

PROJECT QA ASSESSMENT: IMPLEMENTATION

OVERALL PROJECT

EXEMPLARY ●●●●●●	HIGH ●●●●○	SATISFACTORY ●●●○○	NEEDS IMPROVEMENT ●●○○○	INADEQUATE ●○○○○
At least four criteria are rated Exemplary, and all criteria are rated High or Exemplary.	All criteria are rated Satisfactory or higher, and at least four criteria are rated High or Exemplary	At least six criteria are rated Satisfactory or higher, and only one may be rated Needs Improvement. The SES criterion must be rated Satisfactory or above.	At least three criteria are rated Satisfactory or higher, and only four criteria may be rated Needs Improvement.	One or more criteria are rated Inadequate, or five or more criteria are rated Needs Improvement.

DECISION

- **CONTINUE AS PLANNED** – the project is of sufficient quality to continue as planned. All management actions must be addressed in a timely manner.
- **TAKE REMEDIAL ACTION** – the project has issues that must be addressed or the project may be suspended. If the Social and Environmental Standards criterion is below satisfactory, the project may be suspended if the deficiencies are not addressed. All management actions must be addressed in a timely manner.
- **TAKE URGENT ACTION** – the project has significant issues that require urgent management attention, or the project may be cancelled. If the Social and Environmental Standards criterion is Inadequate, the project may be cancelled.

RATING CRITERIA

STRATEGIC

<p>1. Is the project pro-actively taking advantage of new opportunities, adapting its theory of change to respond to changes in the development context, including changing national priorities? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects this project):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3: The project team completed and documented a horizon scanning exercise in the past year to identify new opportunities and changes in the development context that require adjustments in the theory of change. There is clear evidence that the project board has considered the implications, and documented changes to the project's theory of change, RRF, partnerships, etc. made in response, as appropriate. <i>(both must be true to select this option)</i> • 2: The project team has undertaken some horizon scanning in the past year to identify new opportunities and changes in the development context. The project board discussed the scanning and its implications for the project, as reflected in the board minutes. There is some evidence that the project took action as a result, but changes may not have been fully integrated in the project's theory of change, RRF, partnerships, etc. • 1: The project team may have considered new opportunities and changes in the development context since implementation began, but this has not been discussed in the project board. There is limited to no evidence that the project team has considered changes to the project as a result. This option would also be selected if no horizon scanning has been done to date during project implementation. <p>Option 3 applies: The project Team completed a horizon scanning at the beginning of 2020 and as result of this exercise the Project document and related Result Framework (RFF) and partnerships have been adjusted and approved by the Project Board on April 30, 2020.</p>	3	2
	1	
	<p>Evidence Accelerator Labs Project Board Minutes point- Agenda item 3) What does success Look like for Accelerator Labs: Review of the RFF</p>	
<p>2. Is the project aligned with the thematic focus of the UNDP Strategic Plan? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project):</p>	3	2
	1	
	<p>Evidence Accelerator Lab Project document RFF (page 18)</p>	

PROJECT QA ASSESSMENT: IMPLEMENTATION

- **3:** The project responds to one of the three areas of development work¹ as specified in the Strategic Plan; it addresses at least one of the proposed new and emerging areas²; implementation is consistent with the issues-based analysis incorporated into the project design; and the project's RRF includes at all the relevant SP output indicators. *(all must be true to select this option)*
- **2:** The project responds to one of the three areas of development work¹ as specified in the Strategic Plan. The project's RRF includes at least one SP output indicator, if relevant. *(both must be true to select this option)*
- **1:** While the project may respond to one of the three areas of development work¹ as specified in the Strategic Plan, it is based on a sectorial approach without addressing the complexity of the development issue. None of the relevant SP indicators are included in the RRF. This option is also selected if the project does not respond to any of the three SP areas of development work.

*Note: Management Action must be taken for score of 1.

Option 3 applies:

As reflected in the RFF, at the global/aggregated level the project responds to UNDP Strategic Plan (SP) Outcome 1: Accelerated delivery of top-quality programmatic results for the SDGs (SP Organizational Performance, Tier 3). More concretely, the project contributes to the indicator 1.2.6 Percentage of country offices that pilot and/or scale innovative tools and methodologies.

