

Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

Form Status: In Progress	
Overall Rating:	Needs Improvement
Decision:	
Portfolio/Project Number:	00081242
Portfolio/Project Title:	Youth Employment
Portfolio/Project Date:	2014-03-01 / 2019-12-31

Strategic

Quality Rating: Exemplary

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:

The project team has been very alert during the implementation phase and has regularly updated all the necessary documents to reflect the changes identified. All the necessary has been brought to the attention of the project steering committee, where the necessary decisions have been made. The project has also conducted a midterm evaluation, during which all the necessary changes has been reflected to the project document, and agreed upon with the government counterparts and the donor.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	DraftFinalEvaluationReportSD4E14July2017_1288_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/DraftFinalEvaluationReportSD4E14July2017_1288_301.doc)	ada.shima@undp.org	12/11/2019 11:05:00 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:**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	UNDPsupporttoSelf-employment_1288_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/UNDPsupporttoSelf-employment_1288_303.pdf)	ada.shima@undp.org	12/12/2019 2:16:00 PM
2	01UNDP-SDCProDoc-SkillsDevelopmentforEmployment-28Nov2014_1288_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/01UNDP-SDCProDoc-SkillsDevelopmentforEmployment-28Nov2014_1288_303.docx)	ada.shima@undp.org	12/12/2019 2:18:00 PM

Principled**Quality Rating: Needs Improvement**

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:

The project has continuously gathered data on the target beneficiaries and the indirect beneficiaries of the reform. All data has been analysed and adjustments have been continuously made in the lagframe. The mid-term evaluation also contains information on how this was reached.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	01UNDP-SDCProDoc-SkillsDevelopmentforEmployment-28Nov2014_1288_306 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/01UNDP-SDCProDoc-SkillsDevelopmentforEmployment-28Nov2014_1288_306.docx)	ada.shima@undp.org	12/12/2019 2:28:00 PM

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:**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	RiskLogframeupdatedasofDec2016_1288_307 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/RiskLogframeupdatedasofDec2016_1288_307.docx)	ada.shima@undp.org	12/11/2019 12:03:00 PM

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:

The project directly affected people were informed about the corporate mechanisms, but no grievance was received. The project was not categorized as high or moderate risk through the SESP. The grievance mechanisms were in place, but no such grievance was received.

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 logical framework was populated with all the necessary indicators and baselines. the RRF was updated frequently and all the information was cross checked with all the available resources. There were some issues on the reliability and quality of the data, but U

List of Uploaded Documents			
#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	02UNDP-SDCLogFrame-SkillsDevelopmentforEmployment-28Nov2014_1288_309 (http://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/02UNDP-SDCLogFrame-SkillsDevelopmentforEmployment-28Nov2014_1288_309.docx)	ada.shima@undp.org	12/11/2019 12:34:00 PM

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:**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	ProgrammeSteeringCommittee-TORs_1288_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ProgrammeSteeringCommittee-TORs_1288_310.doc)	ada.shima@undp.org	12/11/2019 12:40:00 PM

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:

All the risks were monitored and logged in the project atlas page. Any risk that was evaluated to pose a serious concern to the project implementation, was addressed in the SCM. the decisions of the SC were addressed in the prodoc and were implemented with the new mitigation actions. The risk log was also monitored as per the formats of the donor, in the format attached.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	FINAL_Risk_Log_Template_1288_311 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FINAL_Risk_Log_Template_1288_311.doc)	ada.shima@undp.org	12/12/2019 2:27:00 PM

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 was fully financed by the donor.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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:

The project prepared annually a procurement plan, according to the rules and procedures of UNDP. The procurement plan was prepared in line with the annual work plan, validated with the donor and with the national counterparts.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	01UNDP-SDCProDoc-SkillsDevelopmentforEmployment-28Nov2014_1288_313 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/01UNDP-SDCProDoc-SkillsDevelopmentforEmployment-28Nov2014_1288_313.docx)	ada.shima@undp.org	12/12/2019 2:30:00 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:

UNDP was part of the steering committee of the of the programme and ensure coordination at the decision making level. At the same time, the programme team ensured that all the projects were well coordinated, and where necessary, the same procurement processes were utilized to ensure standardization and efficient use of resources.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Effective**Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

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

- Yes
- No

Evidence:

The project was fully delivered as per the expected outputs.

SD4E preparation and implementation is characterized by a strong participatory process. Cooperation and communication with other Swiss-funded actions acting in the same sector is properly ensured. The SD 4E Programme Team has been pro-active in reducing delays for those issues which were within direct control of the programme. However, frequent changes in the Minister position and thus the absence of continuous leadership and decision-making power at the MoSWY provides a serious drawback to the speedy adoption of programme outputs

List of Uploaded Documents			
#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	LPACminutes-SkillsDevelopmentforEmploymentSD4E_1288_315 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/LPACminutes-SkillsDevelopmentforEmploymentSD4E_1288_315.pdf)	ada.shima@undp.org	12/12/2019 2:25:00 PM
2	MinutesSCmeeting-SD4E31Jan2017_1288_315 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MinutesSCmeeting-SD4E31Jan2017_1288_315.doc)	ada.shima@undp.org	12/12/2019 2:25:00 PM
3	MinutesSCmeeting-SD4E08July2016_1288_315 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MinutesSCmeeting-SD4E08July2016_1288_315.doc)	ada.shima@undp.org	12/12/2019 2:25:00 PM
4	MinutesSCmeeting-SD4E18Dec2015_1288_315 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MinutesSCmeeting-SD4E18Dec2015_1288_315.doc)	ada.shima@undp.org	12/12/2019 2:26:00 PM
5	MinutesSCmeeting-SD4E12June2015_1288_315 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MinutesSCmeeting-SD4E12June2015_1288_315.docx)	ada.shima@undp.org	12/12/2019 2:26:00 PM

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 programme organized biannual steering committee meetings, where the work plan was reviewed and proposed changes were validated and approved.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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

- 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:

Targeting the skill needs of young men and women, has been a success factor for this intervention. The programme also focuses well on facilitating some evidence-based policies in VET and VSD, on strengthening the capacity of Albanian central institutions to improve active labour market measures aligned with policy objectives. VET providers and the private sector could have been better addressed throughout the SD4E design. The Programme has recognised this need and has adjusted some activities allowing now a stronger involvement of the business sector.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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

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:**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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:

During the implementation period of the project, there were several changes in the management structures of the government, with new staff in place, but also with new governance arrangements. For instance, the function of administering the VET providers was transferred to a few different line ministries. This delayed some processes, and sometimes changed some priorities. To address this, a thorough mid-term review was organized, in order to address the needs of the institutions and to align the programme to those needs.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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:

to support the institutions in the proces of finalizing t
he VET and employment policy reform, UNDP drafe
d the consolidation phase of the programme, buildin
g on the lessons learned and ensuring sustanaibility
of results. The consolidation phase was developed j
ointly with relevant institutions of the government of
Albania and disucssed with the donor.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	ProjectDocumentUNDPD4E_Consolidationphase_18.12.2018_1288_320 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ProjectDocumentUNDPD4E_Consolidationphase_18.12.2018_1288_320 .doc)	ada.shima@undp.org	12/11/2019 12:52:00 PM

QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments

The main achievement of the programme are as follows:

Employment Policy reform (2015 – 2018)

- Support to implement the NESS 2014-2020 (NESS Annual Progress reports, Mid-Term Review, coordination with other donor interventions)
- Support to employment policies at regional level (TEP, Regional Employment Boards)
- Support to develop the new Law on Employment Promotion
- Support the implementation and monitoring of ALMPs (scoring system, impact evaluation, design of additional ALMPs)
- Design and implementation of the Self-Employment Programme
- Support NES mid-term planning

VET Policy Reform (2015 – 2018)

- Optimization of the public VET providers' network
- Revision of the National Classification of Occupations
- Support to develop the legal framework: VET bylaws, law on crafts
- Support to establish the quality assurance framework (self-assessment and institutional setup for quality assurance)
- Study on work-based learning models in the Albanian VET
- Improved image of VET: Skills Fairs (based on the Swiss experience), increased numbers of students in VET