

Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

Form Status: Approved

Overall Rating: Needs Improvement

Decision:

Portfolio/Project Number: 00105448

Portfolio/Project Title: Effective Urban Waste Mgmt. for Host CommunitiesPhasell

Portfolio/Project Date: 2017-11-01 / 2021-12-31

Strategic

Quality Rating: Exemplary

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:

Covid -19 has been a threat to the projects ability to achieve its objectives, the Project Team identified relevant changes in the external environment and took the necessary measures and integrated these changes to the project. Such as; physical trainings were realized as online cause of the effect of Covid-19.

Secondly, although project's ToC did not consider the situation of illegal waste pickers and focused only on community-based recycling realities were different on the ground. Illegal waste pickers were making a livelihood out of recycling and their exclusion from the incentive scheme and only working with households would have had a blow on their resilience and survival. For this reason,, the municipalities have signed contracts with companies on the collection of recyclables. These companies then signed with illegalwaste collectors and provided them with municipal vests, which are a clear sign that these persons are legally employed by the company. This increases security and also gives the population a different perception on these people, as they are officially contributing towards the reduction of waste. This is an important step towards the reduction of problems with informal waste pickers and an example of adaptive management although this was not envisaged in project design.

List of Uploaded Documents

| # | File Name | Modified By | Modified On |
|-------------------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|
| No documents available. | | | |

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:

Development setting is 3. BUILD RESILIENCE TO SHOCKS AND CRISIS
Signature Solution is Poverty
SP Output relevant for this project is
3.1.1 Core government functions and inclusive basic services restored post-crisis for stabilisation, durable solutions to displacement and return to sustainable development pathways within the framework of national policies and priorities
The relevant indicator is:
3.1.1.3 Number of people benefitting from jobs and improved livelihoods in crisis or post-crisis settings, disaggregated by sex and other characteristics

List of Uploaded Documents

| # | File Name | Modified By | Modified On |
|---|---|---------------------|------------------------|
| 1 | USBPRMPhaseIIProjectDocumentsignedbyMoEUUNDP_9246_302 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/USBPRMPhaseIIProjectDocumentsignedbyMoEUUNDP_9246_302.pdf) | beyza.onal@undp.org | 10/11/2021 11:04:00 AM |

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:

Targeted groups were identified and engaged so that project benefits remained relevant for them. Although project's ToC did not consider the situation of illegal waste pickers and focused only on community-based recycling, realities were different on the ground. Illegal waste pickers were making a livelihood out of recycling and their exclusion from the incentive scheme and only working with households would have had a blow on their resilience and survival. For this reason,, the municipalities have signed contracts with companies on the collection of recyclables. These companies then signed with illegalwaste collectors and provided them with municipal vests, which are a clear sign that these persons are legally employed by the company. This increases security and also gives the population a different perception on these people, as they are officially contributing towards the reduction of waste.

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:

Project produced a Lessons learned report. The independent evaluation of the project also has a lessons learned component. Both are attached for review.

List of Uploaded Documents

| # | File Name | Modified By | Modified On |
|---|---|----------------------|------------------------|
| 1 | USBPRMFinalEvaluationReport_2021.10.19_FINAL_9246_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/USBPRMFinalEvaluationReport_2021.10.19_FINAL_9246_304.pdf) | oyku.ulucay@undp.org | 10/20/2021 10:46:00 AM |
| 2 | LessonsLearnedReport_2021.10.20_9246_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/LessonsLearnedReport_2021.10.20_9246_304.doc) | oyku.ulucay@undp.org | 10/20/2021 10:47:00 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:

As opposed to a target of 10 000 households participating to the recycling incentivization scheme, 8389 persons (84 % of target) registered to the system. Compared to combined population of Kilis and Haliliye (Kilis being 142.792 Haliliye being 385.881 which officially excludes Syrian population which can be said to make up 50 % of local population) this number is not at scale.

Considering that this incentive system was first tested in this project, piloting with 8389 persons is justifiable. Incentive system is also dependent on keeping Zero Waste Markets but it remains to be seen whether further funding would be possible.

The Zero Waste Market in Haliliye is seen as a pilot activity and depending on the feedback from the population, Haliliye is considering opening more zero waste markets. As the time since opening the market has been too short to gain sufficient feedback, no decision on further expansions has been made. It has been made clear by the municipality that due to extensive promotion of the project in media the current Zero Waste Market is very likely to stay open, which is positive for sustainability, however, no concrete commitment was given.