At the country office level, each Accelerator Lab aligns with the thematic focus of the SP at the beginning of each learning cycle which last 3-4 months. After conducting a thorough horizon scanning at country level with key partners analyzing trends of new data sources to identify emerging challenges, the Accelerator Labs identify the challenges they will be focusing on, which are included in their Action Plans. According to the Action Plans all the focus areas identified by the Labs pertain to one or more of the three **SP areas** of development work and **emerging areas** with a concentration on Area 1. "Sustainable development pathways" and in term of emerging areas there is concentration in Urbanization, Sustainable production technologies, and Social protection; 11% of the Labs focus on SDG 11 (Sustainable cities and communities), 11% on SDG 8 (Decent Jobs and economic growth), and 9% on SDG 12 on Responsible production and consumption.

Accelerator Labs Action plans for 2020, collected in [Airtable](#)

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

Not Applicable

Yes (3)	No (1)
------------	-----------

RELEVANT

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

- **3:** Systematic and structured feedback has been collected over the past year from a representative sample of beneficiaries, with a priority focus on the excluded and marginalized, as part of the project's monitoring system. Representatives from the targeted groups are active members of the project's governance mechanism (i.e., the project board or equivalent) and there is credible evidence that their feedback informs project decision making. *(all must be true to select this option)*
- **2:** Targeted groups have been engaged in implementation and monitoring, with a priority focus on the excluded and marginalized. Beneficiary feedback, which may be anecdotal, has been collected over the past year to ensure the project is addressing local priorities. This information has been used to inform project decision making. *(all must be true to select this option)*

3	2
1	
Evidence	

¹ 1. Sustainable development pathways; 2. Inclusive and effective democratic governance; 3. Resilience building

² sustainable production technologies, access to modern energy services and energy efficiency, natural resources management, extractive industries, urbanization, citizen security, social protection, and risk management for resilience

PROJECT QA ASSESSMENT: IMPLEMENTATION

- **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.

*Note: Management Action must be taken for a score of 1

Option 3 applies:

- The Labs act as conveners of different sectors and stakeholders affected by or working in a concrete problem space (challenge). The Labs are trained and encourage to systematically search for grassroots innovations under the premiss that excluded and marginalized groups can be solutions provider. In 2020, the Accelerator Labs partnered up with the Honeybee Network to conduct a year-round training on Grassroots innovations to position this approach at the centre of the solutions mapping methodology. In 2020 alone, the Labs documented over 1,700 grassroots solutions to address 147 development challenges, covering all 17 SDGs.

Moreover, the Honeybee Network is one the main knowledge partners of the project and they are one of the members of the Strategic Advisory Group, a key component of the project's governance who advises the Project Board. The Strategic Advisory Groups is composed of Donors and globally distinguished experts in development innovation and SDG acceleration, as well as representatives from strategic investors and funding partners to this project.

3	2
---	---

1

Evidence

2- evidence: paper on lesson learned an [audit report](#)

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

- **3:** Knowledge and lessons learned backed (gained, for example, from Peer Assists, After Action Reviews or Lessons Learned Workshops) by credible evidence from evaluation, corporate policies/strategies, analysis and monitoring have been discussed in project board meetings and reflected in the minutes. There is clear evidence that the project's theory of change has been adjusted, as needed, and changes were made to the project to ensure its continued relevance. *(both must be true to select this option)*
- **2:** Knowledge and lessons learned backed by relatively limited evidence, drawn mainly from within the project, have been considered by the project team. There is some evidence that changes were made to the project as a result to ensure its continued relevance. *(both must be true to select this option)*
- **1:** There is limited or no evidence that knowledge and lessons learned have been collected by the project team. There is little or no evidence that this has informed project decision making.

*Note: Management Action must be taken for a score of 1

3	2
---	---

1

Evidence

[Accelerator Lab Project document RFF](#) (page 18)

6. Are the project's measures (through outputs, activities, indicators) to address gender inequalities and empower women relevant and producing the intended effect? If not, evidence-based adjustments and changes have been made. (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project):

- **3:** The project team has systematically gathered data and evidence through project monitoring on the relevance of the measures to address gender inequalities and empowering women. Analysis of data and evidence were used to inform adjustments and changes, as appropriate. *(both must be true to select this option)*
- **2:** The project team has some data and evidence on the relevance of the measures to address gender inequalities and empowering women. There is evidence that at least some adjustments were made, as appropriate. *(both must be true to select this option)*
- **1:** The project team has limited or no evidence on the relevance of measures to address gender inequalities and empowering women. No evidence of adjustments and/or changes being made. This option should also be selected if the project has no measures to address gender inequalities and empowering women relevant to the project results and activities.

