

Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

Form Status: Approved

Overall Rating:	Highly Satisfactory
Decision:	
Portfolio/Project Number:	00118949
Portfolio/Project Title:	IDENTIFICATE
Portfolio/Project Date:	2019-07-19 / 2022-05-31

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:

Three substantive reviews have been developed in the project because the context has been changing. First because of the COVID pandemic, second because of the ETA and IOTA hurricanes and third because of the political and social context of the country.

See: substantive reviews 1, 2, and 3.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Revisión_sustantiva_PRODOC_dic.19_9068_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Revisión_sustantiva_PRODOC_dic.19_9068_301.pdf)	carlos.ochoa@undp.org	11/25/2021 12:05:00 AM
2	2021.04.27RevisiónSustantiva2fondosnacionalesfinal29974.docx_9068_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2021.04.27RevisiónSustantiva2fondosnacionalesfinal29974.docx_9068_301.pdf)	carlos.ochoa@undp.org	11/25/2021 12:05:00 AM
3	RevisiónsustantivaNo.3_firmado_9068_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/RevisiónsustantivaNo.3_firmado_9068_301.pdf)	carlos.ochoa@undp.org	11/25/2021 12:06:00 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 is aligned with result 2 of the UNDP Strategic Plan - "Accelerate structural transformations for sustainable development". Within this scope, it is also aligned with the flagship solution # 2 - "Strengthen effective, inclusive and responsible governance" and will focus on product 2.2.1 - "Enable the use of digital technologies and big data to improve public services and other government functions". Regarding the relevant indicator at the product level, it can be mentioned that the following indicator will be contributed: "Number of countries that use initiatives (frameworks) that take advantage of digital technologies and big data for (d) Legal identity and civil registration...".

See: PRODOC: Section V - Results Framework.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	00118949_PRODOC_9068_302 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/00118949_PRODOC_9068_302.pdf)	carlos.ochoa@undp.org	11/25/2021 12:34:00 AM

Relevant**Quality Rating: Exemplary**

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:

The Project proposed a strategy to bring national identification services to all corners of the country through mobile units. In this way, it was possible to reach populations that find it difficult to move to urban areas where identification and civil registration services are traditionally available.

See PRODOC: Section II - Strategy, title "Contributions to the Sustainable Development Goals and the 2030 Agenda"

The enrollment process serves the entire population without discrimination. Additionally, a register is kept to the ethnic groups of the people enrolled. A specific tour was made to the Gracias a Dios Department (the most remote department with a large indigenous and Afro-Honduran population) adapting the dissemination and training materials to their native languages. Likewise, local personnel were hired to promote effective communication, in the respective languages of each ethnic group.

See:

1. Project for the Strengthening of the RCM of Gracias a Dios
2. Training Plan for Gracias a Dios
3. Poster in Misquito.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Proyecto para el Fortalecimiento de los RCM de Gracia y Dios VF_9068_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Proyecto para el Fortalecimiento de los RCM de Gracia y Dios VF_9068_303.pdf)	carlos.ochoa@undp.org	11/25/2021 12:46:00 AM
2	PLAN DE CAPACITACIÓN DEPARTAMENTO DE GRACIAS A DIOS_9068_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PLAN DE CAPACITACIÓN DEPARTAMENTO DE GRACIAS A DIOS_9068_303.pdf)	carlos.ochoa@undp.org	11/25/2021 12:46:00 AM
3	Infografía Misquito_9068_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Infografía Misquito_9068_303.pdf)	carlos.ochoa@undp.org	11/25/2021 12:47:00 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:

Project progress is monitored weekly, thanks to the information provided by the enrollment kits and the system in general.

Additionally, supervision tours were made.

Finally, various interviews and visits were carried out in order to elaborate the lessons learned.

All the information was used for decision-making in the project meetings and programmatic adjustments in the technical execution meetings.

Please refer to:

1. Example of monitoring report.
2. Example of a tour report.
3. Document of systematization.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Gira2021_1_9068_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Gira2021_1_9068_304.pdf)	carlos.ochoa@undp.org	11/26/2021 1:04:00 AM
2	DashBoardRegistroEDB31-03-2021002_9068_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/DashBoardRegistroEDB31-03-2021002_9068_304.pdf)	carlos.ochoa@undp.org	11/26/2021 1:02:00 AM
3	DOCUMENTODESISTEMATIZACIONPROYECTOIDENTIFICATEMAYO2021_9068_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/DOCUMENTODESISTEMATIZACIONPROYECTOIDENTIFICATEMAYO2021_9068_304.pdf)	carlos.ochoa@undp.org	11/26/2021 1:05:00 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:

There is abundant evidence that the project reached a sufficient number of beneficiaries to contribute significantly to development change, among the results are:

- Enrollment activity throughout the country, including the department of Gracias a Dios.
- The new enrollment strategy designed and implemented with a more flexible approach and outreach to communities to mitigate the impact of COVID-19.
- First time in the country that biometric technology is used to capture data.
- The high degree of training given to registrants has made it possible to reduce enrollment times, generating more efficiency and higher expectations of meeting the project objectives.
- Mobile brigades for the enrollment of citizens in remote places.
- Updated database that includes the civil address of citizens and their biometric data, excluding the deceased.
- Around 5,500,000 people have registered and the process is expected to continue on an ongoing basis.
- Identification and attention to historical inconsistencies of citizen information in the databases, for example, name misspelling, place or date of birth.
- First database of ten fingerprints and facial biometrics.
- First registry of volunteers for organ donation.
- First registration base of the indigenous population.
- Materials in native languages.
- First base for the registration of people with disabilities.
- LGTBIQ + community.
- Respectful and inclusive care of citizens.

Please refer:

1. PPT_Logros12.08.21
2. DashBoardEntrega DNI
3. DashBoardRegistroEDB

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	PPT_Logros12.08.21_9068_305 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PPT_Logros12.08.21_9068_305.pdf)	carlos.ochoa@undp.org	11/25/2021 4:39:00 PM
2	DashBoardEntregaDNI24-11-2021_9068_305 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/DashBoardEntregaDNI24-11-2021_9068_305.pdf)	carlos.ochoa@undp.org	11/25/2021 4:39:00 PM
3	DashBoardRegistroEDB22-11-2021_9068_305 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/DashBoardRegistroEDB22-11-2021_9068_305.pdf)	carlos.ochoa@undp.org	11/25/2021 4:39:00 PM

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 project had a monitoring system disaggregated by sex and indigenous population. Additionally, adjustments were made to the gender marker and specific training topics on gender and attention to diversity were included.

Please refer to:

1. PRODOC: Sección II - Estrategia, título “Enfoque de Género”
2. Substantive review 2
3. DashBoardEntrega DNI
4. DashBoardRegistroEDB

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	00118949_PRODROC_9068_306 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/00118949_PRODROC_9068_306.pdf)	carlos.ochoa@undp.org	11/25/2021 5:14:00 PM
2	Revisión_sustantiva_PRODROC_dic.19_9068_306 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Revisión_sustantiva_PRODROC_dic.19_9068_306.pdf)	carlos.ochoa@undp.org	11/25/2021 5:14:00 PM
3	DashBoardRegistroEDB22-11-2021_9068_306 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/DashBoardRegistroEDB22-11-2021_9068_306.pdf)	carlos.ochoa@undp.org	11/25/2021 5:15:00 PM
4	DashBoardEntregaDNI24-11-2021_9068_306 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/DashBoardEntregaDNI24-11-2021_9068_306.pdf)	carlos.ochoa@undp.org	11/25/2021 5:15:00 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:

Social and environmental risks were recorded and reported quarterly in donor reports. Specific plans were made for the risks identified and implemented, resourced and monitored. The risks were managed effectively.

There were changes in the project due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

Please refer to:

1. Informe estratégico para la prevención de COVID-19 en el Proyecto Identificate
2. Informe SIEMAS 2021-noviembre
3. PROTOCOLO DE BIOSEGURIDAD RNP - CNO
4. Substantive review 3

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	InformeSIEMAS2021-noviembre_9068_307 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/InformeSIEMAS2021-noviembre_9068_307.pdf)	carlos.ochoa@undp.org	11/25/2021 5:44:00 PM
2	PROTOCOLODEBIOSEGURIDADRNP-CNO_9068_307 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PROTOCOLODEBIOSEGURIDADRNP-CNO_9068_307.pdf)	carlos.ochoa@undp.org	11/25/2021 5:45:00 PM
3	InformeestrategicoparalaprevisióndeCOVID-19enelProyectoIdentificate_9068_307 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/InformeestrategicoparalaprevisióndeCOVID-19enelProyectoIdentificate_9068_307.pdf)	carlos.ochoa@undp.org	11/25/2021 5:46:00 PM
4	RevisiónsutantivaNo.3_firmado_9068_307 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/RevisiónsutantivaNo.3_firmado_9068_307.pdf)	carlos.ochoa@undp.org	11/25/2021 5:47:00 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:

A grievance mechanism was in place for people affected by the project and grievances were addressed to mitigate damages effectively.

Complaints were received and responded to, but some challenges were faced in reaching a resolution due to the complexity of the operation.

Please refer to:

1. B.1 PROYECTO CALL CENTER - ALÓ RNP

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	B.1PROYECTOALLCENTER-ALÓRNP_9068_308 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/B.1PROYECTOALLCENTER-ALÓRNP_9068_308.pdf)	carlos.ochoa@undp.org	11/25/2021 6:19:00 PM

Management & Monitoring**Quality Rating: 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 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 had the M&E Plan and a team of people was available for this purpose. Project progress data was collected periodically, with very reliable information. The final evaluation is in process. Lessons learned were captured and used to take corrective action.

Please refer to:

1. TDR evaluacionfinal
2. DOCUMENTODESISTEMATIZACIONPROYECTOIDENTIFICATEMAYO2021_9068_309
3. Plan de M&E

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	TDRevaluacionfinal_CommJB75_9068_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/TDRevaluacionfinal_CommJB75_9068_309.docx)	carlos.ochoa@undp.org	11/25/2021 6:26:00 PM
2	DOCUMENTODESISTEMATIZACIONPROYECTOIDENTIFICATEMAYO2021_9068_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/DOCUMENTODESISTEMATIZACIONPROYECTOIDENTIFICATEMAYO2021_9068_309.pdf)	carlos.ochoa@undp.org	11/25/2021 6:28:00 PM
3	PlanME_9068_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PlanME_9068_309.docx)	carlos.ochoa@undp.org	11/25/2021 6:33:00 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 governance mechanism (project boards and technical tables) worked well. It met with the agreed frequency indicated in the project document and all the minutes of the meetings were signed and filed.

There were quarterly progress reports and presentations to the project board on results, risks and opportunities.

The project board reviewed and used the evidence to inform management decisions.

Extraordinary meetings were held for quick decision making.

Please refer to:

1. AYUDA MEMORIA, JUNTA PROYECTO 5-7-21.pdf
2. AYUDA MEMORIA, JUNTA PROYECTO 4-3-21.pdf
3. AYUDA MEMORIA, JUNTA PROYECTO 22-7-21.pdf
4. AYUDA MEMORIA, JUNTA PROYECTO 12-8-21.pdf
5. AYUDA MEMORIA, JUNTA PROYECTO 12-5-21.pdf

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	AYUDAMEMORIAJUNTAPROYECTO4-3-21_9068_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/AYUDAMEMORIAJUNTAPROYECTO4-3-21_9068_310.pdf)	carlos.ochoa@undp.org	11/25/2021 9:25:00 PM
2	AYUDAMEMORIAJUNTAPROYECTO5-7-21_9068_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/AYUDAMEMORIAJUNTAPROYECTO5-7-21_9068_310.pdf)	carlos.ochoa@undp.org	11/25/2021 9:25:00 PM
3	AYUDAMEMORIAJUNTAPROYECTO12-5-21_9068_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/AYUDAMEMORIAJUNTAPROYECTO12-5-21_9068_310.pdf)	carlos.ochoa@undp.org	11/25/2021 9:26:00 PM
4	AYUDAMEMORIAJUNTAPROYECTO12-8-21_9068_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/AYUDAMEMORIAJUNTAPROYECTO12-8-21_9068_310.pdf)	carlos.ochoa@undp.org	11/25/2021 9:26:00 PM
5	AYUDAMEMORIAJUNTAPROYECTO22-7-21_9068_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/AYUDAMEMORIAJUNTAPROYECTO22-7-21_9068_310.pdf)	carlos.ochoa@undp.org	11/25/2021 9:26:00 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:

Due to the intrinsic complexity of the massive digital enrollment processes, the project developed and implemented a risk management strategy, which included the elaboration of scenarios that allow the Project Board to make timely decisions and reorient the work plan in view of the fulfillment of the results proposed in the project.

