ASM-14098 - Quality Assurance - Design

Procedure Year: 2025

Procedure Rating: Satisfactory

Procedure Status: Approved

Procedure Name: ASM-14098

Procedure Department: CO - Ecuador - Quito

Procedure Type: Design

Record Owner: Aloma Serra

Created by: Aloma Serra,2/20/2025, 6:37 AM

Last Modified by: Claire MEDINA,5/1/2025, 1:35 PM

Decision:

QA Summary/Project Board Comments:

RELATED PORTFOLIOS/PROJECTS(1)					
NAME	DEPARTMENT	STATUS	ATLAS PROJECT NUMBER	START DATE	END DATE
01004064	CO - Ecuador - Quito	On Going		2/17/2025	3/31/2026

RELATED SESPS(1)		
PARENT PROCEDURE	PROCEDURE TYPE	PROCEDURE YEAR
ASM-14099	SESP (Social and Environmental Screening Procedure)	2025

Approval History

Approval Date: Thu May 01 00:00:00 GMT 2025

Approved By: Claire MEDINA <claire.medina@undp.org>

APPROVAL HISTORY			
STEP NAME	DATE	STATUS	ASSIGNED TO
Submitted for Approval	2025-05-01 13:35:44	Approved	Veronica Bohorquez
Submitted for Approval	2025-04-09 15:31:09	Reassigned	Veronica Bohorquez

QA Questionnaire:

Strategic Status: Complete Quality Rating: 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)

The project is clearly linked to the UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD) Theory of Change. It establishes a change pathway that explains how its activities—such as strengthening EMASEO's operational capacity through equipment acquisition and optimizing institutional models via APPs—will lead to improved waste management efficiency and sustainability. The project's strategy is well-structured and logically contributes to outcome-level changes in environmental sustainability and urban management, aligning with CPD priorities. Evidence: PRODOC.

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)

The project aligns with the UNDP Strategic Plan as it responds to at least one development setting specified in the plan, particularly in sustainable urban development and environmental sustainability. It directly contributes to improving waste management efficiency, institutional strengthening, and environmental resilience in urban settings, which are key focus areas of UNDP's Strategic Plan. Additionally, the project's Results and Resources Framework (RRF) includes at least one Strategic Plan (SP) output indicator relevant to waste management, governance, or environmental sustainability. However, a higher score (3) would require that the project explicitly adapt at least one Signature Solution from the Strategic Plan and ensure that all relevant SP output indicators are fully integrated into the RRF. Evidence: PRODOC.

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)

The project is clearly linked to the UNDP Ecuador Country Programme Document (CPD) 2023-2026, aligning with its strategic priorities. Specifically, the project contributes to: Outcome 2: Advancing ecological transition and promoting a sustainable, inclusive, and resilient economy.
By focusing on enhancing waste management systems and institutional strengthening, the project supports Ecuador's efforts toward environmental sustainability and improved public services, as outlined in the CPD. Evidence: PRODOC.

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)

The project clearly specifies its target groups, particularly those left further behind, such as communities in low-income urban areas with limited waste collection services and areas with high environmental vulnerability due to improper waste disposal. The project also prioritizes the inclusion of marginalized groups by improving public waste management services in underprivileged areas, ensuring better sanitation and environmental conditions. Evidence: PRODOC.

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)

The project design references knowledge and lessons learned, particularly in the areas of waste management optimization, institutional strengthening, and public-private partnerships (APPs). It acknowledges sectoral best practices and aligns with UNDP's experience in urban sustainability and environmental governance. Evidence: PRODOC.

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)

The project acknowledges the role of other partners, particularly in waste management and institutional strengthening, and positions UNDP as a key actor in providing technical support, coordination, and governance optimization. It references the importance of Alianzas Público-Privadas (APPs) and highlights the need for inter-institutional collaboration, particularly with local government and private sector actors. An analysis of key stakeholders is included in the PRODOC. Evidence: PRODOC.

Principled Status: Complete Quality Rating: 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)

The project is mainly based on public purchasing, which can influence a human rights-based approach by ensuring transparency, accountability, and non-discrimination in procurement processes. If designed with inclusive criteria, public purchasing can promote fair labor practices, gender-sensitive procurement, and environmental sustainability, supporting broader human rights objectives. Evidence: PRODOC.

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)

A basic gender analysis has been carried out as part of the SESP procedure. The project acknowledges gender-sensitive procurement and institutional design, ensuring that public purchasing and governance improvements promote non-discrimination and equal access to opportunities. Evidence: 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)

The project design integrates sustainability and resilience dimensions by focusing on public purchasing and institutional strengthening, ensuring that waste management infrastructure and governance improvements contribute to long-term resilience. The procurement of waste collection equipment, PTAR, and containers is intended to enhance the efficiency and durability of waste management services, reducing environmental impact and supporting sustainability. Additionally, the institutional strengthening component, including the evaluation of management models and advisory support for APPs, aims to build long-term resilience by optimizing governance structures and financial sustainability. Relevant shocks and hazards—such as inadequate waste infrastructure, regulatory challenges, and operational inefficiencies—have been identified and assessed, with some mitigation and management measures incorporated into the project design and budget. Evidence: 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)

N/A.

Management & Monitoring Status: Complete Quality Rating: 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)

The project's selection of outputs and activities is at an appropriate level, and the results framework includes SMART, results-oriented indicators that measure key expected development changes. However, baselines, targets, and data sources may not yet be fully specified for all indicators. There is some use of target group-focused and sex-disaggregated indicators, particularly where relevant to public purchasing and institutional strengthening, but these may not be consistently applied across all outputs. Strengthening the specificity of baseline data and targets would enhance the robustness of the results framework. Evidence: 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)

The project's governance mechanism is defined, with specific institutions identified as holding key governance roles. The project document outlines the main responsibilities of the Project Board, Project Director/Manager, and quality assurance roles. Evidence: 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)

The project identifies key risks related to achieving results in the initial project risk register, with mitigation measures outlined. The main risks include:

R1. Delays in the acquisition and delivery of equipment, which could impact the project timeline and operational efficiency.
R2. Lack of feasibility in implementing APPs/Strategic Partnerships, potentially affecting the project's financial and operational sustainability.
R3. Lack of commitment to implementing APPs/Strategic Partnerships, which could hinder long-term institutional strengthening and innovation.
Evidence: Risk Matriz.

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)

The project includes clear cost-efficiency measures, such as leveraging EMASEO EP's existing technical capacities, utilizing lessons learned from the initiation plan, and structuring procurement and planning processes to prevent delays and cost overruns. The UNDP's implementation structure ensures proper financial oversight and transparent use of resources. Evidence: 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)

The budget accounts for project management costs, including salaries for key personnel, procurement processes, and administrative support under UNDP's direct implementation modality. Evidence: 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)

UPL and LPL have been taken into consideration internally to calculate DES costs. As stated in the previous question, the budget accounts for project management costs, including salaries for key personnel, procurement processes, and administrative support under UNDP's direct implementation modality. Evidence: PRODOC.

Effective Status: Complete Quality Rating: Highly 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)

The project acknowledges the importance of inclusivity. Importantly, it promotes transparency, public-private partnerships, and institutional strengthening, which could have indirect benefits for underserved communities, particularly in the context of the DMQ. Evidence: 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)

The project incorporates a monitoring and evaluation framework, which includes periodic assessments, reporting (twice a year), and adjustments based on findings. Risk monitoring and governance structures will ensure corrective actions are taken if needed. Evidence: 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)

The project is classified as GEN2 as it integrates a gender perspective across its procurement processes and institutional strengthening efforts. All acquisitions will adhere to gender equality and non-discrimination policies established by UNDP, ensuring that suppliers and contractors comply with equity standards. Additionally, the institutional design will strengthen mechanisms for equitable participation, promoting the inclusion of women in the project's operational management. Furthermore, the Public-Private Partnership (PPP) model will incorporate gender equality criteria, ensuring that the opportunities generated benefit women and underrepresented groups within the waste management sector. Evidence: 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"**

- [x] 1: Societal digital transformation is not a government or contextual priority
- [x] 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)

Digital solutions have not been a key focus of the project. The document does not mention the use of digital technology for efficiency improvements, data management, or monitoring. The project primarily focuses on equipment procurement and institutional strengthening without integrating digital tools or innovation strategies. Evidence: PRODOC.

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)

The project has been developed by UNDP in close consultation with EMASEO (3 specific PRODOC sessions have taken place, and complete validation of the EMASEO has been seeked), the key national implementing partner. EMASEO has actively participated in identifying priorities, defining activities, and shaping the institutional strengthening and procurement components. Additionally, the project aligns with national waste management strategies, ensuring coherence with local policies. Evidence: PRODOC.

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)

A capacity assessment of EMASEO has been completed, identifying key areas for improvement, particularly in fleet management, waste collection efficiency, and institutional governance. The project incorporates institutional strengthening activities, such as technical assistance for the implementation of Public-Private Partnerships (APPs) and optimization of operational models. Evidence: 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 primarily relies on public procurement mechanisms for acquiring waste collection equipment and infrastructure. Additionally, it integrates institutional strengthening measures within EMASEO to enhance operational efficiency. Monitoring will be conducted in alignment with UNDP frameworks, leveraging existing institutional capacities. Evidence: PRODOC.

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)

The project includes a long-term sustainability strategy through the implementation of Public-Private Partnerships (APPs) as a key model for waste management operations. By strengthening EMASEO's institutional capacity and providing technical assistance for structuring and implementing APPs, the project lays the groundwork for continued private sector engagement and financial sustainability beyond the project's duration. The transition plan ensures that EMASEO can progressively manage and expand these partnerships, securing long-term investments and efficiency improvements in waste collection and fleet management. Evidence: PRODOC.