*Note: Management Action must be taken for a score of 1

Option 3 applies:

PROJECT QA ASSESSMENT: IMPLEMENTATION

The RFF has been improved and adjusted in agreement with all different Regional Bureaus, to include data disaggregated by gender and other variables to advance the principle of Leave No One Behind in indicators, when applicable:

1.3 Number of sustainable development solutions identified and documented.

1.4 Variety of innovation methods used to test and iterate over the different hypotheses.

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

- **3:** There is credible evidence that the project is reaching a sufficient number of beneficiaries (either directly through significant coverage of target groups, or indirectly, through policy change) to meaningfully contribute to development change.
- **2:** While the project is currently not at scale, there are explicit plans in place to scale up the project in the future (e.g. by extending its coverage or using project results to advocate for policy change).
- **1:** The project is not at scale, and there are no plans currently to scale up the project in the future.

Option 3 applies:

From November 2019 until May 2020 the project’s global team partnered up with a group of students from Columbia University School of International and Public Affairs (SIPA) to learn from the Labs’ experiences and understand what their needs are to strategically plan for the next grow or scaling phase.

After conducting a deep research and engaging with the initial 60 Labs, the SIPA group developed the hands-on report “Strategy to scale social innovation for development” to support the Labs and other UNDP innovation project to identify scalable solutions and plan accordingly.

According to the independent research conducted by the SIPA team related to the work of the Labs during their initial six months of operations, there is sufficient evidence to support replicability of the overall approach of the Lab cycle (sensing/exploring/experimenting) to scale solutions out, up, and deep and start transferring vetted products, process and services lines towards UNDP, Governments and the private sector is key to achieve impact.

In 2020 alone, the Labs:

- Addressed 147 development challenges, covering all 17 SDGs.
- Documented over 1,700 grassroots solutions and used 48 different innovation methods and approaches.
- Published 360 blog pieces – one a day – on critical development challenges and learning processes.
- Eighteen government counterparts adopted a selection of Accelerator Lab's tools and methods.
- Established 520 partnerships with the government, private sector, civil society organizations, academia, and the UN system.

3	2
---	---

1

Evidence
[Strategy to scale social innovation for development](#)

SOCIAL & ENVIRONMENTAL STANDARDS

8. Does the project seek to further the realization of human rights using a human rights-based approach? (select from options 1-3 that best reflects this project):

- **3:** Credible evidence that the project furthers the realization of human rights, on the basis on applying a human rights-based approach. Any potential adverse impacts on enjoyment of human rights are actively identified, managed and mitigated through the project’s management of risks. (*all must be true to select this option*)
- **2:** Some evidence that the project furthers the realization of human rights. Potential adverse impacts on the enjoyment of human rights have been identified and are adequately mitigated through the project’s management of risks.
- **1:** No evidence that the project aims to further the realization of human rights. Limited or no evidence that potential adverse impacts on enjoyment of human rights are managed.

3	2
---	---

1

Evidence

PROJECT QA ASSESSMENT: IMPLEMENTATION

*Note: Management action or strong management justification must be given for a score of 1

Option 2 applies:

The project has been designed with a 'Human Rights Based Approach' at the center to empower local communities, social and grassroots innovators to advance in the implementation of tested local solutions to foster the achievement of the SDG and human rights using a top-down and bottom-up approaches in combination/synergy. The project provides space to experimentation, iteration, reflection, and improvement of local solutions found in collaboration and consultations with usual and unusual partners to respond to the needs of all groups, including those without immediate 'development potential'.

The Labs considers the full range of rights, when conducting sensemaking, priority setting and identification of challenges and when searching for solutions with a collective intelligence approach, reaching out and including different sectors, -but specially the most vulnerable ones- affected by a challenge under the premise that no goal or right can be pursued to the detriment of other rights.

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

Yes (3)	No (1)
------------	-----------

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

Yes (3)	No (1)
------------	-----------

MANAGEMENT & MONITORING

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

3	2
1	

- **3:** The project has a comprehensive and costed M&E plan. Baselines, targets and milestones are fully populated. Progress data against indicators in the project’s RRF is being reported regularly using credible data sources and collected according to the frequency stated in the Plan, including sex disaggregated data as relevant. Any evaluations conducted, if relevant, fully meet decentralized evaluation standards, including gender UNEG standards. Lessons learned, including during evaluations and/or After Action Reviews, are used to take corrective actions when necessary. *(all must be true to select this option)*
- **2:** The project has a costed M&E Plan, and most baselines and targets are populated. Progress data against indicators in the project’s RRF is collected on a regular basis, although there may be some slippage in following the frequency stated in the Plan and data sources are not always reliable. Any evaluations conducted, if relevant, meet most decentralized evaluation standards. Lessons learned have been captured but may not have been used to take corrective actions yet. *(all must be true to select this option)*
- **1:** The project has an M&E Plan, but costs are not clearly planned and budgeted for, or are unrealistic. Progress data is not being regularly collected against the indicators in the project’s RRF. Evaluations may not meet decentralized evaluation standards. Lessons learned are rarely captured and used. Select this option also if the project does not have an M&E plan.

Evidence

[Accelerator Lab Project document \(page 25\)](#)

ATLAS M&E module

[ToR Mid Term Evaluation](#)

Option 3 applies:

The project has a comprehensive and costed M&E plan included in the project document and approved by the Project Board. Baselines, targets and milestones are fully populated in ATLAS and progress data against each indicator in the project’s RRF is being conducted regularly using as data the Labs Actions plans, closure survey and reflections at the end of the later, social media and blog trackers, and all sources of evidence included in the approved RFF.

At the moment (December 2020) the Global Team is hiring an independent consultant to conduct the Mid Term Evaluation (MTE), which is expected to start at the beginning of 2021, following evaluation standards, including gender UNEG standards. Lessons learned, generated as part of the MTE, are expected to be used to take corrective actions when necessary.

PROJECT QA ASSESSMENT: IMPLEMENTATION

*Note: Management Action must be taken for a score of 1				
<p>12. Is project's governance mechanism (i.e., the project board or equivalent) functioning as intended? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3: The project's governance mechanism is operating well and is a model for other projects. It has met in the agreed frequency stated in the project document and the minutes of the meetings are on file. There is regular (at least annual) progress reporting to the project board or equivalent on results, risks and opportunities. It is clear that the project board explicitly reviews and uses evidence, including progress data, knowledge, lessons and evaluations, as the basis for informing management decisions (e.g., change in strategy, approach, work plan.) <i>(all must be true to select this option)</i> • 2: The project's governance mechanism has met in the agreed frequency and the minutes of the meeting are on file. A project progress report has been submitted to the project board or equivalent at least once in the past year, covering results, risks and opportunities. <i>(both must be true to select this option)</i> • 1: The project's governance mechanism has not met in the frequency stated in the project document over the past year and/or the project board or equivalent is not functioning as a decision-making body for the project as intended. <p>Option 3 applies:</p> <p>The project's governance mechanism approved by the Project Board is operating well and includes Directors and/or Deputies of all UNDP Bureaus. The Project Board has met one time after the approval of the project, which is in line with the agreed frequency stated in the project document and the minutes of the meetings are on file. There is regular (at least annual) progress reporting to the Project Board to share results, risks and opportunities and there is one meeting planned for mid 2021. The Project Board members receive and review evidence, including progress data, knowledge, lessons and evaluations in advance of the meeting as the basis for informing management decisions.</p> <p>*Note: Management Action must be taken for a score of 1</p>		3	2	
		1		
		<p>Evidence</p> <p>Accelerator Lab Project document (page 29).</p> <p>Minutes Project Board</p>		
<p>13. Are risks to the project adequately monitored and managed? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3: The project has actively monitored risks every quarter including consulting with key stakeholders at least once in the past year to identify continuing and emerging risks to project implementation and to assess if the main assumptions remain valid. There is clear evidence that relevant management plans and mitigating measures are being fully implemented to address each key project risk and have been updated to reflect the latest risk assessment. <i>(all must be true to select this option)</i> • 2: The project has monitored risks every quarter, as evidenced by an updated risk log. Some updates have been made to management plans and mitigation measures. • 1: The risk log has not been updated every quarter as required. There may be some evidence that the project has monitored risks that may affect the project's achievement of results, but there is no explicit evidence that management actions have been taken to mitigate risks. <p>Option 3 applies:</p> <p>Following the planning in terms of risks included in the Project Document, the global team actively monitors risks on a monthly basis through the analysis of the Labs' weekly reflections and monthly blogs to identify risks on scaling, resistance, availability of local partners and delays. UNDP's Social and Environmental Standards are also considered.</p> <p>In addition, from September-December 2020 the project was subject to an external Audit on performance, conducted in accordance with UNDP's audit policy to assess performance risks. The Audit had a Satisfactory rating with some recommendations for improvement, none of them high-risk.</p>		3	2	
		1		
		<p>Evidence</p> <p>ATLAS ToR Audit Audit exit notes</p>		

PROJECT QA ASSESSMENT: IMPLEMENTATION

On a regular basis, relevant management plans and mitigating measures are implemented to address each key project risk and have been updated to reflect the latest risk assessment.