List of Uploaded Documents

| # | File Name | Modified By | Modified On |
|-------------------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|
| No documents available. | | | |

Principled**Quality Rating: Needs Improvement**

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:

The Project had a clear focus on improving women's empowerment and gender equality. Activity 1.2 was specifically designed to support women's collectives for handicraft/product manufacturing from recyclables. The evaluation has shown that good progress has been made in both cooperatives, with question on sustainability in the Kilis cooperative due to supposed lack of market opportunities.

Gender has been a key element for this project as waste management at homes is managed mostly by women, therefore women play a significant role in the value chain both as consumers and disposers. Gender responsive communication material was prepared and used in the awareness campaign for this Project. When trainings were provided, care was taken that there is a strong participation from women in the training sessions. From the 412 participants in the Training of Trainers (ToT), 201 or 48.8% were women and 211 or 51.2% were men.

A key component in the Project was to support provide to women's cooperatives. 2 cooperatives were supported by providing equipment and training. The cooperative in Kilis focused on the production of soap from olive oil production waste, the cooperative in Haliliye is working on vegetable production in greenhouses and fertilizer production. Both cooperatives only employ women and in total more than 20 permanent work places were created.

List of Uploaded Documents

| # | File Name | Modified By | Modified On |
|-------------------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|
| No documents available. | | | |

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)
- 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 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 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:

All of the risks and mitigation measures were mentioned in the quarterly reports. At Design Stage SESP was prepared which defines this project as low risk.

List of Uploaded Documents

| # | File Name | Modified By | Modified On |
|---|--|----------------------|------------------------|
| 1 | ProjectQuarterlyReport4_9246_307 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ProjectQuarterlyReport4_9246_307.pdf) | beyza.onal@undp.org | 10/11/2021 11:09:00 AM |
| 2 | SESP_USBPRMII_9246_307 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SESP_USBPRMII_9246_307.pdf) | oyku.ulucay@undp.org | 10/14/2021 3:41:00 PM |

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 informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism and how to access it. If the project was categorized as 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:

Project affected people was not informed of UNDP's corporate accountability mechanism.

List of Uploaded Documents

| # | File Name | Modified By | Modified On |
|-------------------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|
| No documents available. | | | |

Management & Monitoring

Quality Rating: Needs Improvement

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:

Please look at the log-frame reporting of the project for baselines and targets and exact target achievements. 9 indicators were monitored and reported. The only indicator that was not collected was 1.8 Percentage of point to product conversion as a marker for active participation and obtained benefits from incentivization programme.

It was difficult to collect this data from the municipalities as both of the municipalities implemented two types of systems, one of the system is giving products to the citizens according to the points that are collected in their incentive cards, the second system is the one which most of the citizens prefer taking money from the municipalities according to the waste that are collected, so this indicator could not be reported.

List of Uploaded Documents

| # | File Name | Modified By | Modified On |
|---|--|----------------------|------------------------|
| 1 | USBPRMPPhaseIIProjectFinalLog-framereporting_9246_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/USBPRMPPhaseIIProjectFinalLog-framereporting_9246_309.docx) | oyku.ulucay@undp.org | 10/20/2021 10:48:00 AM |

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:

The Project Board (PB) was supposed to guide and oversee the implementation of the Project and was supposed to convene twice during the Project lifetime. Only one meeting was held, on 15 December 2020. There are several points to be made on the PB meeting:

- Project start was in May 2019, so the PB cannot fulfil its function of guiding and overseeing the project when the first meeting was held more than one and a half years later and after the extended project deadline (September 2020).
- The agenda included an introduction to the Project Team, which is surprising after more than 18 months of activities in the Project.
- The minutes don't mention any discussion on critical issues in the project, such as the delays caused by COVID-19 and relevant corrective actions.

Management Response:

Due this and similar other negative experiences, UN DP Quality Assurance Unit started regularly alerting project teams whose PB did not meet in the frequency required in their M&E table.

List of Uploaded Documents

| # | File Name | Modified By | Modified On |
|---|--|---------------------|------------------------|
| 1 | ProjectProgressReport_9246_310 (https://inttranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ProjectProgressReport_9246_310.pdf) | beyza.onal@undp.org | 10/11/2021 11:10:00 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 maybe 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:

All of the quarterly reports reflected the risk and mitigation measures.

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:

The project achieved intended results through adequate resources.

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:

There is procurement plan which is updated according to the procurements needs of the project and according to the request of the Procurement Unit.

