results? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

☐ 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 to select this option)

☒ 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

Coordinated activities with PASS project on integrated fire management strategy, standard operational procedures with KFW Community forestry Namibia Project and bush control strategies with de-bushing project of GIZ

Effective

Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory

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

☒ Yes

☐ No

Evidence

The project is expected to achieve most of its end of targets outputs but with significant shortcomings

18. 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? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

☒ 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 to select this option)

☐ 2: There has been at least one review of the work plan during the 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

monitoring of work plan is being undertaken on a quarterly basis, with the workplan being reviewed twice a year. Its recommended that lessons learnt from implementation will be used in a systematic manner. Progress made against NAFOLA Outputs: Updates as of June 2017

Management Response

19. Are targeted groups being systematically identified and engaged, prioritizing the marginalized and excluded, to ensure results are achieved as expected? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

☐ 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 to select this option)

☒ 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 to select this option)*

☐ 1: The project does 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 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

Targeting 13 hot-spots, capacities of the community institutions assessed, some efforts to identify those excluded from opportunities have been done, but they are still to be improved

20. Are at least 40 per cent of the personnel hired by the project, regardless of contract type, female?

☒ Yes

☐ No

Evidence

44% representation of women

Sustainability & National Ownership

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

21. Are stakeholders and national partners fully engaged in the decision-making, implementation and monitoring of the project? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects 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 to select this option)*

☐ 2: National systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) are used in combination with other support (such as country office support or project systems) to implement and monitor the project, as 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 to select this option)

☐ 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

Management Response

Signed gazetting dossiers by TA, Governors, & MLR; consultative meeting held before the construction of marketing facility

22. There is regular monitoring of changes in capacities and performance of national institutions and systems relevant to the project. The implementation arrangements have been adjusted according to changes in partner capacities. (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

☐ 3: In the past year, changes in capacities and performance of national institutions and systems have been comprehensively assessed/monitored using clear indicators, rigorous methods of data collection and credible data sources including 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 to select this option)

☒ 2: *In the past year, 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 HACT assurance activities. Some adjustment has been made to implementation arrangements if needed to reflect changes in partner capacities. (both must be true to select this option)*

☐ 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

Management Response

National institutions and systems has been assessed and adjustments from MTR will be implemented

23. The transition and phase-out arrangements are reviewed regularly and adjusted according to progress (including financial commitments and capacity). (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

- ☐ 3: The project's governance mechanism has reviewed the project's sustainability plan in the past year, 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 to select this option)
- ☒ 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

Management Response

Transition have started during project implementation such as that SOPs developed for DoF to monitor implementation of community forestry implementation plans exist, but SOPs for community are yet to be developed. Secondly, a forestry inventory fully owned and operated by the MAWF

QA Summary/Project Board Comments:

There is a number of evidence materials to be used (assessed/analyzed) to assess the quality of the project management towards reaching it's objective.

The assessor/s need/s to re assess as per below comments:

1. Q3. Provide evidence of this using the CPD 2014 -2018, as this project was programmed under that framework. The future CPD of 2019 -2023 should not be used as reference.
2. Q4, Review the 2017 (latest donor report prepared for this project) PIR then reassess the matter on indigenous/marginalized community.
3. Q5, upload a list of appropriate documents to serve as proof of potential Knowledge Management products. Assessor/s to go back to the Project Manager and ask for these. Some which can be used are National Forestry Inventories, National Forest Database, and the community consultations and engagement during the seven steps of gazetting community forests.
4. Q 8, Suggest this rating to increase given the donor report, the updated RRF attached to the MTR, etc.
5. Q9, suggest to make yes, as per information contained in the latest donor report, and the updated RRF used for MTR, etc.
6. Q11, add a management response to this question. Or Upload the evidence such as updated RRF used for MTR in 2017, the PMAT, land degradation tracking tool at MTR, and copy of the M&E in prodoc, the two provides good evidence to increase this rating to highest level.
7. Q12, increase rating to 3 based on analyses of the vital formation contained in the latest reports availed for the MTR, and the MTR, PIR, RRF, etc.
8. Q 13, upload the updated risk/matrix, ask from the Project manager, there is enough evidence that this is being done consistently, ref. to the donor report, i.e. PIR 2017; ATLAS risk log, and updated risk from the project manager. Upload the latest log from the project manager as evidence.
9. Q 14, upload the notes that emanated from this meeting, i.e. as summary of corrective actions agreed upon, request the details from the project manager, she should be able to summarize this in a pager which can be attached as evidence. Increase rating.
10. Q14, delete the financial reporting information and request the project manager to share the latest procurement plan (correct format/ detailed correctly) that will be attached as evidence. Once that is done increase rating.
11. Q17, assess this to yes. and upload evidence as latest donor report, i.e. PIR 2017. PMAT updated at MTR, and the RRF updated for MTR.
12. Q18, increase rating to 3, evidence from the latest reporting.
13. Q19, upload a list of Community Forests being supported, this targeting is geographic in scope and is of environmental concern. However the issue of LNOB and targeting individuals could be determined in the narrative parts of the project reports (such as PIR 2017) and number of indirect and direct beneficiaries benefiting ultimately from the support to the CFs. Increase rating to 3
14. Q23, upload evidence of the Sustainability Plan, even if it is a draft. Request this from the project manager.

Overall, the review is good, but did not use the evidence contained in the report. The criteria for quality assessment should be looked at within or in the context of the project objective, and not in isolation. The worth of evidence to do a thorough assessment is contained in the reports, such as latest donor report i.e. PIR 2017, which goes into details regarding most of the elements being assessed. Further, the project manager should be asked to provide the evidence and then send a draft PQA report to use as a monitoring tool for undertaking urgent and pertinent corrective matters. As the PQA implementation is not only a mandatory reporting requirement, it is a supporting tool to enhance project implementation quality, thus it is also a useful tool to use as monitoring tool to take corrective actions.