ASM-05770 - Quality Assurance - Design

Procedure Year: 2023

Overall Project Risk Categorization: Highly Satisfactory

Procedure Status: Approved

Procedure Name: ASM-05770

Procedure Department: CO - Republic of North Macedonia

Procedure Type: Design

Record Owner: Anita Kodzoman

Created by: Anita Kodzoman,3/30/2024, 12:16 PM

Last Modified by: Sanja BOJANIC,4/1/2024, 3:32 AM

Decision:

QA Summary/Project Board Comments:

RELATED PROJECTS(1)					
NAME	DEPARTMENT	STATUS	ATLAS PROJECT NUMBER	START DATE	END DATE
01001677	CO - Republic of North Macedonia	On Going		12/11/2023	6/11/2027

RELATED SESPS(1)		
PARENT PROCEDURE	PROCEDURE TYPE	PROCEDURE YEAR
ASM-05545	SESP (Social and Environmental Screening Procedure)	2024

Approval History

Approval Date: Mon Apr 01 00:00:00 GMT 2024

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

Reassess Closed Procedure History:

APPROVAL HISTORY			
STEP NAME	DATE	STATUS	ASSIGNED TO
Submitted for Approval	2024-04-01 03:32:48	Approved	Sanja BOJANIC
Approval Request Submitted	2024-04-01 03:29:19	Started	Anita Kodzoman

Identified Risks & Treatments

Category: 3. Operational

Risk Significance: Moderate

Risk Significance: Moderate

Sub-Category: 3.8. Capacities of the partners

Event:

There is a risk that insufficient interest of local stakeholders/project beneficiaries to change existing practices in agriculture and tourism.

Causes:

As a result of inadequate capacities and knowledge

Impact:

Which can result in limited achievement of expected results related to application of sustainable agriculture and tourism practices.

RELATED TREATMENTS(1)

ACTIVITIES FOR TREATMENT	EXPECTED EFFECT	TIME PLAN FOR COMPLETE	STATUS	COMMENTS
UNDP will invest in targeted capacity building of the farmers and individuals/entities in tourism industry, and will facilitate potential partnerships among various stakeholders, including CSOs and private sector.	Adoption of sustainable practices in agriculture and tourism sectors that will created opportunities for increased income but will also be beneficial for the environment and nature in the Prespa region	6/11/2027	Ongoing	

Category: 7. Strategic

Risk Significance: Moderate

Risk Significance: Moderate

Sub-Category: 7.3. Stakeholder relations and partnerships

Event:

There is a risk of overlapping with other similar programmes that support investment in sustainable agriculture and tourism

Causes:

As a result of insufficient coordination among the relevant national entities

Impact:

Which will result in inappropriate spending of financial resources

RELATED TREATMENTS(1)				
ACTIVITIES FOR TREATMENT	EXPECTED EFFECT	TIME PLAN FOR COMPLETE	STATUS	COMMENTS
The Project team will establish close coordination with all ongoing programmes in order to ensure synergies and prevent overlap. The Steering Committee of the overall EU for Prespa Programme will be utilized as a mechanism for coordination among all relevant stakeholders	Increased impact and actions on the ground	6/11/2027	Ongoing	

Risk Significance: Moderate

Sub-Category: 7.5. Government commitment

Event:

Stalled support for advancement of the EU agenda in the country

Causes:

As a result of the barriers that are slowing down the progress of the accession process are decreasing the public support and enthusiasm of the population.

Impact:

Which can result in non-fulfillment of obligations assumed by the Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning and/or local self-government of Resen that will jeopardize achievement of planned results related to waste management component of the project

RELATED TREATMENTS(1)				
ACTIVITIES FOR TREATMENT	EXPECTED EFFECT	TIME PLAN FOR COMPLETE	STATUS	COMMENTS
The Project will engage closely with the Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning and the local government of Resen and other key local stakeholders explaining the benefits of the support received from EU. Additionally, targeted public awareness raising programs which are part of the overall EU for Prespa Action shall contribute in mitigation of this risk.	Increased support for the EU accession and adoption of relevant EU policies and practices	6/11/2027	Ongoing	

Risk Significance: Moderate

Sub-Category: 7.6. Change/ turnover in government

Event:

There is a risk of political instability and early and or regular elections

Causes:

As a result of change of the Government and its priorities on central and local level

Impact:

Which will result in delays in the implementation of some of the project activities

RELATED TREATMENTS(1)				
ACTIVITIES FOR TREATMENT	EXPECTED EFFECT	TIME PLAN FOR COMPLETE	STATUS	COMMENTS
The Project will take into consideration the election cycle and shall plan the activities having in mind potential impact of the elections, and the most critical activities that require involvement of the central and/or local governments. The Project shall closely monitor the development of the political situation and will	Smooth implementation of the project activities and achievement of the planned results.	6/11/2027	Ongoing	

RELATED TREATMENTS(1)				
ACTIVITIES FOR TREATMENT	EXPECTED EFFECT	TIME PLAN FOR COMPLETE	STATUS	COMMENTS
keep acting on impartial way, taking into consideration only the interest of the citizens as the ultimate beneficiaries of the Project.				

Category: 7. Strategic

Risk Significance: Moderate

Risk Significance: Moderate

Sub-Category: 7.3. Stakeholder relations and partnerships

Event:

There is a risk of overlapping with other similar programmes that support investment in sustainable agriculture and tourism

Causes:

As a result of insufficient coordination among the relevant national entities

Impact:

Which will result in inappropriate spending of financial resources

RELATED TREATMENTS(1)				
ACTIVITIES FOR TREATMENT	EXPECTED EFFECT	TIME PLAN FOR COMPLETE	STATUS	COMMENTS
The Project team will establish close coordination with all ongoing programmes in order to ensure synergies and prevent overlap. The Steering Committee of the overall EU for Prespa Programme will be utilized as a mechanism for coordination among all relevant stakeholders	Increased impact and actions on the ground	6/11/2027	Ongoing	

Risk Significance: Moderate

Sub-Category: 7.5. Government commitment

Event:

Stalled support for advancement of the EU agenda in the country

Causes:

As a result of the barriers that are slowing down the progress of the accession process are decreasing the public support and enthusiasm of the population.

Impact:

Which can result in non-fulfillment of obligations assumed by the Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning and/or local self-government of Resen that will jeopardize achievement of planned results related to waste management component of the project

RELATED TREATMENTS(1)				
ACTIVITIES FOR TREATMENT	EXPECTED EFFECT	TIME PLAN FOR COMPLETE	STATUS	COMMENTS
The Project will engage closely with the Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning and the local government of Resen and other key local stakeholders explaining the benefits of the support received from EU. Additionally, targeted public awareness raising programs which are part of the overall EU for Prespa Action shall contribute in mitigation of this risk.	Increased support for the EU accession and adoption of relevant EU policies and practices	6/11/2027	Ongoing	

Risk Significance: Moderate

Sub-Category: 7.6. Change/ turnover in government

Event:

There is a risk of political instability and early and or regular elections

Causes:

As a result of change of the Government and its priorities on central and local level

Impact:

Which will result in delays in the implementation of some of the project activities

RELATED TREATMENTS(1)				
ACTIVITIES FOR TREATMENT	EXPECTED EFFECT	TIME PLAN FOR COMPLETE	STATUS	COMMENTS
The Project will take into consideration the election cycle and shall plan the activities having in mind potential impact of the elections, and the most critical activities that require involvement of the central and/or local governments. The Project shall closely monitor the development of the political situation and will keep acting on impartial way, taking into consideration only the interest of the citizens as the ultimate beneficiaries of the Project.	Smooth implementation of the project activities and achievement of the planned results.	6/11/2027	Ongoing	

