ASM-10856 - Quality Assurance - Closure

Procedure Year: 2024

Procedure Rating: Highly Satisfactory

Procedure Status: Approved

Procedure Name: ASM-10856

Procedure Department: CO - Dominican Republic

Procedure Type: Closure

Record Owner: Clara Fernandez Tejada

Created by: Clara Fernandez Tejada,9/6/2024, 1:02 PM

Last Modified by: Sanja BOJANIC,3/14/2025, 10:28 AM

Portofolio/Project Type: Project

RELATED PORTFOLIOS/PROJECTS (1)

NAME	PORTOFOLIO/PROJECT NAME	DEPARTMENT	STATUS	ATLAS PROJECT NUMBER	START DATE	END DATE
00104602	Coordin Programa Cocoa Life II-UNDP-DOM-00104602	CO - Dominican Republic	Financially Closed	00102619	1/1/2018	3/31/2024

Approval Information

Approval Date: Fri Mar 14 00:00:00 GMT 2025

Approved By: Sanja BOJANIC <sanja.bojanic@undp.org>

APPROVAL HISTORY

STEP NAME	DATE	STATUS	ASSIGNED TO
Submitted for Approval	2025-03-14 10:28:05	Approved	Sanja BOJANIC
Approval Request Submitted	2025-03-11 09:53:33	Started	Pierre CANDELON

QA Questionnaire:

Strategic | Status: Complete | Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory

1. Did the project pro-actively identified changes to the external environment and incorporated them into the project strategy?

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

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

El equipo del proyecto identificó riesgos y factores externos que afectaban el logro de los resultados durante la ejecución de esta intervención, como los impactos de la Pandemia del COVID-19 que retrasaron la implementacion; la sequía prolongada limitó el éxito de la siembra del cacao en las zonas de intervención y fue necesario replantar; la resistencia de los productores al cambio en

principio limitó la implementación del proyecto; Incumplimiento por parte de los productores al momento de la siembra; en algunas zonas del proyecto los productores estabán dispersos y se dificultó la organización de las Escuelas de Campo; retraso en el pago del incentivo a los productores; Bajo volumen de cacao acopiado; inconformidad con el proceso de aplicación de la evaluación de IPSOS a los productores de CL.
Estas situaciones fueron abordados en las reuniones del Comité Directivo del Proyecto, con los socios del proyecto y el donante, con la finalidad de revisarlos y se tomaron acciones para ajustar la estrategia de implementación. Aunque hubo dificultades para adoptar las decisiones y adaptarse a los cambios se pudo lograr con éxito las metas previstas del proyecto. Ver como evidencia documento sistematización de experiencias del proyecto.

2. Was the project aligned with the thematic focus of the Strategic Plan?

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

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

Con relación al Plan Estratégico PNUD 2022-2025, esta iniciativa se articula con la dirección de cambio “a) Transformación estructural, que incluye transiciones verdes, inclusivas y digitales”; con la Solución Emblemática 4 “Medio ambiente”, la cual otorga un papel central a la naturaleza y al medio ambiente en los planes y economías nacionales; y con el catalizador de impacto del desarrollo “Innovación estratégica”, que busca capacitar a los gobiernos y las comunidades para mejorar el rendimiento de los sistemas en su conjunto, de modo que sean adaptativos y resilientes.
El Proyecto se enmarca en el Marco de Cooperación de las Naciones Unidas para el Desarrollo Sostenible (UNSDCF), así como en las metas del PNUD expresadas en el Documento de Programa País (CPD). Con respecto al UNSDCF, existe una alineación directa con el Resultado 4: “Para el 2027, Las personas, las comunidades, las instituciones nacionales y locales y los sectores estratégicos gestionan el riesgo de desastres con un enfoque multidimensional, afrontan los retos del cambio climático y promueven la gestión sostenible de los ecosistemas y los asentamientos humanos urbanos y rurales, en un entorno resiliente, inclusivo, con igualdad de género, responsable con el planeta y las generaciones futuras.” El proyecto responde al Producto 4.2 Mecanismos de inversión pública y privada movilizados para soluciones en materia de biodiversidad, agua, océanos y clima, y a los indicadores 4.2.1 Número de personas que se benefician directamente de los mecanismos para soluciones en materia de biodiversidad, agua, océanos y clima financiados con recursos del sector público y/o privado.
En cuanto al CPD, el Proyecto se vincula con el Producto del programa “3.2. Se dota a los sectores público y privado de soluciones para proteger el capital natural para la transición a una economía verde y azul", y al indicador 3.2.2. Ver Prodoc.

