Implementation Stage Quality Ass

Form Status: Under Review	

Overall Rating:	Needs Improvement
Decision:	Take remedial action: The project has issues that must be addressed or the project may be satisfactory, the project may be suspended if the deficiencies are not addressed. All manag
Portfolio/Project Number:	00085987
Portfolio/Project Title:	Strengthening Inclusive Dev in the CHT
Portfolio/Project Date:	2016-10-01 / 2020-09-30

Strategic   **Quality Rating: Exe**

1. Is the project pro-actively identifying changes to the external environment and incorporating them into the project strateg

- ◉ *3: The project team has identified relevant changes in the external environment that may present new opportunities or have been tested to determine if the project's strategy is still valid. There is evidence that the project board has consid response. (all must be true)*
- ○ 2: The project team has identified relevant changes in the external environment that may present new opportunities or evidence that the project board discussed this, but relevant changes may not have been fully integrated in the project
- ○ 1: The project team may have considered relevant changes in the external environment since implementation began, project as a result.

Evidence:

As continued activities of host community in the project intervention areas in CHT, a demand has created by DANIDA to expand its intervention to Cox's Bazar host communities in order to improve their socioeconomic conditions though increasing diversified livelihoods. The major successful interventions such as social cohesion, farmer field school and agroforestry of the current project will be implemented in Cox's Bazar host communities for reducing adverse impacts caused by Rohinga. This is a new change that proactively will be added to the external environment of this project.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name
1	AgreementonsupporttoHostCommunitiesaffectedbyRohingyaInfluxProject_199_201 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/AgreementonsupporttoHostCommunitiesaffectedbyRo

2. Is the project aligned with the UNDP Strategic Plan?

◉ *3: The project responds at least one of the development settings[3] as specified in the Strategic Plan (SP) and adopts a relevant SP output indicators. (all must be true)*

○ 2: The project responds to one of the three areas of development work[1] as specified in the Strategic Plan. The project true)

○ 1: While the project may respond to a partner's identified need, this need falls outside the UNDP Strategic Plan. Also

Evidence:

Yes, the main goal of this project links with the UNDP' Strategic Plan. This project also aligns with the UNDAF's outcome 1,2 and 3 by addressing the main outputs of this project (1) strengthened community land, resource and livelihood management, (2) increased participation and influence to shape decision making and (3) democratic governance strengthened with responsive institutions and effective services. Based on the overall objective and implementation modality, this project will help track a few SP output indicators a followings:

SDG 1.1.1. Proportion of population below the
international poverty line by sex, age, employment status and geographical
location;

Eradicating poverty: SDG 1.3.1. Proportion of population covered by
social protection floors/systems, by sex, distinguishing children, unemployed
persons, older persons, persons with disabilities, pregnant women, newborns,
work-injury victims and the poor and the vulnerable;

Gender equality: SDG 5.2.1. Proportion of ever partnered women and
girls aged 15 years and older subjected to physical, sexual or psychological
violence by a current or former intimate partner in the previous 12 months, by
form of violence and by age;

(Ref- https://undocs.org/DP/2017/38)

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name
1	Signed-Prodoc-SID-CHT_199_202 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Signed-Prodoc-S CHT_199_202.pdf)

Relevant   **Quality Rating: Sati**

3. Are the project's targeted groups being systematically engaged, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginaliz

- ○ 3: Systematic and structured feedback has been collected over the past two years from a representative sample of be of the project's monitoring system. Representatives from the targeted groups are active members of the project's gove evidence that their feedback informs project decision making. (all must be true)
- ● *2: Targeted groups have been engaged in implementation and monitoring, with a priority focus on the discriminated ar collected over the past year to ensure the project is addressing local priorities. This information has been used to infor*
- ○ 1: Some beneficiary feedback may have been collected over the past year, but this information has not been used to i feedback has been collected.
- ○ Not Applicable

Evidence:

> This project has established a routine beneficiary feedback system which is being used for decision making and project implementation as well. An evidence is attached.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name
1	03-VCFMgtPlan-Begenachari-2018_199_203 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/03-VCF Begenachari-2018_199_203.pdf)

4. Is the project generating knowledge and lessons learned (i.e., what has worked and what has not) and has this knowledg 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 Ac from evaluation, corporate policies/strategies, analysis and monitoring have been discussed in project board meetings 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, have b 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 have been collected by the project team. There

Evidence:

Currently this project has a regular system to collate knowledge and lessons as robust evidence in changing any project component. In such context, this project incorporates critical lessons by conducting regular progress review meeting at management level where GoB counterparts participate. Most of the critical and crucial additions are being discussed properly in those meetings in order to be added in the project design.