Category: 7. Strategic

Risk Significance: Moderate

Risk Significance: Moderate

Sub-Category: 7.3. Stakeholder relations and partnerships

Event:

There is a risk of overlapping with other similar programmes that support investment in sustainable agriculture and tourism

Causes:

As a result of insufficient coordination among the relevant national entities

Impact:

Which will result in inappropriate spending of financial resources

RELATED TREATMENTS(1)				
ACTIVITIES FOR TREATMENT	EXPECTED EFFECT	TIME PLAN FOR COMPLETE	STATUS	COMMENTS
The Project team will establish close coordination with all ongoing programmes in order to ensure synergies and prevent overlap. The Steering Committee of the overall EU	Increased impact and actions on the ground	6/11/2027	Ongoing	

RELATED TREATMENTS(1)				
ACTIVITIES FOR TREATMENT	EXPECTED EFFECT	TIME PLAN FOR COMPLETE	STATUS	COMMENTS
for Prespa Programme will be utilized as a mechanism for coordination among all relevant stakeholders				

Risk Significance: Moderate

Sub-Category: 7.5. Government commitment

Event:

Stalled support for advancement of the EU agenda in the country

Causes:

As a result of the barriers that are slowing down the progress of the accession process are decreasing the public support and enthusiasm of the population.

Impact:

Which can result in non-fulfillment of obligations assumed by the Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning and/or local self-government of Resen that will jeopardize achievement of planned results related to waste management component of the project

RELATED TREATMENTS(1)				
ACTIVITIES FOR TREATMENT	EXPECTED EFFECT	TIME PLAN FOR COMPLETE	STATUS	COMMENTS
The Project will engage closely with the Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning and the local government of Resen and other key local stakeholders explaining the benefits of the support received from EU. Additionally, targeted public awareness raising programs which are part of the overall EU for Prespa Action shall contribute in mitigation of this risk.	Increased support for the EU accession and adoption of relevant EU policies and practices	6/11/2027	Ongoing	

Risk Significance: Moderate

Sub-Category: 7.6. Change/ turnover in government

Event:

There is a risk of political instability and early and or regular elections

Causes:

As a result of change of the Government and its priorities on central and local level

Impact:

Which will result in delays in the implementation of some of the project activities

RELATED TREATMENTS(1)				
ACTIVITIES FOR TREATMENT	EXPECTED EFFECT	TIME PLAN FOR COMPLETE	STATUS	COMMENTS
The Project will take into consideration the election cycle and shall plan the activities having in mind potential impact of the elections, and the most critical activities that require involvement of the central and/or local governments. The Project shall closely monitor the development of the political situation and will keep acting on impartial way, taking into consideration only the interest of the citizens as the ultimate beneficiaries of the Project.	Smooth implementation of the project activities and achievement of the planned results.	6/11/2027	Ongoing	

QA Questionnaire:

Strategic Status: Complete Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory

1. Does the project specify how it will contribute to higher level change through linkage to the programme's Theory of Change?

(●) 3: The project is clearly linked to the programme's theory of change. It has an explicit change pathway that explains how the project will contribute to outcome level change and why the project's strategy will likely lead to this change. This analysis is backed by credible evidence of what works effectively in this context and includes assumptions and risks.

( ) 2: The project is clearly linked to the programme's theory of change. It has a change pathway that explains how the project will contribute to outcome-level change and why the project strategy will likely lead to this change.

( ) 1: The project document may describe in generic terms how the project will contribute to development results, without an explicit link to the programme's theory of change.

*Note: Projects not contributing to a programme must have a project-specific Theory of Change. See alternative question under the information icon for these cases.
*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)

Project Document uploaded

2. Is the project aligned with the UNDP Strategic Plan?

- 3: The project responds to at least one of the development settings as specified in the Strategic Plan and adapts at least one Signature Solution. The project's RRF includes all the relevant SP output indicators. (all must be true)
- (●) 2: The project responds to at least one of the development settings as specified in the Strategic Plan. The project's RRF includes at least one SP output indicator, if relevant. (both must be true)
- 1: The project responds to a partner's identified need, but 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.

*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)

ProDoc uploaded

3. Is the project linked to the programme outputs? (i.e., UNSDCF/CPD, RPD or Strategic Plan IRRF for strategic interventions not part of a programme)

- (●) YES
- NO

*Note: Project QA cannot be approved by Project QA Approver when the response is "No".

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

Yes. Outcome 3; Output 3.2

Relevant Status: Complete Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory

4. Does the project identify target groups , and particularly those marginalized, vulnerable and left further behind (LNOB)

- 3: The LNOB target groups are clearly specified, prioritising discriminated, and marginalized groups left furthest behind, identified through a rigorous process based on evidence.
- (●) 2: The LNOB target groups are clearly specified, prioritizing groups left furthest behind.
- 1: The LNOB target groups are not clearly specified.

*Note: Risk management must be done for criteria with score of 1. Projects that build institutional capacity should still identify targeted groups to justify support.

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

{rpDoc uploaded

5. Have knowledge, good practices, and past lessons learned of UNDP and others informed the project design?

- (●) 3: Knowledge and lessons learned backed by credible evidence from sources such as evaluation, corporate policies/strategies, and/or monitoring have been explicitly used, with appropriate referencing, to justify the approach used by the project.
- 2: The project design mentions knowledge and lessons learned backed by evidence/sources but have not been used to justify the approach selected.

1: There is little, or no mention of knowledge and lessons learned informing the project design. Any references made are anecdotal and not backed by evidence.

*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)

ProDoc uploaded

6. Does UNDP have a clear advantage to engage in the role envisioned by the project vis-à-vis national / regional / global partners and other actors?

3: An analysis has been conducted on the role of other partners in the area where the project intends to work, and credible evidence supports the proposed engagement of UNDP and partners through the project, including identification of potential funding partners. It is clear how results achieved by partners will complement the project's intended results and a communication strategy is in place to communicate results and raise visibility vis-à-vis key partners. Options for south-south and triangular cooperation have been considered, as appropriate. (all must be true)

2: Some analysis has been conducted on the role of other partners in the area where the project intends to work, and relatively limited evidence supports the proposed engagement of and division of labour between UNDP and partners through the project, with unclear funding and communications strategies or plans.

1: No clear analysis has been conducted on the role of other partners in the area that the project intends to work. There is risk that the project overlaps and/or does not coordinate with partners' interventions in this area. Options for south-south and triangular cooperation have not been considered, despite its potential relevance.

*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)

UNDP was selected to implemented the project at the Call for Proposals issues by the EU Delegation in Skopje. During the project design comprehensive process for identification of other players in the Prespa region was carried out. Clear division of activities that will be supported by UNDP vs. the activities that will be implemented and funded by the national partners and the EU Delegation was made. This reflected in the project document.

Principled | Status: Complete | Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory

7. Does the project apply a human rights-based approach?

3: The project is guided by human rights and incorporates the principles of accountability, meaningful participation, and non-discrimination in the project's strategy. The project upholds the relevant international and national laws and standards. Any potential adverse impacts on enjoyment of human rights were rigorously identified and assessed as relevant, with appropriate mitigation and management measures incorporated into project design and budget. (all must be true)

2: The project is guided by human rights by prioritizing accountability, meaningful participation and non-discrimination. Potential adverse impacts on enjoyment of human rights were identified and assessed as relevant, and appropriate mitigation and management measures incorporated into the project design and budget. (both must be true)

1: No evidence that the project is guided by human rights. Limited or no evidence that potential adverse impacts on enjoyment of human rights were considered

*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)