According to UNDP [main policy on Engagement Facility](#), all policies on corporate and country-level reporting, the SESP, audit and risk management equally apply to the engagement facility. In this line at the Lab's all the risks are identified and monitored via ATLAS through each Engagement facility.

*Note: Management Action must be taken for a score of 1

EFFICIENT

14. Adequate resources have been mobilized to achieve intended results. If not, management decisions were taken to adjust expected results in the project's results framework.

Yes (3)	No (1)
------------	-----------

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

3	2
---	---

- **3:** The project has an updated procurement plan. Implementation of the plan is on or ahead of schedule. The project quarterly reviews operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addresses them through appropriate management actions. *(all must be true to select this option)*
- **2:** The project has an updated procurement plan. The project annually reviews operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addresses them through appropriate management actions. *(all must be true to select this option)*
- **1:** The project does not have an updated procurement plan. The project may or may not have reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner, however management actions have not been taken to address them.

1

Evidence
3- procurement plan attached and all in track

*Note: Management Action must be taken for a score of 1

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

3	2
---	---

- **3:** There is evidence that the project regularly reviews costs against relevant comparators (e.g., other projects or country offices) or industry benchmarks to ensure the project maximizes results that can be delivered with given resources. The project actively coordinates with other relevant ongoing projects and initiatives (UNDP or other) to ensure complementarity and seek efficiencies wherever possible (e.g., joint activities.) *(both must be true to select this option)*
- **2:** The project monitors its own costs and gives anecdotal examples of cost efficiencies (e.g., spending less to get the same result,) but there is no systematic analysis of costs and no link to the expected quality of results delivered. The project coordinates activities with other projects to achieve cost efficiency gains.
- **1:** There is little or no evidence that the project monitors its own costs and is considering ways to save money beyond following standard procurement rules.

1

Evidence
2- There is internal analysis for the preparation of the AWP (attached) +sustainability analysis (attached)

EFFECTIVE

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

Yes (3)	No (1)
------------	-----------

18. Have there been regular reviews of the work plan to ensure that the project is on track to achieve the desired results, and to inform course corrections if needed? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project):

3	2
---	---

- **3:** Quarterly progress data has informed regular reviews of the project work plan to ensure that the activities implemented are most likely to achieve the desired results. There is evidence that data and lessons learned (including from evaluations and/or After Action Reviews) have been used to inform course corrections, as needed. Any necessary budget revisions have been made. *(both must be true to select this option)*
- **2:** There has been at least one review of the work plan during the year to assess if project activities are on track to achieving the desired development results (i.e., outputs.) There may or may not be evidence that data or lessons learned has been used to inform the review(s). Any necessary budget revisions have been made.

1

Evidence
Project Board minutes

PROJECT QA ASSESSMENT: IMPLEMENTATION

- **1:** While the project team may have reviewed the work plan at least once over the past year to ensure outputs are delivered on time, no link has been made to the delivery of desired development results. Select this option also if no review of the work plan by management has taken place over the past year.

Option 3 applies:

The project was revised in 2020 and new indicators were agreed among different Bureaus. The Accelerator Lab network is an initiative about making space for creativity in the face of problems that need new methods, skills and energy. As such, setting a predefined set of indicators of success for UNDP's Accelerator Lab initiative from the start was challenging. In 2020, as an exercise in iteration, the Monitoring and Evaluation plans have been updated to reflect the lab network's experience.

*Note: Management Action must be taken for a score of 1

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

- **3:** The project is targeting specific groups and/or geographic areas, identified by using credible data sources on their capacity needs, deprivation and/or exclusion from development opportunities relevant to the project's area of work. There is clear evidence that the targeted groups are being reached as intended. The project has engaged regularly with targeted groups over the past year to assess whether they are benefiting as expected and adjustments were made if necessary, to refine targeting. *(all must be true to select this option)*
- **2:** The project is targeting specific groups and/or geographic areas, based on some evidence of their capacity needs, deprivation and/or exclusion from development opportunities relevant to the project's area of work. Some evidence is provided to confirm that project beneficiaries are members of the targeted groups. There has been some engagement with beneficiaries in the past year to assess whether they are benefiting as expected. *(all must be true to select this option)*
- **1:** The project does not report on specific targeted groups. There is no evidence to confirm that project beneficiaries are populations have capacity needs or are deprived and/or excluded from development opportunities relevant to the project area of work. There may have been some engagement with beneficiaries to assess whether they are benefiting as expected, but it has been limited or has not occurred in the past year.

Option 3 applies:

By design, the project targets specific geographic areas. With the addition of 32 new Labs in 2020, the Lab Network for 92 Labs covers 79% of Least Developed Countries (LDCs), 52% of Low-Income Countries (LICs) and 71% of Small Islands and Developing States.

3	2
1	

Evidence
[Project Map coverage](#)

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

Yes (3)	No (1)
--------------------	-------------------

SUSTAINABILITY & NATIONAL OWNERSHIP

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

- **3:** Only national systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) are used to fully implement and monitor the project. All relevant stakeholders and partners are fully and actively engaged in the process, playing a lead role in project decision-making, implementation and monitoring. *(both must be true to select this option)*
- **2:** National systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) are used in combination with other support (such as country office support or project systems) to implement and monitor the project, as necessary. All relevant stakeholders and partners are fully and actively engaged in the process, playing an active role in project decision-making, implementation and monitoring. *(both must be true to select this option)*

3	2
1	

Evidence

PROJECT QA ASSESSMENT: IMPLEMENTATION

- **1:** There is relatively limited or no engagement with national stakeholders and partners in the decision-making, implementation and/or monitoring of the project.

Since this is Global Project the questions is not applicable.

*Note: Management Action must be taken for a score of 1

22. There is regular monitoring of changes in capacities and performance of national institutions and systems relevant to the project. The implementation arrangements³ have been adjusted according to changes in partner capacities. (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project):

- **3:** In the past year, changes in capacities and performance of national institutions and systems have been comprehensively assessed/monitored using clear indicators, rigorous methods of data collection and credible data sources including HACT assurance activities. Implementation arrangements have been formally reviewed and adjusted, if needed, in agreement with partners according to changes in partner capacities. *(both must be true to select this option)*
- **2:** In the past year, aspects of changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems have been monitored by the project using indicators and reasonably credible data sources including HACT assurance activities. Some adjustment has been made to implementation arrangements if needed to reflect changes in partner capacities. *(both must be true to select this option)*
- **1:** Some aspects of changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems may have been monitored by the project, however changes to implementation arrangements have not been considered. Also select this option if changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems have not been monitored by the project.

Since this is Global Project the questions is not applicable.

*Note: Management Action must be taken for a score of 1

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

- **3:** The project's governance mechanism has reviewed the project's sustainability plan in the past year, including arrangements for transition and phase-out, to ensure the project is on track in meeting the requirements set out by the plan. The plan has been adjusted according to progress as needed. *(both must be true to select this option)*
- **2:** There has been a review of the project's sustainability plan, including arrangements for transition and phase-out, to ensure the project is on track in meeting the requirements set out by the plan.
- **1:** The project may have a sustainability plan, but there has not been a review of this strategy since it was developed. Also select this option if the project does not have a sustainability strategy.

Option 1 applies

The project has been extended by the Project Board to close in December 2023, for two additional years from the initial plan, to accommodate three years implementation for the new 32 Labs added to the Network in 2020. The global team, in consultation with Resident Coordinators, Founding Investors and different Bureaus is currently working in a sustainability plan, that includes a phase out initial 60 Labs and available options for the uptake of the Lab's work by UNDP, Government or private sector, depending on each case.

The project is currently designing a sustainability plan not limited to the Labs' continuation as structures, but rather of the ways of working (protocols) that the Accelerator Labs employ. The Accelerator Labs' work may continue either through a) through nationally raised resources and remain in UNDP to hand over the lab capabilities to government either at national or sub-national level. The Project Board is expected to revised a sustainability plan with models to implement a phase out of the project that secures continuation of the achievement of the Labs in mid 2021.

3	2
---	---

1

Evidence

3	2
---	---

1

Evidence

³ Responsible Parties, Direct Country Office Support (DCOS), MOUs/LOAs

PROJECT QA ASSESSMENT: IMPLEMENTATION

*Note: Management Action must be taken for a score of 1