List of Uploaded Documents	
#	**File Name**
1	Approvedmeetingminutes-16thJune19atDhaka_199_204 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Approvedmeetingminutes-16thJune19atDhaka_199_

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

- ⦿ *3: There is credible evidence that the project is reaching a sufficient number of beneficiaries (either directly through si meaningfully contribute to development change.*
- ○ 2: While the project is currently not at scale, there are explicit plans in place to scale up the project in the future (e.g. change).
- ○ 1: The project is not at scale, and there are no plans currently to scale up the project in the future.

Evidence:

There is a clear information about the scale up issues of the project. Very recently this project has received a new fund from Canadian CIDA on improving equitable access to safe, quality and inclusive education for 1,200 adolescent girls particularly ethnic minorities and persons with disabilities, which will be a totally new modality and will be implemented in the 26 upazilas in CHT.
CHTWCA project will have an extension opportunity from USAID. The project team has submitted a full proposal along with costed workplan, MEL component and other relevant issues. Hopefully this will be started implementing from next fiscal year (October, 2019) of USAID.
Based on the existing project implementation by DANIDA fund in CHT, a new project has been awarded in the host communities affected by Rohinga influx, which will cover 3 upazilas of Bandadban and Cox's Bazar districts, respectively.
From now and as per the 3 key outputs of Prodoc will be measured by all project and interventions.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name
1	SGDE-EDRMS-9004488-v5-P007055-UNDP-9_9M_199_205 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SGDE-EDRMS-9004488-v5-P007055-UNDP-9_9M_·

Principled   **Quality Rating: Nee**

6. Are the project's measures (through outputs, activities, indicators) to address gender inequalities and empower women r
and changes have been made.

- ○ 3: The project team has systematically gathered data and evidence through project monitoring on the relevance of the data and evidence were used to inform adjustments and changes, as appropriate. (both must be true)
- ◉ *2: The project team has some data and evidence on the relevance of the measures to address gender inequalities an made, as appropriate. (both must be true)*
- ○ 1: The project team has limited or no evidence on the relevance of measures to address gender inequalities and emp option should also be selected if the project has no measures to address gender inequalities and empower women re

Evidence:

> Yes, this project addresses a few number of gender related indicators at output level. Therefore, this project collects adequate data to measure gender inequalities and empowerment routinely. Even more, qualitative data is also being collected and documented to some extent of this project.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name
1	06-SuccessStory_GenderEquity_CHTWCA_199_206 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments SuccessStory_GenderEquity_CHTWCA_199_206.docx)

7. Are social and environmental impacts and risks being successfully managed and monitored?

○ 3: Social and environmental risks are tracked in the risk log. Appropriate assessments conducted where required (i.e. and some level of social and environmental assessment for Moderate risk projects as identified through SESP). Relev process and implemented, resourced, and monitored. Risks effectively managed or mitigated. If there has been a sub SESP is updated to reflect these changes. (all must be true)

⦿ *2: Social and environmental risks are tracked in the risk log. Appropriate assessments conducted where required (i.e. and some level of social and environmental assessment for Moderate risk projects as identified through SESP). Relev risks. OR project is categorized as Low risk through the SESP.*

○ 1: Social and environmental risks have not been tracked in the risk log. For projects categorized as High or Moderate been completed and/or management plans or measures development, implemented or monitored. There have been s been updated. (any may be true)

Evidence:

> Yes, this project has started collecting these issues by addressing community participation including identification of community vulnerability, action plan and mitigation measure. This will be documented from next year.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name
No documents available.	

8. Are grievance mechanisms available to project-affected people and are grievances (if any) addressed to ensure any per

○ 3: Project-affected people have been actively informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism (SRM/SECU) through the SESP, a project -level grievance mechanism is in place and project affected people informed. If grievance Guidance. (all must be true)

○ 2: Project-affected people have been informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism and how to access it. grievance mechanism is in place and project affected people informed. If grievances have been received they are res

⦿ *1: Project-affected people not informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism. If grievances have been rece*

Evidence:

> No, this project has not used any grievance mechanism so far. But, it collects some information while a beneficiary consultation meeting or workshop takes place.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name
No documents available.	

Management & Monitoring   **Quality Rating: Exe**

9. Is the project's M&E Plan sufficient and adequately implemented?

○ *3: The project has a comprehensive and costed M&E plan. Baselines, targets and milestones are fully populated. Pro
  using credible data sources and collected according to the frequency stated in the Plan, including sex disaggregated (
  decentralized evaluation standards, including gender UNEG standards. Lessons learned, including during evaluations
  necessary. (all must be true)*

○ 2: The project has a costed M&E Plan, and most baselines and targets are populated. Progress data against indicator
  some slippage in following the frequency stated in the Plan and data sources are not always reliable. Any evaluations
  Lessons learned have been captured but may not have been used to take corrective actions yet. (all must be true)

○ 1: The project has an M&E Plan, but costs are not clearly planned and budgeted for, or are unrealistic. Progress data
  Evaluations may not meet decentralized evaluation standards. Lessons learned are rarely captured and used. Select

Evidence:

> Yes, this project has a robust and costed M&E plan including target vs achievement, baseline
> information, level of achievement ect. Pls see the annual report page from 47.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name
1	AnnualProgressReport_CHTWCA_199_209 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/AnnualProgressReport_CHTWCA_199_209.pdf)

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

○ *3: The project's governance mechanism is operating well, and is a model for other projects. It has met in the agreed fr* *on file. There is regular (at least annual) progress reporting to the project board or equivalent on results, risks and opp* *evidence, including progress data, knowledge, lessons and evaluations, as the basis for informing management decis* *this option)*

○ 2: The project's governance mechanism has met in the agreed frequency and the minutes of the meeting are on file. / at least once in the past year, covering results, risks and opportunities. (both must be true to select this option)

○ 1: The project's governance mechanism has not met in the frequency stated in the project document over the past ye; making body for the project as intended.

Evidence:

Yes, this project has a routine progress sharing meeting with its all stakeholders. A formal working paper includes results against each indicator, risk, critical challenges and financial data is prepared for Project implementation Committee (PIC) and National Steering Committees (NSC).

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name
1	NSCmeetingminutesofSID-CHTproject_199_210 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/NSCmeetingminutesofSID-CHTproject_199_210.pdf)
2	PICmeetingminutes_SID-CHT_July18_199_210 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PICmeetingminutes_SID-CHT_July18_199_210.pdf)

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

○ *3: The project has actively monitored risks every quarter including consulting with key stakeholders, including security* *assumptions remain valid. There is clear evidence that relevant management plans and mitigating measures are bein* *to reflect the latest risk assessment. (all must be true)*

○ 2: The project has monitored risks every year, as evidenced by an updated risk log. Some updates have been made t

○ 1: The risk log has not been updated as required. There may be some evidence that the project has monitored risks (i of results, but there is no explicit evidence that management actions have been taken to mitigate risks. In the case of UNDP Security Office on appropriate measures.

Evidence:

All the risks mentioned in the Prodoc are being tracked through regular monitoring and observation. Normally this happens within every quarter. A prescribed format is using to track all the risks for providing support for making possible mitigation as needed. Normally the outcomes generated from this exercise is sharing at the PIC and NSC meetings.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name
1	Risklog_199_211 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Risklog_199_211.pptx)

Efficient   **Quality Rating: High**

12. Adequate resources have been mobilized to achieve intended results. If not, management decisions were taken to adju

- ◉ *Yes*
- ○ No

Evidence:

> Based on the work plan, all the resources and inputs are being mobilized and utilized.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name
No documents available.	

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

- ◉ *3: The project has an updated procurement plan. Implementation of the plan is on or ahead of schedule. The project and addresses them through appropriate management actions. (all must be true)*
- ○ 2: The project has an updated procurement plan. The project annually reviews operational bottlenecks to procuring in actions. (all must be true)
- ○ 1: The project does not have an updated procurement plan. The project may or may not have reviewed operational bottlenecks actions have not been taken to address them.

Evidence:

> This project has an updated procurement plan in which all the delivery and inputs are aligned.
> See the attached procurement plan and results.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name
1	13-ProcurementPlan2019_SID-CHTSegmented22Jan19FINAL_199_213 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/13-ProcurementPlan2019_SID-CHTSegmented22Jan19FINAL_199_213.pdf)

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

○ 3: There is evidence that the project regularly reviews costs against relevant comparators (e.g., other projects or coun that can be delivered with given resources. The project actively coordinates with other relevant ongoing projects and i wherever possible (e.g. joint activities.) (both must be true)

◉ *2: The project monitors its own costs and gives anecdotal examples of cost efficiencies (e.g., spending less to get the expected quality of results delivered. The project coordinates activities with other projects to achieve cost efficiency ga*

○ 1: There is little or no evidence that the project monitors its own costs and is considering ways to save money beyond

Evidence:

> Yes, this is maintaining by budget and program people in order take into account on the expected results from different components.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name
1	14-takingintoaccounttheexpectedquality_199_214 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/14-takingintoaccounttheexpectedquality_199_214.pptx)

Effective **Quality Rating:** **High**

15. Is the project is on track to deliver its expected outputs?

◉ *Yes*
○ No

Evidence:

Most of the expected outputs are tracking considering its quality as well. A well established M&E plan is also using to measure all the output on on plan delivery.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name
1	15-FinalReport_ImpactAssessmentofAFSPII_02August2018_199_215 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/15-FinalReport_ImpactAssessmentofAFSPII_02August2018_199_215.pdf)

16. Have there been regular reviews of the work plan to ensure that the project is on track to achieve the desired results, a

○ 3: Quarterly progress data has informed regular reviews of the project work plan to ensure that the activities implemen and lessons learned (including from evaluations and/or After Action Reviews) have been used to inform course correc must be true)

◉ *2: There has been at least one review of the work plan per year to assess if project activities are on track to achieving evidence that data or lessons learned has been used to inform the review(s). Any necessary budget revisions have be*

○ 1: While the project team may have reviewed the work plan at least once over the past year to ensure outputs are del results. Select this option also if no review of the work plan by management has taken place over the past year.

