

Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

Form Status: Approved

Overall Rating:	Highly Satisfactory
Decision:	
Portfolio/Project Number:	00112325
Portfolio/Project Title:	Turkey- UNDP Partnership in Development
Portfolio/Project Date:	2018-06-21 / 2021-10-31

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 Board and the project team have identified the potential risks and delays. For example, when the COVID-19 pandemic started, it was identified as a risk as early as February. Accordingly, country office teams have taken measures; activities can be shifted to virtual platforms were re-designed to achieve the objectives. The Project Board also granted project extensions to country teams to allow sufficient time to implement their activities in full.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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:

Contributing Outcome (RPD 2018-2021): Outcome 2: Addressing poverty and inequalities through more inclusive growth. Output 2.3. Enabling environment strengthened through diverse partnerships to expand opportunities for public and private sector, including alternative financing for the achievement of the SDGs

Indicative Output(s):

- Turkey's contribution to South South and triangular Cooperation strengthened
- Turkey's role as a knowledge hub that forges South-South, triangular and other forms of cooperation enhanced

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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:

All country offices have engaged the local stakeholders in the project implementation process while prioritizing discriminated and marginalized parts of society.

In Angola, UNDP has held several consultations with the authorities responsible for the national system TVET both at the national and local level for over six months and has gained a deep understanding of the lessons learned and current challenges facing TVET in Angola. During the implementation stage, After the approval of the presidential decree which regulates the apprenticeship modalities in Angola in November 2020, the Turkey-UNDP Partnership became the first pioneering initiative to implement an apprenticeship program with the new regulation promoted by the Government with great visibility. This project became the pioneering initiative 100 people received training in vocational training centers women and disabled people were prioritized in training. In the training

conducted to strengthen the capacities of local business association, 165 (102 women) young entrepreneurs and informal workers have been trained in informatics and business management.

Benin's project is in perfect alignment with a strategic action included in the Programme d'Action du Gouvernement du Bénin (PAG, Programme of Action of the Government of Benin, 2016–2021), i.e. "Revitalize and modernize the Beninese public administration". This action is included in axis 2: "Improving governance" of pillar 1, "Democracy, the Rule of Law and Good Governance" in this programme. During the implementation of the project, over 30 civil servants received capacity building trainings.

In DRC, local communities were engaged in the project designing activities. The CO has conducted various provincial workshops since 2014 to enhance the local capacities in the region. During the implementation process of the project, local committees for the management of the construction sites were established to create a local ownership of the project.

In Lao, the project was designed to train the local members of the villages which were affected by natural disasters and UXO. In the designing stage, consultations were held with the National Regulatory Authority for UXO and Mine Action Sector in Lao PDR (NRA). In the implementation stage of the project, representative of every household from the villages was invited to attend the training as well as 350 students from local villages. Local committees were established to continue the awareness-raising campaigns beyond the implementation of the project. When the local community requested more rescue equipment, the project board approved the allocation of funds for the procurement of the equipment.

In Rwanda, the project is a result of continuous consultations with different stakeholders including the Gender Monitoring Office (GMO), the UN Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN Women), the Ministry of Women and Family Promotion, the Ministry of Trade and Industry, the Ministry of Labor and the Ministry of Finance and Economic Planning. More importantly, the project is a result of consultations with leaders and staff at all levels of various private sector companies discussing key gender accountability challenges faced by the private sector in Rwanda. A series of high-level events with the Chief Executive Officers of private companies and leaders from the selected public institutions, workshops with selected staff from private companies, public in

stitutions, and the Private Sector Federation (PSF), have contributed to shaping the project objective and to identifying the key entry points to address gender inequalities in the Rwandan private sector.

Overall the project was in line with the local priorities of the recipient countries and project board has approved the allocation of funds to the activities which benefited the beneficiaries.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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:

UNDP IRH closely monitored each project and its activities on the ground and offered its support to all the country offices. Both UNDP IRH and COs closely cooperated with Turkish Partners to maintain a transparent information flow.

Some lessons learned in this process are listed as below:

- Ensuring a continuous communication channel between the donor and the project management teams engaging with all parties including available procedural/project management information quickly resolves disagreements and prevent delays.
- Involvement of the Regional Offices in both project evaluation and project implementation processes proved to have added value to the project. Their involvement was especially beneficial when evaluating the proposed projects with relevant contextual knowledge, as well as overcoming language and context knowledge barriers.
- When the selected project is strongly connected to the CO's programmatic focus area and part of a broader programme, these projects have been more successful in terms of implementing activities and achieving the targeted goals. On the other hand, linking to broader programs with multiple donors creates challenges in differentiating Turkish contribution and identifying the actual impact of the project/contribution.
- The size of the project funding to Country offices is critical in ensuring efficiency. The transactional and reporting requirements of running a small project (like those supported under the Turkey-UNDP Partnership-Phase 2) are very similar to running a much larger scale project. Hence, small projects might raise the risk of limited interest among country offices (during the application or implementation stages).
- Country offices, which have involved the Turkish Embassies from earlier stages of the project implementation, have been more successful in establishing strong cooperation on the ground and regularly engaging with Turkish counterparts.
- Projects with multiple contingency plans and proactive problem-solving approaches had a higher chance of success and could more easily adapt to the challenges caused by COVID-19. For example, LAO CO was particularly successful in its proactive approach to move activities from Q4 to Q3 with the anticipation of another lockdown.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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:

There is credible evidence that the project is reaching a sufficient number of beneficiaries in Angola, Benin, Lao, DRC, and Rwanda.

- In Lao, the project team already scaled up the project building upon the lessons learned from Turkey-U NDP Partnership with another funding source.
- In Benin, Rwanda, and DRC, other components of the project are ongoing with other funding.
- In Angola and Rwanda, the project teams have supported the formalization of national standards in their respective thematic areas in Angola and Rwanda which has contributed to a meaningful development change. In Angola, project teams were even engaged in the initiation of the new vocational training center for women project of TIKA in Angola.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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:

The programme developed criteria for the initiatives and projects to be supported with funding. These criteria also included gender equality and women's empowerment to provide a preference for projects that serve for equality. The projects in Angola, Rwanda, and Lao have collected gender-disaggregated data on the results of the projects. All projects have conducted their activities while adhering to the gender-responsive project planning guidelines of UNDP and have adjusted their projects activities to adopt gender-inclusive approaches.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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:

One risk identified at the beginning of the project was the possibility of limited demand from the beneficiary countries during the call for proposals process. However, this risk was not materialized with high demand from the beneficiary countries for the Turkey-UNDP Partnership in Development Phase II. Another risk identified was the possibility of delays in the implementation of the projects. These delays indeed happened due to the global COVID-19 pandemic.

To mitigate this risk, UNDP IRH continuously communicated with all parties including available procedural/project management information to quickly resolve disagreements and prevent delays. High-level decision-makers in important milestones of the project were involved whenever necessary to ensure commitment for the project objectives and efficient resolution of any pending items.

The final risk factor identified in the beginning was the possibility of a change of the priorities or key actors of partner countries due to delays during the project selection process faced in the beginning of the project. To mitigate this risk, UNDP IRH continually informed country offices regarding the delays. However, all partners maintained their interest in benefiting from the Turkey-UNDP Partnership in Development Phase II.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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 sub-projects supported by the project are implemented by the Country Offices, which have their own grievance mechanisms as part of their programme implementation.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Management & Monitoring**Quality Rating: Exemplary**

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 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:

In addition to annual progress reports, the project prepares quarterly reports which report the progress based on the results-based management guidelines of UNDP. Progress against indicators in the project RRF are regularly reported through the annual reports.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Approved-Turkey-UNDPfD-ProgressReport Nov2020_10357_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Approved-Turkey-UNDPfD-ProgressReportNov2020_10357_309.pdf)	kubra.ozturk@undp.org	11/5/2021 12:42:00 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:

The project's governance mechanism operated well. It has met in the agreed frequency stated in the project document and the minutes of the meetings are on file (attached). There is quarterly and annual progress reporting to the project board results, risks, and opportunities. It is clear that the project board explicitly reviews and uses evidence, including progress data, knowledge, lessons, and evaluations, as the basis for informing management decisions (e.g., change in strategy, approach, work plan.) Moreover, UNDP IRH and the Board Members have held numerous informal meetings informing the board members of the potential risk and delays in the project.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	newlysignedPBMinutes_10357_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/newlysignedPBMinutes_10357_310.pdf)	kubra.ozturk@undp.org	11/5/2021 12:43:00 PM
2	signedProjectBoardMinutes2_10357_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/signedProjectBoardMinutes2_10357_310.pdf)	kubra.ozturk@undp.org	11/5/2021 12:43:00 PM
3	Signed-ProjectBoardMinutes-Dec2020.docx2_10357_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Signed-ProjectBoardMinutes-Dec2020.docx2_10357_310.pdf)	kubra.ozturk@undp.org	11/5/2021 12:43:00 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:

One risk identified in the beginning of the project was the possibility of limited demand from the beneficiary countries during the call for proposal process. However, this risk was not materialized with high demand from the beneficiary countries for the Turkey-UNDP Partnership in Development Phase II.

Another risk identified was the possibility of delays in the implementation of the projects. These delays indeed happened due to the global COVID-19 pandemic. To mitigate this risk, UNDP IRH continuously communicated with all parties including available procedural/project management information to quickly resolve disagreements and prevent delays. High-level decision makers in important milestones of the project were involved whenever necessary in order to ensure commitment for the project objectives and efficient resolution of any pending items.

Final risk factor identified in the beginning was the possibility of a change of the priorities or key actors of partner countries due to delays during the project selection process faced in the beginning of the project. To mitigate this risk, UNDP IRH continually informed country offices regarding the delays. However, all partners maintained their interest in benefiting from the Turkey-UNDP Partnership in Development Phase II.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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 overall project budget of \$500,000 was sufficient for all country offices to complete their project activities within the given timeframe. The Project Board took necessary action and adjusted the budget allocation as needed when the project was extended until 31st of October 2021.

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 followed the corporate procurement guidelines as well as the requirements laid out by the document attached 'Guidelines for Call for Proposal'.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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 IRH has collected quarterly progress and financial reports from the country teams and has prepared reports accordingly. Whenever needed, the Project Board took necessary action to ensure the efficiency of the project activities. Quarterly reports are attached.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	CombinedQ3Report_10357_314 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CombinedQ3Report_10357_314.docx)	kubra.ozturk@undp.org	11/9/2021 11:41:00 AM
2	2021Q3ProgressReport_10357_314 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2021Q3ProgressReport_10357_314.pdf)	kubra.ozturk@undp.org	11/9/2021 11:40:00 AM
3	2021-Q1Report_10357_314 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2021-Q1Report_10357_314.pdf)	kubra.ozturk@undp.org	11/9/2021 11:40:00 AM
4	CombinedQ2Report-Draft_10357_314 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CombinedQ2Report-Draft_10357_314.docx)	kubra.ozturk@undp.org	11/9/2021 11:40:00 AM
5	CombinedQ4Report_10357_314 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CombinedQ4Report_10357_314.docx)	kubra.ozturk@undp.org	11/9/2021 11:41:00 AM
6	Q1PROGRESSREPORTcombined_10357_314 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Q1PROGRESSREPORTcombined_10357_314.doc)	kubra.ozturk@undp.org	11/9/2021 11:41:00 AM
7	Q2Report_10357_314 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Q2Report_10357_314.pdf)	kubra.ozturk@undp.org	11/9/2021 11:41:00 AM

Effective**Quality Rating: Exemplary**

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

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

Evidence:

The project was initially planned to be concluded by December 2020. However, due to delays caused by COVID-19 the project was extended until October 2021. All the project activities which were planned to take place by October 2021 were in line with the extended project timeline have been completed.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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:

Yes, there have been two budget revisions approved by the Project Board to ensure activities would be implemented.

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:

All the project proposals received have identified geographical areas and prepared needs assessment-based project proposals. Some project documents were revised according to the requests of the Project Selection Committee.

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:

In Angola, the project implementation process was conducted in close partnership with the Turkish Embassy in Angola, TIKA, Ministry of Public Administration, Labour and Social Security (MAPTSS), and National Institute for Employment and Vocational Training (INEFOP). When the MAPTSS required curriculum changes to the apprenticeship program, UNDP took necessary actions to amend the project activities.

In Benin, the project was conducted in partnership between the Turkish Embassy in Benin and Ministry of Labor and Civil Service in Benin.

In Lao, the partnership between the Turkish Embassy in LAO and Department of Meteorology and Hydrology, and Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare (MLSW) was strong. When the local authorities requested more early warning equipment, the Project Board approved the financial allocation and has aligned the project activities with local priorities.

In Rwanda, the project engaged the national authorities from the design stage of the project. The partnership between the Turkish Embassy in Rwanda, Gender Monitoring Office in Rwanda was strong and fully aligned with national priorities.

In DRC, the local authorities in the Masisi region were engaged in the project implementation process. Moreover, the villagers were involved in daily project activities which have increased the overall national ownership of the project.

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 [arrangements⁸](#) 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:

This is not applicable to this project.

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:

All country offices have submitted their sustainability plans along their project proposals which were evaluated both by the Project Selection Committee and the Project Board.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments