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_Nov9201 9_7501_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FinalEvaluati onReportK4DMproject_Nov92019_7501_30 3.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.

Evidence:

> Under the project, an in-depth study titled "South-So uth Cooperation for Financing SDGs" was conducte d and the findings were later published as a knowled ge product. Several knowledge materials were prod uced and one example is a report on the potentialitie s of Non-Resident Bangladeshi (NRB) engagement i n the development process which has offered a fram ework for the PIE (Philanthropy, Investment, Experti se) sharing. The project has prepared a final evaluat ion report by hiring two independent consultants and a lessons-learned study was also conducted and the findings will be published. [Final Evaluation Report, P-63]

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	FinalEvaluationReportK4DMproject_Nov9201 9_7501_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FinalEvaluati onReportK4DMproject_Nov92019_7501_30 4.pdf)	mahir.saimum@undp.org	2/3/2021 7:42:00 AM

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

○ *3: There was credible evidence that the project reached 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 was not considered 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 was not at scale, and there are no plans to scale up the project in the future.

Evidence:

The Project has the potentiality to scale up in the future; therefore, the second phase of K4DM has been designed to continue its contribution to the development changes in the next three years. K4DM project is closely intertwined with four SDG targets 17 - 17. 3, 17.6, 17.9, and 17.17. For example, Target 17.9 aims to "enhance international support for implementing effective and targeted capacity-building in developing countries to support national plans to implement all the sustainable development goals, including through North-South, South-South, and triangular cooperation," which clearly corresponds with the outcome, principles, and outputs of K4DM project. Similarly, the K4DM project also has strong linkages with the financing plan of the 8th Five Year Plan. The 8th FYP has been drafted to guide the activities to contribute towards achieving the SDGs as a whole where the SDG 14, 16, and 17 are partially aligned.
[Final Evaluation Report, P-29, P-31]

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	FinalEvaluationReportK4DMproject_Nov9201 9_7501_305 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FinalEvaluati onReportK4DMproject_Nov92019_7501_30 5.pdf)	mahir.saimum@undp.org	2/3/2021 7:42:00 AM

Principled   **Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

6. Were the project's measures (through outputs, activities, indicators) to address gender inequalities and empower women relevant and produced the intended effect? If not, evidence-based adjustments and changes were made.

○ 3: The project team gathered data and evidence through project monitoring on the relevance of the measures to address gender inequalities and empower women. Analysis of data and evidence were used to inform adjustments and changes, as appropriate. (both must be true)

◉ *2: The project team had some data and evidence on the relevance of the measures to address gender inequalities and empower women. There is evidence that at least some adjustments were made, as appropriate. (both must be true)*

○ 1: The project team had limited or no evidence on the relevance of measures to address gender inequalities and empowering women. No evidence of adjustments and/or changes made. This option should also be selected if the project has no measures to address gender inequalities and empower women relevant to the project results and activities.

Evidence:

K4DM considers "gender" as a cross-cutting issue th erefore, gender inequalities and women empowerm ent were not addressed in a direct way. Through ma ny activities and outputs, gender inequalities and wo men empowerment were addressed: via training on "Gender and Development" for the GoB officials, the dialogue of the gender thematic group, and the NHD R. [Final Evaluation Report, P-41]

A fundamental component of K4DM is to drive great er gender equality and provide further opportunities, upskilling, and career advancement for women in th e ERD. Two activities support this approach includin g a) Activity 1.1.3: ERD to develop a Leadership and Performance Enhancement Guideline, vetted by ER D Senior Management, to identify and enable increa sed pathways for talent management and leadership development; and b) Activity 2.2.5: create an NRB P ool Fund to support NRB initiatives that target wome n and NRBs from other disadvantaged communities.

In addition, gender equality is promoted across the i nstitutions that K4DM works with to promote a great er understanding of contemporary gender equality is sues. Through e-Centre for Capacity Development, courses on gender equality and equity will be provid ed to promote women's empowerment and this will f orm a key performance indicator for the capacity buil ding institution. [ProDoc K4DM Phase II, P-9 and 14]

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	FinalEvaluationReportK4DMproject_Nov920 19_7501_306 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FinalEvaluati onReportK4DMproject_Nov92019_7501_30 6.pdf)	mahir.saimum@undp.org	2/3/2021 7:43:00 AM

7. Were social and environmental impacts and risks successfully managed and monitored?

○   3: Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. Appropriate assessments conducted where required (i.e., Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) for High risk projects and some level of social and environmental assessment for Moderate risk projects as identified through SESP). Relevant management plan(s) developed for identified risks through consultative process and implemented, resourced, and monitored. Risks effectively managed or mitigated. If there is a substantive change to the project or change in context that affects risk levels, the SESP was updated to reflect these changes. (all must be true)

◉   *2: Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. Appropriate assessments conducted where required (i.e., Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) for High risk projects and some level of social and environmental assessment for Moderate risk projects as identified through SESP). Relevant management plan(s) developed, implemented and monitored for identified risks. OR project was categorized as Low risk through the SESP.*

○   1: Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. For projects categorized as High or Moderate Risk, there was no evidence that social and environmental assessments completed and/or management plans or measures development, implemented or monitored. There are substantive changes to the project or changes in the context but SESP was not updated. (any may be true)

Evidence:

> K4DM project is a strategic project of ERD towards knowledge generation and its management. Therefore it has minimal field-level interventions. Consequently, the project is in the low-risk category of Social and Environmental Screening.
>
> During implementation, an unanticipated risk arose - the COVID-19 pandemic - that hampered the project's implementation. Nevertheless, the project re-prioritized its activities considering the pandemic and took the necessary initiatives to mitigate the risks and maintain successful management and monitoring of the project. [Final Evaluation Report, P-26]

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	FinalEvaluationReportK4DMproject_Nov92019_7501_307 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FinalEvaluationReportK4DMproject_Nov92019_7501_307.pdf)	mahir.saimum@undp.org	2/3/2021 7:43:00 AM

8. Were grievance mechanisms available to project-affected people and were grievances (if any) addressed to ensure any perceived harm was effectively mitigated?

○ *3: Project-affected people actively informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism (SRM/SECU) and how to access it. If the project was categorized as High or Moderate Risk through the SESP, a project -level grievance mechanism was in place and project affected people informed. If grievances were received, they were effectively addressed in accordance with SRM Guidance. (all must be true)*

○ 2: Project-affected people informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism and how to access it. If the project was categorized as High Risk through the SESP, a project -level grievance mechanism was in place and project affected people informed. If grievances were received, they were responded to but faced challenges in arriving at a resolution.

○ 1: Project-affected people was not informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism. If grievances were received, they were not responded to. (any may be true)

Evidence:

> K4DM project was a strategic project of ERD towards knowledge generation and its management, not the one which is delivering services in the field. Field level interventions were minimal. Consequently, the project was of low-risk category according to Social and Environmental Screening. As there were no social risks, the project did not have any grievance mechanisms.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On

No documents available.

Management & Monitoring   **Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory**

9. Was the project's M&E Plan adequately implemented?

○ *3: The project had a comprehensive and costed M&E plan. Baselines, targets and milestones were fully populated. Progress data against indicators in the project's RRF was 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, included during evaluations and/or After-Action Reviews, were used to take corrective actions when necessary. (all must be true)*

○ 2: The project costed M&E Plan, and most baselines and targets were populated. Progress data against indicators in the project's RRF was collected on a regular basis, although there was may be some slippage in following the frequency stated in the Plan and data sources was not always reliable. Any evaluations conducted, if relevant, met most decentralized evaluation standards. Lessons learned were captured but were used to take corrective actions. (all must be true)

○ 1: The project had M&E Plan, but costs were not clearly planned and budgeted for, or were unrealistic. Progress data was not regularly collected against the indicators in the project's RRF. Evaluations did not meet decentralized evaluation standards. Lessons learned were rarely captured and used. Select this option also if the project did not have an M&E plan.

