

Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

Form Status: Approved	
Overall Rating:	Highly Satisfactory
Decision:	
Portfolio/Project Number:	00064036
Portfolio/Project Title:	Development Effectiveness
Portfolio/Project Date:	2012-01-01 / 2020-12-31

Strategic**Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

1. Did the project pro-actively identified changes to the external environment and incorporated them into the project strategy?

- ☐ 3: The project team identified relevant changes in the external environment that may present new opportunities or threats to the project's ability to achieve its objectives, assumptions were tested to determine if the project's strategy was valid. There is some evidence that the project board considered the implications, and documented the changes needed to the project in response. (all must be true)
- ☒ 2: *The project team identified relevant changes in the external environment that may present new opportunities or threats to the project's ability to achieve its objectives. There is some evidence that the project board discussed this, but relevant changes did not fully integrate in the project. (both must be true)*
- ☐ 1: The project team considered relevant changes in the external environment since implementation began, but there is no evidence that the project team considered these changes to the project as a result.

Evidence:

Flexibility in determining project strategies and their implementation -which adequately addressed the emerging needs- positively influenced project performance. The K4DM preserved a certain degree of flexibility in setting its strategies and funding as UNDP was the project's sole external funder.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	FinalEvaluationReportK4DMproject_Nov92019_7501_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FinalEvaluationReportK4DMproject_Nov92019_7501_301.pdf)	mahir.saimum@undp.org	2/3/2021 7:39:00 AM
2	9thBoardMeetingminutes_7501_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/9thBoardMeetingminutes_7501_301.pdf)	mahir.saimum@undp.org	2/3/2021 7:39:00 AM

2. Was the project aligned with the thematic focus of the Strategic Plan?

- ☒ 3: The project responded to at least one of the development settings as specified in the Strategic Plan (SP) and adopted at least one Signature Solution . The project's RRF included all the relevant SP output indicators. (all must be true)
- ☐ 2: The project responded to at least one of the developments settings¹ as specified in the Strategic Plan. The project's RRF included at least one SP output indicator, if relevant. (both must be true)
- ☐ 1: While the project may have responded to a partner's identified need, this need falls outside of the UNDP Strategic Plan. Also select this option if none of the relevant SP indicators are included in the RRF.

Evidence:

The project responded to SP Outcome 2: Accelerate structural transformations for sustainable development. The project's M&E plan included SP Output Indicator 1.1.1.2: Number of national and sub-national governments and other partners sharing their innovative solutions through SSMART and SP Output Indicator 1.2.2.2: Volume of additional resources leveraged through public and private financing for the SDGs with UNDP support.

The project adopted Signature solution: Governance for peaceful, just, and inclusive societies.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	K4DMmePLAN2020_7501_302 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/K4DMmePLAN2020_7501_302.docx)	mahir.saimum@undp.org	2/3/2021 7:40:00 AM

Relevant**Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory**

3. Were the project's targeted groups systematically identified and engaged, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized, to ensure the project remained relevant for them?

- ☐ 3: Systematic and structured feedback was collected over the project duration from a representative sample of beneficiaries, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized, as part of the project's monitoring system. Representatives from the targeted groups were active members of the project's governance mechanism (i.e., the project board or equivalent) and there is credible evidence that their feedback informs project decision making. (all must be true)
- ☒ 2: Targeted groups were engaged in implementation and monitoring, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized. Beneficiary feedback, which may be anecdotal, was collected regularly to ensure the project addressed local priorities. This information was used to inform project decision making. (all must be true to select this option)
- ☐ 1: Some beneficiary feedback may have been collected, but this information did not inform project decision making. This option should also be selected if no beneficiary feedback was collected
- ☐ Not Applicable

Evidence:

Target groups (government officials) were engaged in implementation and monitoring. Their feedback was collected through questionnaires after capacity development activities. The final evaluation also captured feedback. This information was sometimes used for project decision making.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	FinalEvaluationReportK4DMproject_Nov92019_7501_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FinalEvaluationReportK4DMproject_Nov92019_7501_303.pdf)	mahir.saimum@undp.org	2/3/2021 7:41:00 AM

4. Did the project generate knowledge, and lessons learned (i.e., what has worked and what has not) and has this knowledge informed management decisions to ensure the continued relevance of the project towards its stated objectives, the quality of its outputs and the management of risk?

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