ProDoc and SESP

8. Does the project use gender analysis in the project design?

3: A participatory gender analysis has been conducted and results from this gender analysis inform the development challenge, strategy and expected results sections of the project document. Outputs and indicators of the results framework include explicit references to gender equality, and specific indicators measure and monitor results to ensure women are fully benefitting from the project. (all must be true)

- ( ) 2: A basic gender analysis has been carried out and results from this analysis are scattered (i.e., fragmented and not consistent) across the development challenge and strategy sections of the project document. The results framework may include some gender sensitive outputs and/or activities but gender inequalities are not consistently integrated across each output. (all must be true)
- ( ) 1: The project design may or may not mention information and/or data on the differential impact of the project's development situation on gender relations, women and men, but the gender inequalities have not been clearly identified and reflected in the project document.

*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)

Results Framework of the ProDoc

9. Did the project support the resilience and sustainability of societies and/or ecosystems?

- ( ) 3: Credible evidence that the project addresses sustainability and resilience dimensions of development challenges, which are integrated in the project strategy and design. The project reflects the interconnections between the social, economic and environmental dimensions of sustainable development. Relevant shocks, hazards and adverse social and environmental impacts have been identified and rigorously assessed with appropriate management and mitigation measures incorporated into project design and budget. (all must be true)
- (•) 2: The project design integrates sustainability and resilience dimensions of development challenges. Relevant shocks, hazards and adverse social and environmental impacts have been identified and assessed, and relevant management and mitigation measures incorporated into project design and budget. (both must be true)
- ( ) 1: Sustainability and resilience dimensions and impacts were not adequately considered.

*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)

ProDoc

10. Has the Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) been conducted to identify potential social and environmental impacts and risks? The SESP is not required for projects in which UNDP is Administrative Agent only and/or projects comprised solely of the preparation and dissemination of reports and communication materials; organization of events, workshops, or training; strengthening capacities of partners to participate in international negotiations and conferences; partnership coordination (including UN coordination) and management of networks; and global/regional projects with no country-level activities as well as Development Effectiveness projects and Institutional Effectiveness projects. [If yes, upload the completed checklist. If SESP is not required, Select all exemption criteria that apply.]

- (•) Yes
- ( ) No
- ( ) SESP not required because project consists solely of (Select all exemption criteria that apply)

***Applicable only to option "SESP not required"**

- [ ] 1: Preparation and dissemination of reports, documents and communication materials
- [ ] 2: Organization of an event, workshop, training
- [ ] 3: Strengthening capacities of partners to participate in international negotiations and conferences
- [ ] 4: Partnership coordination (including UN coordination) and management of networks
- [ ] 5: Global/regional projects with no country level activities (e.g. knowledge management, inter-governmental processes)
- [ ] 6: UNDP acting as Administrative Agent
- [ ] 7: Development Effectiveness projects and Institutional Effectiveness projects

*Note: Project QA cannot be approved by Project QA Approver when the response is “No”.

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

SESP included i

Management & Monitoring | Status: Complete | Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory

11. Does the project have a strong results framework?

- (●) 3: The project's selection of outputs and activities are at an appropriate level. Outputs are accompanied by SMART, results-oriented indicators that measure the key expected development changes, each with credible data sources and populated baselines and targets, including gender sensitive, target group focused, sex-disaggregated indicators where appropriate. (all must be true)
- ( ) 2: The project's selection of outputs and activities are at an appropriate level. Outputs are accompanied by SMART, results-oriented indicators, but baselines, targets and data sources may not yet be fully specified. Some use of target group focused, sex-disaggregated indicators, as appropriate. (all must be true)
- ( ) 1: The project's selection of outputs and activities are not at an appropriate level; outputs are not accompanied by SMART, results-oriented indicators that measure the expected change and have not been populated with baselines and targets; data sources are not specified, and/or no gender sensitive, sex-disaggregation of indicators. (if any is true)

*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)

Result Framework of the ProDoc

12. Is the project's governance mechanism clearly defined in the project document, including composition of the project board?