Please refer to:

1. Substantive review 2

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	2021.04.27RevisiónSustantiva2fondosnacionalesfinal29974.docx_9068_311 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2021.04.27RevisiónSustantiva2fondosnacionalesfinal29974.docx_9068_311.pdf)	carlos.ochoa@undp.org	11/25/2021 9:31:00 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:

Tranche A had a planned disbursement of \$ 24,122,637.00 to cover the main preparations that were carried out.

Tranche B had a disbursement of \$ 39,464,315, which was disbursed gradually. This phase was focused on starting with the execution of critical activities of the project, such as enrollment; activity that exceeded expectations, if the situation that caused destruction by the natural phenomena ETA and IOTA is taken into consideration. Floods and loss of infrastructure in different regions of the country forced the project to suspend the enrollment process in high-risk rural and urban areas. The response of the project's technical team was positive, even taking into account the Covid-19 pandemic. They have worked uninterruptedly despite the unforeseen events, managing to enroll 5.2 million during section B.

For the closure of the project, \$ 9,500,000.00 was requested, funds that were used to carry out the activities of closing the DNI delivery, updating the project document and timely transfer of the knowledge acquired throughout the project.

The project team managed to enroll 5,500,000 people and have delivered 4,700,000 DNI, at the end of 2021.

Please refer to:

1. Informe 9 BCIE Identificate al 31 de octubre de 2021.pdf

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Informe9BCIEIdentificateal31deoctubrede2021_9068_312 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Informe9BCIEIdentificateal31deoctubrede2021_9068_312.pdf)	carlos.ochoa@undp.org	11/25/2021 9:44:00 PM

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 updated the procurement plan on a quarterly basis. On a quarterly basis, operational bottlenecks for the acquisition of inputs were reviewed in a timely manner and addressed through appropriate management actions.

There were some logistical delays due to COVID-19, but they were overcome.

Please refer to:

1. Informe8BCIEIdentificateTrimestralAbrilaJunio2021

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Informe8BCIEIdentificateTrimestralAbrilaJunio202173_9068_313 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Informe8BCIEIdentificateTrimestralAbrilaJunio202173_9068_313.docx)	carlos.ochoa@undp.org	11/25/2021 9:49:00 PM
2	AnálisisEficienciaFinal_9068_313 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/AnálisisEficienciaFinal_9068_313.pdf)	carlos.ochoa@undp.org	11/25/2021 10:28:00 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:

Regular budget revisions have been made according to the results and adjustments of the field operations and the substantive revisions that have introduced new activities. The project has made use of corporate units for procurement and existing agreements, seeking cost efficiency, reduction of time in procurement and guarantee of results.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Effective**Quality Rating: Exemplary**

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

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

Evidence:

The project never stopped and although it suffered some delays, it obtained the results and reached the goals.

Please refer to:

1. Ppt.Oscarcontribuciónalagobernabilidadydemocracia
2. Ppt.Robertocontribuciónal desarrolloSocial
3. Ppt.RolandocontribuciónalatransformacionDigital

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Ppt.Oscarcontribuciónalagobernabilidadydemocracia21deNovFInal_9068_315 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Ppt.Oscarcontribuciónalagobernabilidadydemocracia21deNovFInal_9068_315.pptx)	carlos.ochoa@undp.org	11/25/2021 10:37:00 PM
2	Ppt.Robertocontribuciónal desarrolloSocial_9068_315 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Ppt.Robertocontribuciónal desarrolloSocial_9068_315.pptx)	carlos.ochoa@undp.org	11/25/2021 10:38:00 PM
3	Ppt.RolandocontribuciónalatransformacionDigital_Identificate20.11.21_9068_315 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Ppt.RolandocontribuciónalatransformacionDigital_Identificate20.11.21_9068_315.pptx)	carlos.ochoa@undp.org	11/25/2021 10:39:00 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:

On a quarterly basis, the donor was informed about the project work plan, its expenses and purchasing plan to ensure that the activities implemented were more likely to achieve the desired results. There was a permanent budget review.