Evidence:

The project prepared M&E Plan, reports, and Quarterly progress reports regularly with the progress data against indicators using credible data sources according to the frequency stated in the project's M&E plan, including sex dis-aggregated data as relevant. The final evaluation was conducted following UNEG standards to draw lessons learned and inform the next phase of the project. [Final Evaluation Report, P-26, M&E Plan, Quarterly Progress Reports (Q1, Q2, Q3, Q4)]

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	K4DMmePLAN2020_7501_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/K4DMmePLAN2020_7501_309.docx)	mahir.saimum@undp.org	2/3/2021 7:44:00 AM
2	QuarterlyProgressReportQ1_2020_7501_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/QuarterlyProgressReportQ1_2020_7501_309.pdf)	mahir.saimum@undp.org	2/3/2021 7:45:00 AM
3	QuarterlyProgressReport_Q2-2020_7501_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/QuarterlyProgressReport_Q2-2020_7501_309.pdf)	mahir.saimum@undp.org	2/3/2021 7:45:00 AM
4	QuarterlyProgressReport_Q3_2020_7501_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/QuarterlyProgressReport_Q3_2020_7501_309.pdf)	mahir.saimum@undp.org	2/3/2021 7:45:00 AM
5	FinalEvaluationReportK4DMproject_Nov92019_7501_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FinalEvaluationReportK4DMproject_Nov92019_7501_309.pdf)	mahir.saimum@undp.org	2/3/2021 7:44:00 AM
6	QuarterlyProgressReportQ4_2020_7501_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/QuarterlyProgressReportQ4_2020_7501_309.pdf)	mahir.saimum@undp.org	2/3/2021 7:45:00 AM

10. Was the project's governance mechanism (i.e., the project board or equivalent) function as intended?

○ *3: The project's governance mechanism operated well, and was a model for other projects. It met in the agreed frequency stated in the project document and the minutes of the meetings were all on file. There was 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 reviewed and used evidence, including progress data, knowledge, lessons and evaluations, as the basis for informing management decisions (e.g., change in strategy, approach, work plan.) (all must be true to select this option)*

○ 2: The project's governance mechanism met in the agreed frequency and minutes of the meeting are on file. A project progress report was submitted to the project board or equivalent at least once per year, covering results, risks and opportunities. (both must be true to select this option)

○ 1: The project's governance mechanism did not meet in the frequency stated in the project document over the past year and/or the project board or equivalent was not functioning as a decision-making body for the project as intended.

Evidence:

> The Project Executive Board meetings were held on a regular basis as per TAPP and the related docume ntations was filed. The Board was updated regularly on results, risks, and opportunities based on which management decisions were made. [ALL Executive Board Meeting Minutes (1st-10th)]

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	1st_ExecutiveBoardmeetingminutes_7501_3 10 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/ QAFormDocuments/1st_ExecutiveBoardme etingminutes_7501_310.pdf)	mahir.saimum@undp.org	2/3/2021 7:46:00 AM
2	2nd_Executiveboardmeeting_minutes_7501 _310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/Project QA/QAFormDocuments/2nd_Executiveboar dmeeting_minutes_7501_310.pdf)	mahir.saimum@undp.org	2/3/2021 7:46:00 AM
3	3rdboardmeetingminutes_7501_310 (https://i ntranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormD ocuments/3rdboardmeetingminutes_7501_3 10.pdf)	mahir.saimum@undp.org	2/3/2021 7:46:00 AM
4	4th_Boardmeetingminutes_7501_310 (http s://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFor mDocuments/4th_Boardmeetingminutes_75 01_310.pdf)	mahir.saimum@undp.org	2/3/2021 7:47:00 AM
5	5thBoardMeetingMinutes_7501_310 (https:// intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormD ocuments/5thBoardMeetingMinutes_7501_3 10.pdf)	mahir.saimum@undp.org	2/3/2021 7:47:00 AM
6	6thSignedminutes_7501_310 (https://intrane t.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocume nts/6thSignedminutes_7501_310.pdf)	mahir.saimum@undp.org	2/3/2021 7:47:00 AM
7	7thboardmeeting_K4DM_7501_310 (https://i ntranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormD ocuments/7thboardmeeting_K4DM_7501_31 0.pdf)	mahir.saimum@undp.org	2/3/2021 7:47:00 AM
8	8thEBMSignedminutes_7501_310 (https://int ranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDoc uments/8thEBMSignedminutes_7501_310.p df)	mahir.saimum@undp.org	2/3/2021 7:47:00 AM
9	9thBoardMeetingminutes_7501_310 (https:// intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormD ocuments/9thBoardMeetingminutes_7501_3 10.pdf)	mahir.saimum@undp.org	2/3/2021 7:48:00 AM
10	10thExecutiveBoardMeeting-minutes_7501_ 310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQ A/QAFormDocuments/10thExecutiveBoardM eeting-minutes_7501_310.pdf)	mahir.saimum@undp.org	2/3/2021 7:48:00 AM

11. Were risks to the project adequately monitored and managed?

○ 3: The project monitored risks every quarter and consulted with the key stakeholders, security advisors, to identify continuing and emerging risks to assess if the main assumptions remained valid. There is clear evidence that relevant management plans and mitigating measures were fully implemented to address each key project risk and were updated to reflect the latest risk assessment. (all must be true)

◉ *2: The project monitored risks every year, as evidenced by an updated risk log. Some updates were made to management plans and mitigation measures.*

○ 1: The risk log was not updated as required. There was may be some evidence that the project monitored risks that may affected the project's achievement of results, but there is no explicit evidence that management actions were taken to mitigate risks.

Evidence:

> The project regularly monitored risks to identify and address risks and these updates were properly documented in Quarterly Progress Reports. [Quarterly progress Report (Q1, Q2, Q3, Q4)]

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	QuarterlyProgressReport_Q3_2020_7501_311 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/QuarterlyProgressReport_Q3_2020_7501_311.pdf)	mahir.saimum@undp.org	2/3/2021 7:49:00 AM
2	QuarterlyProgressReportQ4_2020_7501_311 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/QuarterlyProgressReportQ4_2020_7501_311.pdf)	mahir.saimum@undp.org	2/3/2021 7:50:00 AM
3	QuarterlyProgressReportQ1_2020_7501_311 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/QuarterlyProgressReportQ1_2020_7501_311.pdf)	mahir.saimum@undp.org	2/3/2021 7:49:00 AM
4	QuarterlyProgressReport_Q2-2020_7501_311 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/QuarterlyProgressReport_Q2-2020_7501_311.pdf)	mahir.saimum@undp.org	2/3/2021 7:49:00 AM

Efficient   **Quality Rating: Exemplary**

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

◉ *Yes*
○ No

Evidence:

> The project's resource allocation was adequate. [Final Evaluation Report, P-48-50]

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	FinalEvaluationReportK4DMproject_Nov92019_7501_312 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FinalEvaluationReportK4DMproject_Nov92019_7501_312.pdf)	mahir.saimum@undp.org	2/3/2021 7:50:00 AM

13. Were project inputs procured and delivered on time to efficiently contribute to results?

◉ *3: The project had a procurement plan and kept it updated. The project quarterly reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addressed them through appropriate management actions. (all must be true)*

○ 2: The project had updated procurement plan. The project annually reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addressed them through appropriate management actions. (all must be true)

○ 1: The project did not have an updated procurement plan. The project team may or may not have reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs regularly, however management actions were not taken to address them.

Evidence:

K4DM's procurement plans were reviewed by the procurement focal of UNDP CO in Bangladesh. The plans and implementation status, which are crucial for achieving the results, were also shared and reviewed in the Mid-Term Review and Year-end Review conducted by UNDP CO. [Power Point and Minutes of the MTR & YER]

The Procurement Unit of UNDP CO provided direct support to K4DM to ensure transparent and timely purchasing processes, ensuring the best value for money. [Final Evaluation Report, P-51]

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	FinalEvaluationReportK4DMproject_Nov92019_7501_313 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FinalEvaluationReportK4DMproject_Nov92019_7501_313.pdf)	mahir.saimum@undp.org	2/3/2021 7:51:00 AM
2	YearendREVIEWMEETINGMINUTES23_12_7501_313 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/YearendREVIEWMEETINGMINUTES23_12_7501_313.docx)	mahir.saimum@undp.org	2/7/2021 5:43:00 PM
3	MTRReview_ProjectLevelpresentation_K4DM_7501_313 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MTRReview_ProjectLevelpresentation_K4DM_7501_313.pptx)	mahir.saimum@undp.org	2/7/2021 5:42:00 PM
4	MidYearREVIEWMEETINGMINUTESasof28.06.2020_7501_313 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MidYearREVIEWMEETINGMINUTESasof28.06.2020_7501_313.docx)	mahir.saimum@undp.org	2/7/2021 5:42:00 PM
5	ProjectSelfAssesment_MidYearReview_Jun_Jul_2020furtherrevised_compiled_K4DM002_22_6_7501_313 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ProjectSelfAssesment_MidYearReview_Jun_Jul_2020furtherrevised_compiled_K4DM002_22_6_7501_313.pptx)	mahir.saimum@undp.org	2/7/2021 5:42:00 PM

6	YearEndReview_ProjectLevelpresentation_Final_7501_313 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/YearEndReview_ProjectLevelpresentation_Final_7501_313.ppt)	mahir.saimum@undp.org	2/7/2021 5:43:00 PM
7	ProcurementPlanK4DM-2018_7501_313 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ProcurementPlanK4DM-2018_7501_313.xlsx)	mahir.saimum@undp.org	2/7/2021 5:50:00 PM
8	ProcurementPlanK4DM-2019_PromedID_7501_313 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ProcurementPlanK4DM-2019_PromedID_7501_313.xlsx)	mahir.saimum@undp.org	2/7/2021 5:51:00 PM
9	ProjectProcurementPlanK4DM-2020_7501_313 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ProjectProcurementPlanK4DM-2020_7501_313.pdf)	mahir.saimum@undp.org	2/7/2021 5:51:00 PM

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

○ *3: There is evidence that the project regularly reviewed costs against relevant comparators (e.g., other projects or country offices) or industry benchmarks to ensure the project maximized results delivered with given resources. The project actively coordinated with other relevant ongoing projects and initiatives (UNDP or other) to ensure complementarity and sought efficiencies wherever possible (e.g. joint activities.) (both must be true)*

○ 2: The project monitored its own costs and gave anecdotal examples of cost efficiencies (e.g., spending less to get the same result,) but there was no systematic analysis of costs and no link to the expected quality of results delivered. The project coordinated activities with other projects to achieve cost efficiency gains.

○ 1: There is little or no evidence that the project monitored its own costs and considered ways to save money beyond following standard procurement rules.

Evidence:

According to the Final Evaluation Report, in terms of value for money, the project performance was moderately high. The project had also worked in partnership with other projects e.g. A2I, SC4SDGs on complementary targets and associated activities. Considering all these, on the whole, the Project can be labelled as "moderately efficient" one. [Final Evaluation Report, P-57]

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	FinalEvaluationReportK4DMproject_Nov9201 9_7501_314 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FinalEvaluati onReportK4DMproject_Nov92019_7501_31 4.pdf)	mahir.saimum@undp.org	2/3/2021 7:52:00 AM

Effective   **Quality Rating: Exemplary**

15. Was the project on track and delivered its expected outputs?

- ◉ *Yes*
- ○ No

Evidence:

Initially the project implementation was delayed due to resources and approval. Nevertheless, the project reached its outputs by delivering the activities. Due to some unavoidable situations (change of leadership, delay in decision making towards developing NHDR, Eminent Persons Group was formed but could not make progress due to the change of governance mechanism in ERD), most of the activities were achieved, but some of the outputs could not be reached. [Final Evaluation Report, P-47]

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	FinalEvaluationReportK4DMproject_Nov9201 9_7501_315 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FinalEvaluati onReportK4DMproject_Nov92019_7501_31 5.pdf)	mahir.saimum@undp.org	2/3/2021 7:54:00 AM

16. Were there regular reviews of the work plan to ensure that the project was on track to achieve the desired results, and to inform course corrections if needed?

○ *3: Quarterly progress data informed regular reviews of the project work plan to ensure that the activities implemented were most likely to achieve the desired results. There is evidence that data and lessons learned (including from evaluations /or After-Action Reviews) were used to inform course corrections, as needed. Any necessary budget revisions were made. (both must be true)*

○ 2: There was at least one review of the work plan per year with a view to assessing if project activities were on track to achieving the desired development results (i.e., outputs.) There may or may not be evidence that data or lessons learned were used to inform the review(s). Any necessary budget revisions have been made.

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

Evidence:

> The project regularly reviewed progress against the work plan using progress data and lessons learned and took necessary actions to achieve targeted results. [Quarterly Progress Report (Q1, Q2, Q3 and Q 4)]

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	QuarterlyProgressReportQ1_2020_7501_31 6 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/Q AFormDocuments/QuarterlyProgressReport Q1_2020_7501_316.pdf)	mahir.saimum@undp.org	2/3/2021 7:55:00 AM
2	QuarterlyProgressReport_Q2-2020_7501_31 6 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/Q AFormDocuments/QuarterlyProgressReport_ Q2-2020_7501_316.pdf)	mahir.saimum@undp.org	2/3/2021 7:58:00 AM
3	QuarterlyProgressReport_Q3_2020_7501_3 16 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/ QAFormDocuments/QuarterlyProgressRepor t_Q3_2020_7501_316.pdf)	mahir.saimum@undp.org	2/3/2021 7:59:00 AM
4	QuarterlyProgressReportQ4_2020_7501_31 6 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/Q AFormDocuments/QuarterlyProgressReport Q4_2020_7501_316.pdf)	mahir.saimum@undp.org	2/3/2021 7:59:00 AM

17. Were the targeted groups systematically identified and engaged, prioritizing the marginalized and excluded, to ensure results were achieved as expected?

3/4/22, 11:47 AM   Closure Print

○ 3: The project targeted 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 were reached as intended. The project engaged regularly with targeted groups over the past year to assess whether they benefited as expected and adjustments were made if necessary, to refine targeting. (all must be true)

○ 2: The project targeted 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 was some engagement with beneficiaries in the past year to assess whether they were benefiting as expected. (all must be true)

○ 1: The project did 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 is some engagement with beneficiaries to assess whether they benefited as expected, but it was limited or did not occurred in the past year.

◉ *Not Applicable*

Evidence:

> Not applicable.
>
> Since K4DM was a strategic Project and aimed to promote and facilitate a knowledge-based decision-making process, to explore the innovative alternatives for resource mobilization and its effective utilization through collaboration between all stakeholders and capacity enhancement of ERD therefore discriminated and marginalized groups were not the priority focus and target beneficiaries of the Project.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	FinalEvaluationReportK4DMproject_Nov9201 9_7501_317 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FinalEvaluati onReportK4DMproject_Nov92019_7501_31 7.pdf)	mahir.saimum@undp.org	2/3/2021 8:01:00 AM
2	ReportonERDPEDIAtraining_7501_317 (http s://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFor mDocuments/ReportonERDPEDIAtraining_7 501_317.docx)	mahir.saimum@undp.org	2/3/2021 8:01:00 AM

Sustainability & National Ownership   **Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory**

https://intranet-apps.undp.org/ProjectQA/Forms/ClosurePrint?fid=7501   20/25

18. Were stakeholders and national partners fully engaged in the decision-making, implementation and monitoring of the project?