- ( ) 3: The project's governance mechanism is fully defined. Individuals have been specified for each position in the governance mechanism (especially all members of the project board.) Project Board members have agreed on their roles and responsibilities as specified in the terms of reference. The ToR of the project board has been attached to the project document. (all must be true)
- (●) 2: The project's governance mechanism is defined; specific institutions are noted as holding key governance roles, but individuals may not have been specified yet. The project document lists the most important responsibilities of the project board, project director/manager and quality assurance roles. (all must be true)
- ( ) 1: The project's governance mechanism is loosely defined in the project document, only mentioning key roles that will need to be filled at a later date. No information on the responsibilities of key positions in the governance mechanism is provided.

*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)

ProDoc

13. Have the project risks been identified using the risk assessment tools (Project Quality Assurance, Social and Environmental Screening Procedure, Partner Capacity Assessment Tool, Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfer, Private Sector Due Diligence, etc., if applicable), with clear plans stated to manage and mitigate each risk?

- (●) 3: Project risks related to the achievement of results are fully described in the project risk register, based on comprehensive analysis drawing on the programme's theory of change, Social and Environmental Standards and screening, situation analysis, capacity assessments and other analysis such as funding potential and reputational risk. Risks have been identified through a consultative process with key internal and external stakeholders, including consultation with the UNDP Security Office as required. Clear and complete plan in place to manage and mitigate each risk, including security risks, reflected in project budgeting and monitoring plans. (both must be true)
- ( ) 2: Project risks related to the achievement of results are identified in the initial project risk register based on a minimum level of analysis and consultation, with mitigation measures identified for each risk.
- ( ) 1: Some risks may be identified in the initial project risk register, but no evidence of consultation or analysis and no clear risk mitigation measures identified. This option is also selected if risks are not clearly identified, no initial risk log is included with the project document and/or no security risk management process has taken place for the project.

*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)

ProDoc

Efficient Status: Complete Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory

14. Have specific measures for ensuring cost-efficient use of resources been explicitly mentioned as part of the project design?

- (●) 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)

ProDoc

15. Is the budget justified and supported with valid estimates?

- (●) 3: The project's budget is at the activity level with funding sources, and is specified for the duration of the project period in a multi-year budget. Realistic resource mobilisation plans are in place to fill unfunded components. Costs are supported with valid estimates using benchmarks from similar projects or activities. Cost implications from inflation and foreign exchange exposure have been estimated and incorporated in the budget. Adequate costs for monitoring, evaluation, communications and security have been incorporated.
- ( ) 2: The project's budget is at the activity level with funding sources, when possible, and is specified for the duration of the project in a multi-year budget, but no funding plan is in place. Costs are supported with valid estimates based on prevailing rates.
- ( ) 1: The project's budget is not specified at the activity level, and/or may not be captured in a multi-year budget.

*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)

Budget within the ProDoc

16. Is the Country Office / Regional / Global Project fully recovering the costs involved with project implementation?

- ( ) 3: The budget fully covers all project costs that are attributable to the project, including programme management and development effectiveness services related to strategic country programme planning, quality assurance, pipeline development, policy advocacy services, finance, procurement, human resources, administration, issuance of contracts, security, travel, assets, general services, information and communications based on full costing in accordance with prevailing UNDP policies (i.e., UPL, LPL.)
- (●) 2: The budget covers significant project costs that are attributable to the project based on prevailing UNDP policies (i.e., UPL, LPL) as relevant.
- ( ) 1: The budget does not adequately cover project costs that are attributable to the project, and UNDP is cross-subsidizing the project.

*Note: Risk management must be done for criteria with score of 1. The budget must be revised to fully reflect the costs of implementation before the project commences.

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

ProDoc

Effective | Status: Complete | Quality Rating: Satisfactory

17. Have targeted groups, and particularly those marginalized, vulnerable, and left further behind (LNOB), been engaged in the design of the project?