The data and lessons learned were used to make tactical and operational adjustments.

Please refer to:

1. Informe9BCIEIdentificateal31deoctubrede2021
2. INFORMEPRELIMINARAVANCESDESISTEMATIZACIONABRIL202

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Informe9BCIEIdentificateal31deoctubrede2021_9068_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Informe9BCIEIdentificateal31deoctubrede2021_9068_316.pdf)	carlos.ochoa@undp.org	11/25/2021 10:20:00 PM
2	INFORMEPRELIMINARAVANCESDESISTEMATIZACIONABRIL2021_9068_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/INFORMEPRELIMINARAVANCESDESISTEMATIZACIONABRIL2021_9068_316.docx)	carlos.ochoa@undp.org	11/25/2021 10:50:00 PM

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:

The project took into account ethnic groups in very isolated areas (Mosquitia), identified through the use of a mapping at the beginning of the project. All target groups were reached as planned. Enrollment with target groups was constantly monitored to assess whether they benefited as expected. The targeting was done in areas where ethnic groups were present. Please refer to:

1. INFORME 0521

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	INFORME0521_9068_317 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/INFORME0521_9068_317.pdf)	carlos.ochoa@undp.org	11/25/2021 10:59:00 PM

Sustainability & National Ownership**Quality Rating: 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:

Only national systems were used to fully implement and monitor the project. A fundamental part of the identify yourself project was the participation of civil society through mechanisms of access to public information and social auditing that allowed transparency and accountability in the processes of enrollment and delivery of the identity card, as well as, in the construction of the new electoral roll.

All relevant stakeholders and partners were fully and actively involved in the process, playing a leadership role in decision-making, implementation and monitoring of the project.

Please refer to:

1. IIInformeACTUALIZADO
2. InformeConsolidadodeMonitoreodeVeeduriasocial-ASJ

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	IIInformeACTUALIZADO_9068_318 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/IIInformeACTUALIZADO_9068_318.pdf)	carlos.ochoa@undp.org	11/26/2021 12:53:00 AM
2	InformeConsolidadodeMonitoreodeVeeduriasocial-ASJ_9068_318 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/InformeConsolidadodeMonitoreodeVeeduriasocial-ASJ_9068_318.pdf)	carlos.ochoa@undp.org	11/26/2021 12:36:00 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:

A HACT of the RNP was carried out during the beginning of the project.
 For its implementation, a team of 165 people formed a complete organizational structure.
 At the end of the project, training and capacity-building actions have been carried out.
 Please refer to:
 1. Organigrama2020
 2. EstrategiaCapacitacionRCM2021

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Organigrama2020_9068_319 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Organigrama2020_9068_319.pdf)	carlos.ochoa@undp.org	11/26/2021 12:28:00 AM
2	EstrategiaCapacitacionRCM2021_9068_319 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/EstrategiaCapacitacionRCM2021_9068_319.pdf)	carlos.ochoa@undp.org	11/26/2021 12:30:00 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 Project Board approved the project's sustainability plan, and the training and capacity-building plans. The plan was implemented as planned at the end of the project, taking into account adjustments made during implementation.

Please refer to:

1. EstrategiaCapacitacionRCM2021
2. AccionesparalasostenibilidadyDesarrollodecapacidades

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	EstrategiaCapacitacionRCM2021_9068_320 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/EstrategiaCapacitacionRCM2021_9068_320.pdf)	carlos.ochoa@undp.org	11/26/2021 1:00:00 AM
2	AccionesparalasostenibilidadyDesarrollodecapacidades_9068_320 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/AccionesparalasostenibilidadyDesarrollodecapacidades_9068_320.docx)	carlos.ochoa@undp.org	11/26/2021 1:01:00 AM

QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments

The project has had a monitoring system and the necessary adjustments have been made to ensure quality in its execution and the achievement of results, optimizing resources.