Relevant	Status: Complete	Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory

3. Are the project’s targeted groups, and particularly those marginalized, vulnerable and left further behind (LNOB), being systematically engaged, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized, to ensure the project leaves no one behind (LNOB) and remains 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 (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

Mediante un proceso de análisis de la problemática del sector cacao en el marco de la Plataforma Nacional del Cacao y la documentación de la situación de dicho sector desarrollado en el marco de la implementación de la primera fase del CLP (Fase I), se priorizaron cuatro problemáticas fundamentales, en base a lo cual se diseñó la estrategia de implementación de este programa en el país, a través de los diferentes socios. El programa integró a diversos actores de la cadena de valor del cacao como el Ministerio de Agricultura, del sector privado, CONACADO y FUPAROCA, como agentes de desarrollo en las zonas productoras.
El proyecto ha promovido el involucramiento y la participación de los grupos objetivo con una visión participativa. Durante la ejecución del proyecto se llevaron a cabo talleres de planificación anuales para desarrollar las actividades de CLP con los socios incluyendo a actores claves identificados. Se establecieron los resultados y actividades esperadas de acuerdo a los pilares del CLP para cada año en el marco de los proyectos coordinados con los socios de CONACADO y FUPAROCA.
Asimismo, anualmente se desarrollaron talleres con los dos socios del proyecto para levantar las lecciones aprendidas, experiencias y mejores prácticas de implementación de CLP con el fin de ajustar la estrategia de implementación del proyecto. También se apoyó en el proceso de diseño de 16 Planes de Acción Comunitaria (CAP) en las comunidades de CL. En cada comunidad se realizó un diagnóstico rural participativo, y se creó un Comité de Desarrollo Comunitario (CODEC) con la participación de comunitarios de ambos géneros y distintos grupos generacionales, para trabajar los planes de acción diseñados por la comunidad y colaborar con el seguimiento de estos. Además el PNUD apoyó la implementación de la estrategia de recuperación socioeconómica de las comunidades del CLP durante y después de la pandemia del COVID-19. Ver informe de Sistematizacion, y el Informe Final del proyecto.

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 (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

El proyecto ha generado conocimiento y lecciones aprendidas durante su implementación. Durante la ejecución del proyecto se llevaron a cabo talleres de planificación anuales para desarrollar actividades con los socios. Como resultado, se establecieron los resultados y actividades esperadas de acuerdo a los pilares del CLP para cada año en el marco de los proyectos coordinados con los socios de CONACADO y FUPAROCA
Asimismo, anualmente se desarrollaron talleres con los dos socios del proyecto para levantar las lecciones aprendidas, experiencias y mejores prácticas de implementación de CLP con el fin de ajustar la estrategia de implementación del proyecto. De igual manera se realizaron talleres de sistematizacion de experiencias del proyecto donde se consolidaron los problemas, las lecciones aprendidas, los logros, y los retos para el futuro tomando en cuenta las dos fases de ejecucion del proyecto.
Ver informes de sistematizacion, y el Informe Final del Proyecto.

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 (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

El proyecto ha alcanzado la mayoría de los productores (grupo meta) integrados a las instituciones socias del proyecto (CONACADO y FUPAROCA). Directamente el proyecto ha beneficiado a los productores y sus familias, y los cambios han sido evidenciados en los informes y reportes de los socios, y de la entidad que ha evaluado el impacto del proyecto (IPSOS). El resumen del impacto del proyecto se incluye como evidencia (Presentación Cierre). Asimismo, durante la pandemia del COVID-19 se apoyó a las comunidades en la recuperación de sus medios de vida lo que impactó a un mayor número de beneficiarios. Ver informe final del proyecto como anexo.

Principled	Status: Complete	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.

- (selected) 3: The project team has systematically gathered data and evidence through project monitoring on the relevance of the measures to address gender inequalities and empower women. Analysis of data and evidence were used to inform adjustments and changes, as appropriate. (both must be true)
- 2: The project team 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 (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

La equidad de género y empoderamiento de la mujer, fue incluido a profundidad en el diseño, e incorporado a la gestión del proyecto durante su ejecución con buenos resultados. Se tomaron en cuenta los temas de género en la ejecución de todas las actividades. Las actividades desarrolladas en el marco del proyecto cuentan con indicadores desagregados por género.

El programa apoyó la implementación del Plan de Empoderamiento de la Mujer Dominicana CL, siguiendo las prioridades identificadas con los socios, se brindó orientación permanente y desarrollo de capacidades para asegurar una implementación adecuada del Plan. Se resalta el empoderamiento de las mujeres en la cadena de valor, su participación en los grupos comunitarios y en los procesos de fortalecimiento de capacidades para el manejo de las plantaciones.

El programa apoyó el fortalecimiento de las capacidades de emprededurismo y gestion de negocios para mipymes en las localidades de intervencion, con énfasis en aquellas lideradas por mujeres impactando a 41 emprendedores de los cuales 24 eran mujeres. Las provincia en los cuales se trabajó este componente fueron Puerto Plata, Maria Trinidad Sanchez, Duarte, Monte Plata y Sánchez Ramírez.

Ver informe final como evidencia.

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 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)
- (selected) 2: Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. Appropriate assessments were conducted where required (i.e., Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) for high/substantial-risk projects and targeted assessments for moderate risk projects as identified through SESP). Relevant management plan(s) developed, implemented, and monitored for identified risks. Select this option for SESP exempted projects and/or categorized as low risk through the SESP.
- 1: Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. For projects categorized as High or Moderate Risk, 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 (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

Este proyecto fue categorizado como de bajo riesgo en la fase de diseño. Los riesgos sociales y ambientales fueron identificados y gestionados durante el diseño y ejecución del proyecto. En el diseño, el proyecto incluyó la aplicación del SESP, de acuerdo con los estándares sociales y ambientales del PNUD. Durante su ejecución entre 2022 y 2023 no se encontraron nuevas evidencias de

riesgos ambientales y sociales o el escalamiento de aquellos detectados en la fase de diseño. Durante su ejecución en el 2022 nuevos brotes epidemiológicos del COVID-19 (i.e. variantes) y agravamiento de sus efectos sanitarios y socioeconómicos a nivel nacional y local pudieron afectar paracialmente las actividades. Algunas acciones a partir de la identificación de este último riesgo se pusieron en marcha.
Ver informes periódicos del proyecto.

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 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 have been informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism and how to access it. If the project is categorized as High Risk through the SESP, a project -level grievance mechanism is in place and project affected people informed. If grievances have been received they are responded to but face challenges in arriving at a resolution. Select this option for SESP Exempted projects.
- ○ 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 (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

El proyecto no reporta denuncias ni agravios sociales y ambientales surgidos durante su ejecución. Asimismo, el Diagnóstico Social y Ambiental (SESP) elaborado en la formulación del proyecto indica un riesgo bajo y se han identificado medidas para mitigarlo.

Management & Monitoring	Status: Complete	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 (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

Las acciones de monitoreo y evaluación establecidas en el PRODOC fueron implementadas de acuerdo a lo establecido. Ver en el documento de proyecto (PRODOC), en especial atención a la sección de Monitoreo y Evaluación, como evidencia.

10. Did 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 (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

Este proyecto con modalidad DIM, y no se realizaron reuniones de la Junta de proyecto tal como se establecieron en el PRODOC. A pesar de esto, se mantuvieron reuniones periódicas con el donante y los socios para fines de seguimiento y toma de decisiones oportunas.

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 (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

El proyecto actualizó anualmente el registro de riesgos, y las medidas propuestas para abordar estos riesgos. Para más detalles y como evidencia, ver el Documento de Proyecto (enmienda 4), en su anexo 4. Análisis de Riesgos.

Efficient	Status: Complete	Quality Rating: Highly 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 (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

Todos los recursos previstos para el proyecto fueron recibidos del donante. Ver informe final (Resumen financiero)

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 (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

El proyecto anualmente actualizó su plan de adquisiciones, y procuró la implementación del mismo de acuerdo a lo previsto. Ver anexos como evidencia en la carpeta Planes.

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 (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

El proyecto monitoreó sus propios costos de sus bienes y servicios, y se apoyó en la experiencia de la unidad de adquisiciones de la oficina de país del PNUD. La gran parte de los recursos fue utilizada para la implementación del proyecto. Todos los procesos de compras y contrataciones cumplieron con los políticas y regulaciones de PNUD. El Proyecto, es de implementación DIM, se ejecuta en base a las normativas y procedimientos de PNUD, que verifican como principio esencial el value for money, la competencia técnica adecuada de los bienes y servicios y la preminencia de las ofertas más económicas de aquellas que cumplen a cabalidad y suficiencia con los requerimientos técnicos del proyecto. Esto evidencia un uso eficiente de los recursos y la continuidad del Proyecto por disponibilidad presupuetaria. Sobre el monitoreo, el mismo es constante y de manera regular se ingresa la información en los informes. Ver informes periódicos

Effective	Status: Complete	Quality Rating: Exemplary

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

Yes

No

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

El Proyecto se implementó acorde a sus actividades, cronogramas y presupuestos planificados.
Ver: PRODOC, Informe Final

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 (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

El proyecto implementó acciones de revisión y actualización del plan de trabajo anualmente para el logro de sus resultados. La revisión se basó en las necesidades específicas que resultan de las lecciones aprendidas, obstáculos y oportunidades de implementación. Estos ajustes en la planificación fueron socializados con el donante. Ver PRODOC Enmienda 4.

17. Were the targeted groups, and particularly those marginalized, vulnerable and left further behind (LNOB), 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 (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

Las personas beneficiarias directas la conforman personas productoras de cacao en las provincias definidas y especificadas en el documento de proyecto. La ampliación de los beneficiarios directos e indirectos se basó en los levantamientos realizados durante la pandemia del Covid-19 y la implementacion de la estrategia de recuperación socioeconómica de las comunidades, así como el monitoreo de
los beneficiarios durante la implementación de actividades.
El programa logró apoyar a los productores y a sus comunidades en diferentes aspectos, que se fundamentaron en 4 pilares, Finca, Comunidad, Juventud, y Medio de Vida. A nivel de los productores y la comunidad, el programa fomentó los siguientes puntos:

- 39 comunidades cuentan con planes de acción comunitarios y comités de desarrollo comunitario para la gestión de sus necesidades. Actualmente 15 de estos comités están activos.
- Se implementaron 47 iniciativas comunitarias beneficiando a 1,800 productores y sus familias relativos a emprendimientos, medio ambiente, acueducto, escuela, energía, caminos, deportes, etc.
- La capacitación de 303 jóvenes en emprendedurismo y manejo de negocios.
- Apoyo a 18 emprendimientos negocio liderados por jóvenes sobre agricultura, servicios técnicos, comercio electrónico, viveros, otros.
- Apoyo a 24 iniciativas sobre cria de animales, repostería, producción de vegetales, servicios.

Ver: PRODOC, ver informe final del proyecto

18. If there is a digital or data technology solution in the project: have technology and data risks been addressed specifically for closure, or continued use by partners or UNDP?

- 3: Yes, a) the implementation and closure followed good practices, such as UNDP's digital standards and data principles; b) technology sustainability risks are addressed: hosting, licenses, intellectual property, data ownership, code documentation, or partner capacity (operations, maintenance and continued improvement); and c) post project scalability has been considered: digital public goods or reusability for other UNDP units. (All must be true)
- 2: Specific technology and data risks have been partially addressed for project closure, next to Standard UNDP sustainability practices and project risk management.
- 1: Standard UNDP sustainability practices and project risk management are applied, but no specific practices to address technology or data risks are followed.
- (selected) The project did not utilize a data or digital technology solution.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

El proyecto no promovió una solución tecnológica. Pero sí apoyó a los socios en la digitalización de los polígonos de las fincas de cacao mediante sistemas de bases de datos geoespaciales. Los socios recibieron capacitacion sobre el manejo de estos sistemas.

Sustainability & National Ownership	Status: Complete	Quality Rating: Satisfactory

19. 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)
- (selected) 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 (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

El proyecto fue implementado en la modalidad DIM por PNUD, los socios nacionales tuvieron una limitada participación en la toma de decisiones, a nivel de Junta de Proyecto. Aunque se mantuvieron reuniones periódicas con los socios para fines seguimiento y toma de decisiones.

20. Were there regular monitoring of changes in capacities and performance of institutions and systems relevant to the project, as needed, and were the implementation arrangements8 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 were monitored by the project, however changes to implementation arrangements were not considered. Also select this option if changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems were not monitored by the project.
- Not Applicable

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

El proyecto fue implementado en la modalidad DIM por PNUD, por lo que los sistemas nacionales de las instituciones no fueron evaluados o monitoreados.

21. 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 (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

Este proyecto fue revisado regularmente por el PNUD y el donante para garantizar la sostenibilidad de las acciones, incluyendo el proceso de transición y estrategia de salida. Durante la fase de cierre se levantaron junto a los socios del proyecto las lecciones aprendidas, la visión y retos a futuro. Como accion de cierre se realizó un taller técnico de cierre con todos los socios, el donante y el PNUD para revisar resultados, productos, metas, lecciones aprendidas, retos y visión a futuro.
Ver informe final, minuta taller técnico de cierre.