- 3: Credible evidence that all targeted groups, prioritising discriminated, vulnerable and marginalized populations that will be involved in or affected by the project, have been actively engaged in the design of the project. The project has an explicit strategy to identify, engage and ensure the meaningful participation of target groups as stakeholders throughout the project, including through monitoring and decision-making (e.g., representation on the project board, inclusion in samples for evaluations, etc.)
- (●) 2: Some evidence that key targeted groups have been consulted in the design of the project.
- 1: No evidence of engagement with targeted groups during project design.
- 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)

ProDoc

18. Does the project plan for adaptation and course correction if regular monitoring activities, evaluation, and lesson learned demonstrate there are better approaches to achieve the intended results and/or circumstances change during implementation?

- (●) 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)

ProDoc

19. The gender marker for all project outputs are scored at GEN2 or GEN3, indicating that gender has been fully mainstreamed into all project outputs at a minimum.

- (●) 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)

ProDoc

20. Have societal digital risks and opportunities been taken into account when designing the project's approach and have digital or data technology solutions been considered to enhance the efficiency, effectiveness and scalability of project results?

- 3: To the extent possible, societal digital risks and opportunities have been investigated when designing the strategy and Theory of Change, and the potential use of digital or data technologies in project activities has been considered in line with UNDP's digital standards and data principles. (All must be true)
- (●) 2: Only the potential use of digital or data solutions in project activities has been considered in line with UNDP's digital standards and data principles, but there is no or limited evidence that aspects of inclusive digital societies have been considered in the design of the strategy or Theory of Change.
- 1: Neither societal digital risks and opportunities, nor digital or data technology solutions were specifically considered in the project design or, UNDP's digital standards and data principles are not taken into account when intending to use digital or data technology solutions in project activities.
- Digital considerations are not relevant to this project.

***Applicable only to option "Digital considerations are not relevant"**

- [ ] 1: Societal digital transformation is not a government or contextual priority
- [ ] 2: A non-digital approach yields higher effectiveness and efficiency
- [ ] 3: Other (specify in the "Evidence" section)

*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)

ProDoc uploaded

Sustainability & National Ownership | Status: Complete | Quality Rating: Satisfactory

21. Have national / regional / global partners led, or proactively engaged in, the design of the country / regional / global project, respectively?

- ( ) 3: National / regional / global partners have full ownership of the country / regional / global project and led the process of the development of the project jointly with UNDP.
- (•) 2: The project has been developed by UNDP in close consultation with national / regional / global partners.
- ( ) 1: The project has been developed by UNDP with limited or no engagement with national partners.

*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)

Regular consultations with various stakeholders on central and local levels were held (Ministry of Environment and Physical Planning, Municipality of Resen, local CSOs, Public Utility Enterprise form Resen)

22. Are key institutions and systems identified, and is there a strategy for strengthening specific / comprehensive capacities based on capacity assessments conducted?

- ( ) 3: The project has a strategy for strengthening specific capacities of national institutions and/or actors based on a completed capacity assessment. This strategy includes an approach to regularly monitor national capacities using clear indicators and rigorous methods of data collection, and adjust the strategy to strengthen national capacities accordingly.
- (•) 2: A capacity assessment has been completed. There are plans to develop a strategy to strengthen specific capacities of national institutions and/or actors based on the results of the capacity assessment.
- ( ) 1: Capacity assessments have not been carried out
- ( ) 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)

ProDoc

23. Is there is a clear strategy embedded in the project specifying how the project will use national systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluations, etc.,) to the extent possible?

- ( ) Yes
- ( ) No
- (•) Not Applicable

*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)

The project is implemented under the DIM modality

24. Is there a clear transition arrangement / phase-out plan developed with key stakeholders in order to sustain or scale up results (including resource mobilisation and communications strategy)?

- (●) 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)

ProDoc