List of Uploaded Documents

| # | File Name | Modified By | Modified On |
|---|---|---------------------|------------------------|
| 1 | PROCUREMENTPLAN_2020USBPRM_9246_313 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PROCUREMENTPLAN_2020USBPRM_9246_313.xlsx) | beyza.onal@undp.org | 10/11/2021 11:13:00 AM |

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:

The project budget was updated according to the project transaction reports each month. Having said that at some of the costs were significantly above their budget allocation due to several factors:

There are difference in certain costs components between the budget mentioned in the ProDoc and actual expenses:

- Cost of UNDP Project Staff: are 64% higher than planned, the difference was explained as follows: the budget was established in 2017, but the project was carried out in 2020/2021 when inflation was much higher. Also, project duration is longer than expected. Both points are valid, although the project duration could have been shorter in case proper project management would have been applied, this would have saved some costs. The extension based on COVID-19 was not foreseeable, which explains part of the cost increase for UNDP staff.
- Contractual services companies: 3 times the budget. Due to COVID-19 some activities could not be carried out as efficiently as planned. It was decided to produce informative/branded materials regarding zero waste in targeted provinces together with the implementing partner (this includee design, production and distribution of various materials which contains three types of animation videos, two types of promotion videos, four types of posters, brochures, market bags, banners, billboards, informative videos to be shown on local channels). Also, the design of the training and ToT activities were modified and extended, leading to additional costs. Based on the request of both municipalities LED screens were procured to promote zero waste to local people and Syrians in targeted provinces. All this, together with costs increases due to inflation (the Project budget was based on 2017 price levels) explains the difference. This explanation doesn't make sense,
- Institutional contracts: are 87% less than budgeted. Difference is explained by shifting of budgets between cost components.

List of Uploaded Documents

| # | File Name | Modified By | Modified On |
|---|---|---------------------|------------------------|
| 1 | CopyofBudgetTablefinal_9246_314 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CopyofBudgetTablefinal_9246_314.xlsx) | beyza.onal@undp.org | 10/11/2021 11:14:00 AM |

Effective

Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory

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

- Yes
 No

Evidence:

Major achievements of the project are as follows:
Two incentivization schemes for households designed and operational in Kilis and Haliliye.
8326 households participating to the system
1826 tons of recycling waste collected each year in two municipalities
2 Civic Amenity Centers established / Mobile amenity centers were installed (8 in Kilis, 10 in Haliliye)
2 cooperatives on vegetable and compost production in Haliliye and soap production from olive oil waste in Kilis
125 persons trained on composting, soap production and recycling. 42% of the trainees were Syrians.
412 community wardens trained (48.8 % women)

Most outputs were satisfactory with the exception of two

1.8 Percentage of point to product conversion as a marker for active participation and obtained benefits from incentivization programme.

1.10 Number of positively resulted impact assessments (IAs) on social cohesion by participatory waste management

For indicator 1.8 Percentage of point to product conversion as a marker for active participation and obtained benefits from the incentivization programme, it is difficult to collect this data from the municipalities

as both of the municipalities implemented two types of systems, one of the system is giving products to the citizens according to the points that are collected in their incentive cards, the second system is the one which most of the citizens prefer taking money from the municipalities according to the waste that are collected, so it is difficult to collect this data from the municipalities.

For indicator 1.10, while a baseline and follow up surveys were completed, these IAs are not reliable in the sense that the sample size (around 250 persons per city) are not big enough to claim enough representation of Syrian and host community populations. A reliable sample size would have been 2000 per city (1000 Syrians, 1000 HC) meaning 4000 respondents for each round. The profiles of respondents also vary too much in each round to claim the baseline and follow up surveys are targeting identical people. The IA also did not try to reach people who were part of awareness raising activities of this Project but general population. A Project with limited resources can not change perceptions, attitudes and behaviours of an entire city but only those respondents who were part of trainings, so the assumptions of the IA are also flawed in that sense.

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:

Project Quarterly Reports include workplans as annexes.

List of Uploaded Documents

| # | File Name | Modified By | Modified On |
|---|--|---------------------|------------------------|
| 1 | Annex2_AnnualWorkPlan_9246_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Annex2_AnnualWorkPlan_9246_316.xlsx) | beyza.onal@undp.org | 10/11/2021 11:15:00 AM |

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 project targeted specific groups and employed a Leave no one behind approach both for Syrian population and also for women.