○ *3: Only national systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) were used to fully implement and monitor the project. All relevant stakeholders and partners were fully and actively engaged in the process, playing a lead role in project decision-making, implementation and monitoring. (both must be true)*

○ 2: National systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) were used to implement and monitor the project (such as country office support or project systems) were also used, if necessary. All relevant stakeholders and partners were actively engaged in the process, playing an active role in project decision-making, implementation and monitoring. (both must be true)

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

○ Not Applicable

Evidence:

> The project beneficiaries were involved in all stages of project implementation as active members of the governance mechanism, including decision-making, implementation, and monitoring. [All Executive Board Meeting Minutes (1st-10th)]

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	1st_ExecutiveBoardmeetingminutes_7501_3 18 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/ QAFormDocuments/1st_ExecutiveBoardme etingminutes_7501_318.pdf)	mahir.saimum@undp.org	2/3/2021 8:02:00 AM
2	2nd_Executiveboardmeeting_minutes_7501 _318 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/Project QA/QAFormDocuments/2nd_Executiveboar dmeeting_minutes_7501_318.pdf)	mahir.saimum@undp.org	2/3/2021 8:02:00 AM
3	3rdboardmeetingminutes_7501_318 (https://i ntranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormD ocuments/3rdboardmeetingminutes_7501_3 18.pdf)	mahir.saimum@undp.org	2/3/2021 8:02:00 AM
4	4th_Boardmeetingminutes_7501_318 (http s://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFor mDocuments/4th_Boardmeetingminutes_75 01_318.pdf)	mahir.saimum@undp.org	2/3/2021 8:02:00 AM

5	5thBoardMeetingMinutes_7501_318 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/5thBoardMeetingMinutes_7501_318.pdf)	mahir.saimum@undp.org	2/3/2021 8:03:00 AM
6	6thSignedminutes_7501_318 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/6thSignedminutes_7501_318.pdf)	mahir.saimum@undp.org	2/3/2021 8:03:00 AM
7	7thboardmeeting_K4DM_7501_318 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/7thboardmeeting_K4DM_7501_318.pdf)	mahir.saimum@undp.org	2/3/2021 8:03:00 AM
8	8thEBMSignedminutes_7501_318 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/8thEBMSignedminutes_7501_318.pdf)	mahir.saimum@undp.org	2/3/2021 8:03:00 AM
9	9thBoardMeetingminutes_7501_318 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/9thBoardMeetingminutes_7501_318.pdf)	mahir.saimum@undp.org	2/3/2021 8:03:00 AM
10	10thExecutiveBoardMeeting-minutes_7501_318 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/10thExecutiveBoardMeeting-minutes_7501_318.pdf)	mahir.saimum@undp.org	2/3/2021 8:04:00 AM

19. Were there regular monitoring of changes in capacities and performance of institutions and systems relevant to the project, as needed, and were the implementation arrangements[8] adjusted according to changes in partner capacities?

○ 3: Changes in capacities and performance of national institutions and systems were assessed/monitored using clear indicators, rigorous methods of data collection and credible data sources including relevant HACT assurance activities. Implementation arrangements were formally reviewed and adjusted, if needed, in agreement with partners according to changes in partner capacities. (all must be true)

◉ *2: Aspects of changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems were monitored by the project using indicators and reasonably credible data sources including relevant HACT assurance activities. Some adjustment was made to implementation arrangements if needed to reflect changes in partner capacities. (all must be true)*

○ 1: Some aspects of changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems may have been monitored by the project, however changes to implementation arrangements have not been considered. Also select this option if changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems have not been monitored by the project.

○ Not Applicable

Evidence:

Yes, there were regular monitoring of the performance of ERD, and as per regular need assessment, K4DM has rendered services that generated knowledge for development with a target of augmenting the capacity of the officials of ERD for broad-based development assessment focusing on the areas including other important issues like procurement, GOB's financial system, the operational procedure of UN agencies and on emerging development concepts like NRB engagement, South-South Cooperation and so on. For example, South-South Cooperation Conference could not be held due to the unavailability of an honorable Prime Minister. Many capacity development activities could not be implemented due to the COVID-19 situation. [Final Evaluation Report, P-39-41]

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	FinalEvaluationReportK4DMproject_Nov92019_7501_319 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FinalEvaluationReportK4DMproject_Nov92019_7501_319.pdf)	mahir.saimum@undp.org	2/3/2021 8:04:00 AM

20. Were the transition and phase-out arrangements were reviewed and adjusted according to progress (including financial commitment and capacity).

○ *3: The project's governance mechanism regularly reviewed the project's sustainability plan, including arrangements for transition and phase-out, to ensure the project remained on track in meeting the requirements set out by the plan. The plan was implemented as planned by the end of the project, taking into account any adjustments made during implementation. (both must be true)*

○ 2: There was a review of the project's sustainability plan, including arrangements for transition and phase-out, to ensure the project remained on track in meeting the requirements set out by the plan.

○ 1: The project may have had a sustainability plan but there was no review of this strategy after it was developed. Also select this option if the project did not have a sustainability strategy.

Evidence:

The phase-out arrangements were carefully reviewed in the board meetings and by the UN wing officials, including the ERD Secretary. The transition and phase-out arrangements were agreed upon and implemented to ensure the sustainability of the project with minimal interruption. [Letter of Project Extension (5), Project Document of K4DM Phase II, Validation Workshop Minutes]

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	1st_ProjectExtensionLetterfromUNDP_7501_320 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/1st_ProjectExtensionLetterfromUNDP_7501_320.pdf)	mahir.saimum@undp.org	2/3/2021 8:05:00 AM
2	2nd_ProjectExtensionLetter_7501_320 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2nd_ProjectExtensionLetter_7501_320.pdf)	mahir.saimum@undp.org	2/3/2021 8:05:00 AM
3	3rd_ProjectextensionletterfromERDtoCO_7501_320 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/3rd_ProjectextensionletterfromERDtoCO_7501_320.pdf)	mahir.saimum@undp.org	2/3/2021 8:05:00 AM
4	4th_PlanningCommission_ProjectExtension_2020_7501_320 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/4th_PlanningCommission_ProjectExtension_2020_7501_320.pdf)	mahir.saimum@undp.org	2/3/2021 8:05:00 AM
5	5th_Planningcommission_ExtensionletterK4DM_July-December20_7501_320 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/5th_Planningcommission_ExtensionletterK4DM_July-December20_7501_320.pdf)	mahir.saimum@undp.org	2/3/2021 8:05:00 AM
6	K4DMPhaseII_ProDoc_7501_320 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/K4DMPhaseII_ProDoc_7501_320.pdf)	mahir.saimum@undp.org	2/3/2021 8:06:00 AM
7	signedValidationWorkshopMinutes_rotated_7501_320 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/signedValidationWorkshopMinutes_rotated_7501_320.pdf)	mahir.saimum@undp.org	2/3/2021 8:06:00 AM

QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments

Decisions of the 10th (final) Project Board meeting:

1.   The total cost for NHDR has been booked for this year. There will be no split in the budget for the publication of NHDR between the first and the second phase of K4DM.

2.   The closing of the first phase of K4DM needs to be accelerated with the proper procedural guidance of UNDP and GoB.

3.   The second phase of K4DM will commence on 1 January 2021.

4.   ERD, Finance Division, and UNDP will work collaboratively on the resource mobilization and allocation for the second phase.

5.   The assets will be kept for the next (second) phase rather than being transferred to the GoB.