Evidence:

Yes this is a very common activity of this project. One review workshop once in a year conducts with respective and IPNGO staff, where all the completed and incomplete activities as well as indicators are being discussed technically.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name
1	16-MeetingminutesofCoordinationMeeting_MCGSocialCohesion_199_216 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/16-MeetingminutesofCoordinationMeeting_MCGSocialCohesion_199_216.pdf)

17. Are targeted groups being systematically identified and engaged, prioritizing the marginalized and excluded, to ensure

○ *3: The project is targeting specific groups and/or geographic areas, identified by using credible data sources on their ⟨*
relevant to the project's area of work. There is clear evidence that the targeted groups are being reached as intended.
assess whether they are benefiting as expected and adjustments were made if necessary to refine targeting. (all mus

○ 2: The project is targeting specific groups and/or geographic areas, based on some evidence of their capacity needs,
project's area of work. Some evidence is provided to confirm that project beneficiaries are members of the targeted gr
assess whether they are benefiting as expected. (all must be true)

○ 1: The project does not report on specific targeted groups. There is no evidence to confirm that project beneficiaries a
project area of work. There may have been some engagement with beneficiaries to assess whether they are benefitin

○ Not Applicable

Evidence:

> This project has a standard beneficiary selection guideline which uses by its respective and
> PNGO staff while selecting beneficiaries. In addition to this beneficiary selection, it helps to
> select geographical areas like community, village, para, VCF and RF in CHT area. Based on
> the regular monitoring and outcome survey, evidence from benefitted beneficiaries is being
> collected and documented as per the project monitoring plan.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name
1	Communityselectionguideline-AFSPIII_199_217 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Communityselectionguideline-AFSPIII_199_217.pdf)

Sustainability & National Ownership   **Quality Rating: Sati**

18. Are stakeholders and national partners fully engaged in the decision-making, implementation and monitoring of the proj

○ *3: Only national systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) are used to fully implement and monitor the ｜*
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.) are used to implement and monitor the project, bu
used if necessary. All relevant stakeholders and partners are fully and actively engaged in the process, playing an act
be true)

○ 1: There is relatively limited or no engagement with national stakeholders and partners in the decision-making, implen

○ Not Applicable

Evidence:

Yes, this project conducts regular decision making event such as the National Steering
Committee meeting where all the aspects of project implementation like procurement, M&E,
HR are discussed among multi-stakeholder engagement. This is a participatory event where all
participants play an active role in collective decision making process.

List of Uploaded Documents	
#	File Name
1	NSCmeetingminutesofSID-CHTproject_199_218 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/NSCmeetingminutesofSID-CHTproject_199_218.pdf)

19. There is regular monitoring of changes in capacities and performance of institutions and systems relevant to the project
according to changes in partner capacities.

○ 3: In the past two years, changes in capacities and performance of institutions and systems have been comprehensiv
   collection and credible data sources including relevant HACT assurance activities. Implementation arrangements have
   according to changes in partner capacities. (both must be true)

◉ *2: In the past two years, aspects of changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and system
   credible data sources including relevant HACT assurance activities. Some adjustment has been made to implementat
   be true)*

○ 1: Some aspects of changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems may have be
   arrangements have not been considered. Also select this option if changes in capacities and performance of relevant

○ Not Applicable

Evidence:

Yes, this is done very frequently at partner NGO level to assess their performance and
capacities in line with the implementation modality. An evidence is attached.

List of Uploaded Documents	
#	File Name
1	19-IDQASummaryreport_Rangamati_199_219 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/19-IDQASummaryreport_Rangamati_199_219.pdf)

20. The transition and phase-out arrangements are reviewed regularly and adjusted according to progress (including finan

○ 3: The project's governance mechanism has reviewed the project's sustainability plan, including arrangements for tran
requirements set out by the plan. The plan has been adjusted according to progress as needed. (both must be true)

○ 2: There has been a review of the project's sustainability plan, including arrangements for transition and phase-out, to

◉ *1: The project may have a sustainability plan, but there has not been a review of this strategy since it was developed.*

Evidence:

Currently, based on the Prodoc no projects are in phase out mode.

Management Resp

Currently, based on

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	

No documents available.

QA Summary/Project Board Comments

◄ | | ►