The approach to "leaving no one behind" (LNOB) not only entails reaching the poorest of the poor, but also seeks to combat discrimination and rising inequalities within and amongst countries, and their root causes. Leaving no one behind means moving beyond assessing average and aggregate progress, towards ensuring progress for all population groups at a disaggregated level. The Project followed this approach by understanding the special situation of Syrians under Temporary Protection (SuTP) in Turkey and defining Project activities aiming at avoiding their economic exclusion. The project targeted

ng that no one is left behind. Through the Temporary Protection regulation the Government of Turkey provides a rights-based legal framework, which offers access to education, health care, employment and social security to Syrians.

By supporting the integration of informal waste pickers into a formal system with financial compensation for recyclables collected, the Project positively contributed towards LNOB in several ways: through transforming an illegal into a legal system, thereby integrating SuTP families into their communities, increasing security in neighborhoods and generating income opportunities for families of waste pickers. Also the activities to include Syrian refugees in women's cooperatives and provide them with income opportunities is an important contribution.

The Project had a clear focus on improving women's empowerment and gender equality. Activity 1.2 was specifically designed to support women's collectives for handicraft/product manufacturing from recyclables. The evaluation has shown that good progress has been made in both cooperatives, with question on sustainability in the Kilis cooperative due to supposed lack of market opportunities.

Gender has been a key element for this project as waste management at homes is managed mostly by women, therefore women play a significant role in the value chain both as consumers and disposers. Gender responsive communication material was prepared and used in the awareness campaign for this Project. When trainings were provided, care was taken that there is a strong participation from women in the training sessions. From the 412 participants in the Training of Trainers (ToT), 201 or 48.8% were women and 211 of 51.2% were men.

A key component in the Project was to support provide to women's cooperatives. 2 cooperatives were supported by providing equipment and training. The cooperative in Kilis focused on the production of soap from olive oil production waste, the cooperative in Haliliye is working on vegetable production in greenhouses and fertilizer production. Both cooperatives only employ women and in total more than 20 permanent work places were created.

List of Uploaded Documents

| # | File Name | Modified By | Modified On |
|-------------------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|
| No documents available. | | | |

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:

National systems were not used during the project. The project relied on cooperation with two municipalities and only UNDP and municipal systems were used for data collection on recycling. For other aspects such as procurement and M&E, only UNDP systems and procedures were used.

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:

Capacities of national institutions were monitored by the project team through the support of individual consultant and HACT was implemented. Please look at the micro-assessment attached.

List of Uploaded Documents

| # | File Name | Modified By | Modified On |
|---|---|----------------------|------------------------|
| 1 | FINAL_MicroAssessmentReport_ÇYGM_9246_319 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FINAL_MicroAssessmentReport_ÇYGM_9246_319.pdf) | oyku.ulucay@undp.org | 10/20/2021 10:40:00 AM |

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 meeting took place with USBPRM officials on 14.10.2021 to discuss a new project on the basis of the findings of the previous two phases. The meeting presentation is attached for information purposes.

As PRM's focus is on humanitarian activities, any development interventions has to have a humanitarian aspect to it such as livelihoods and social cohesion. PRM tries to fill the funding gaps in areas which are underfunded and this regards waste management is not a priority as EU invests large sums in this area, hence UNDP proposes to continue partnership with PRM in livelihoods and social cohesion activities. In particular the focus for future partnership would be:

- Scaling up and expanding the livelihood components of previous PRM funded projects on supporting women cooperatives
- Focusing on Digital Livelihoods, Agricultural Development, and Social Cohesion & Protection
- Targeting the most vulnerable refugee women (Syrian, Afghan, Iraqi and other)

UNDP received demand from Hatay and Akçakale/Şanlıurfa municipalities in support of women cooperatives which UNDP proposes to address by:

- Supporting 400 local women - refugee and host community member - in building technical skills for production, income generation, marketing, and life skills such as communication, financial literacy, and language
- safe environment for women for resilience building and enhancing social cohesion through psychosocial support and social events
- Establishing, supporting and facilitating integration of new and/or existing women cooperatives to national, regional and global markets

List of Uploaded Documents

| # | File Name | Modified By | Modified On |
|---|--|----------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 | UNDPTurkey-PRMCooperation_Final_9246_320 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/UNDPTurkey-PRMCooperation_Final_9246_320.pptx) | oyku.ulucay@undp.org | 10/14/2021 5:16:00 PM |

QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments
