

ASM-02825 - Quality Assurance - Implementation

**Procedure Year:** 2023

**Overall Project Risk Categorization:** ● Satisfactory

**Procedure Status:** Approved

**Procedure Name:** ASM-02825

**Procedure Department:** CO - El Salvador - San Salvador

**Procedure Type:** Implementation

**Record Owner:** Ryna Avila

**Created by:** Ryna Avila, 12/20/2023, 1:33 PM

**Last Modified by:** Therese Sebastian, 2/29/2024, 11:29 AM

**Decision:**

**QA Summary/Project Board Comments:**

RELATED PROJECTS(1)					
NAME	DEPARTMENT	STATUS	ATLAS PROJECT NUMBER	START DATE	END DATE
00107946	CO - El Salvador - San Salvador	On Going	00107731	7/31/2020	7/31/2025

### Approval History

**Approval Date:**   **Approved By:**

APPROVAL HISTORY			
STEP NAME	DATE	STATUS	ASSIGNED TO
Submitted for Approval	2023-12-21 07:37:58	Approved	Rafael Pleitez
Approval Request Submitted	2023-12-20 16:13:30	Started	Ryna Avila

### Identified Risks & Treatments

**Category:** 4. Organizational

**Risk Significance:**  Substantial

**Risk Significance:**  Substantial

**Sub-Category:** 4.5. Monitoring and oversight



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.

**\*Note: Risk management must be done for criteria with score of 1.**

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

Se analizan nuevos riesgos, y se realizaron los ajustes por la transición del CNE a la DGEHM. Se presenta la revisión sustantiva (la cual se encuentra en firma del Director General de la DGEHM) y el Informe del taller de Adaptación.

**2. Is the project aligned with the UNDP 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.

**\*Note: Risk management must be done for criteria with score of 1.**

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

Este proyecto contribuirá el eje de cambio "Transformación estructural", fomentando el uso de tecnologías que contribuyen con la disminución del consumo energético, y fomentando modelos de movilidad amigables con el medio ambiente y asequibles (transporte público, ciclovías, redes peatonales seguras).

En el eje "No dejar a nadie atrás", contribuye en que todos los ciudadanos de San Salvador tengan acceso, seguridad, y se incluyen temas de género y grupos vulnerables.

Contribuye al eje "Fomentar la resiliencia", al fomentar la no dependencia de vehículo de combustión interna (particular o público), en épocas de crisis económicas, desastres naturales y crisis sanitarias.

Contributing Outcome (UNDAF/CPD, RPD or GPD):

Efecto 2.1. Se han diseñado planes y pilotos de movilidad urbana sostenible en municipios seleccionados del AMSS.

Efecto 3.1. Las municipalidades seleccionadas del AMSS han adoptado una ruta de desarrollo con eficiencia energética.

Indicative Output(s) with gender marker2:

2.1.3. Diseño de propuestas para abordar temas de seguridad pública para acceder al Sistema de Transporte Público siguiendo un enfoque de género

Relevant

Status: Complete

Quality Rating: **Highly Satisfactory**

**3. Are the project's target groups, and particularly those discriminated, marginalized, vulnerable and left further behind (LNOB), being systematically engaged to ensure the project leaves no one behind (LNOB) and remains relevant for them?**

- 3: Systematic and structured feedback has been collected over the past two years 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 target 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)

- 2: Target groups have been engaged in implementation and monitoring. 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)
- 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

**\*Note: Risk management must be done for criteria with score of 1.**

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

El proyecto no contempla grupos discriminados y marginalizados, porque la naturaleza del proyecto no tiene trabajo comunitario, sino más orientado a desarrollo de pilotos para promover eficiencia

**4. Is the project generating 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 have been 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, 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)
- 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.

**\*Note: Risk management must be done for criteria with score of 1.**

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

La evaluación de medio termino del proyecto permitió hacer ajustes de contexto importantes, basado en lecciones aprendidas y discusiones con las contrapartes, el proyecto se adapto a los cambios institucionales de la estrategia de gobierno. Esto quedo reflejado en la ultima revisión sustantiva del proyecto, aprobado en la Junta de Proyecto de Julio 2023.

- Se disuelve el CNE y se convierte en Dirección General de Energía, Hidrocarburos y Minas (DGEHM)
- Se elimina todo lo relacionado al SITRAMSS (puesto que desaparecio) y se adapta a la nueva visión de un sistema de Bus Rapid Transit (BRT)

**5. Is the project sufficiently at scale, or is there potential to scale up in the future, to meaningfully contribute to development change?**

- 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.

**\*Note: Risk management must be done for criteria with score of 1.**

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

Dentro de los planes que tiene la DGEHM, se encuentra el fomento al uso de los vehículos eléctricos como parte de la estrategia de descarbonización del sector transporte a nivel nacional.







- 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)
- 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.

**\*Note: Risk management must be done for criteria with score of 1.**

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

Se elabora un Plan de compras a inicios del año, el cual es presentado a la Junta de Proyecto para aprobación. Este instrumento es usado como herramienta de seguimiento.

**14. Is there regular monitoring and recording of cost efficiencies taking into account the expected quality of results?**

- 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)
- 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.

**\*Note: Risk management must be done for criteria with score of 1.**

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

Si se realiza la revisión de costos; la nueva Ley de compras publicas obliga que se realice un estudio de mercado previo al proceso de compra.

Effective

Status: Complete

Quality Rating: Needs Improvement

**15. Is the project is on track to deliver its expected outputs?**

- Yes
- No

**\*Note: Risk management must be done when the response is "No".**

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

Existen atrasos en la implementación del proyecto, debido a diferentes causas (Covid al inicio del proyecto; retraso en compras en 2022 por las adecuaciones de gobierno; transición del CNE a la DGEHM; micro evaluación; curva de aprendizaje por la nueva ley de compras). Se han tomado acciones para agilizar el desarrollo del proyecto, como la adaptación del proyecto a estas nuevas condiciones.

**16. 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?**

- 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)
- 2: There has been at least one review of the work plan per 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.





**19. Are 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.) 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)
- 2: National systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) are used to implement and monitor the project, but other support (such as country office support or project systems) may also be used if 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)
- 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

**\*Note: Risk management must be done for criteria with score of 1.**

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

Se sostienen reuniones de Junta de Proyecto para dar seguimiento y tomar acuerdos sobre medidas que contribuyan a corregir problemas detectados y agilizar la ejecución presupuestaria. En las Juntas de proyecto, están representados las instituciones interesadas y socios.

**20. There is regular monitoring of changes in capacities and performance of institutions and systems relevant to the project, as needed. The implementation arrangements have been adjusted according to changes in partner capacities.**

- 3: In the past two years, changes in capacities and performance of institutions and systems have been comprehensively assessed/monitored using clear indicators, rigorous methods of data collection and credible data sources including relevant 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)
- 2: In the past two years, 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 relevant HACT assurance activities. Some adjustment has been made to implementation arrangements if needed to reflect changes in partner capacities. (both 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

**\*Note: Risk management must be done for criteria with score of 1.**

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

El reconocimiento de la nueva DGEHM como Socio Implementador, fue aprobado en Junta de Proyecto. Posterior al reconocimiento se realizó la evaluación de capacidades de la DGEHM en el marco del HACT.

**21. The transition and phase-out arrangements are reviewed regularly and adjusted according to progress (including financial commitments and capacity).**

- 3: The project's governance mechanism has reviewed 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. The plan has been adjusted according to progress as needed. (both must be true)
- 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.

**\*Note: Risk management must be done for criteria with score of 1.**

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

En el documento de Revisión Sustantiva se ha previsto como mecanismo de sostenibilidad delegar las funciones del Centro de Experticia en el Centro Metropolitano de OPAMSS