

Implementation and Monitoring Stage Quality Assurance Report

Overall Project Rating : **Exemplary**

Decision : Continue as planned: The project is of sufficient quality to continue as planned. All management actions must be addressed in a timely manner.

Project Number : 00048982

Project Title : Workplan for Conflict Prevention and Recovery Team at Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery

Project Date : 01-Jan-2008

Strategic

Quality Rating: **Exemplary**

1. Is the project pro-actively taking advantage of new opportunities, adapting its theory of change to respond to changes in the development context, including changing national priorities? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects this project)

- 3: *The project team completed and documented a horizon scanning exercise in the past year to identify new opportunities and changes in the development context that require adjustments in the theory of change. There is clear evidence that the project board has considered the implications, and documented changes to the project's theory of change, RRF, partnerships, etc. made in response, as appropriate. (both must be true to select this option)*
- 2: The project team has undertaken some horizon scanning in the past year to identify new opportunities and changes in the development context. The project board discussed the scanning and its implications for the project, as reflected in the board minutes. There is some evidence that the project took action as a result, but changes may not have been fully integrated in the project's theory of change, RRF, partnerships, etc.
- 1: The project team may have considered new opportunities and changes in the development context since implementation began, but this has not been discussed in the project board. There is limited to no evidence that the project team has considered changes to the project as a result. This option would also be selected if no horizon scanning has been done to date during project implementation.

Evidence

The project has engaged in extensive multi-party horizon scanning with DPA and the EU. Please see attached workplan.

List of Uploaded Documents

File Name	Modified By	Modified
Copy_of_Insider_Mediation_Work_Plan_year_one_AS.xlsx	kristoffer.tangri@undp.org	12/22/2016 7:13:25 PM

2. Is the project aligned with the thematic focus of the UNDP Strategic Plan? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

- 3: *The project responds to one of the three areas of development [work](#) as specified in the Strategic Plan; it addresses at least one of the proposed new and emerging [areas](#); implementation is consistent with the issues-based analysis incorporated into the project design; and the project's RRF includes all the relevant SP output indicators. (all must be true to select this option)*
- 2: The project responds to one of the three areas of development [work](#) as specified in the Strategic Plan. The project's RRF includes at least one SP output indicator, if relevant. (both must be true to select this option)
- 1: While the project may respond to one of the three areas of development [work](#) as specified in the Strategic Plan, it is based on a sectorial approach without addressing the complexity of the development issue. None of the relevant SP indicators are included in the RRF. This option is also selected if the project does not respond to any of the three SP areas of development work.

Evidence

Project relates to SP Outcome 5, Outputs 5.5 and 5.6

Management Response

3. Evidence generated through the project has been explicitly used to confirm or adjust the programme/CPD's theory of change.

- Yes
- No

Evidence

Bolivia, Honduras, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Guatemala CPDs / UNDAF have been adjusted based on the work on Insider Mediation. Please see attached annual report.

List of Uploaded Documents

File Name	Modified By	Modified
EU_Progress_report_August_10_final_VDM.docx	kristoffer.tangri@undp.org	12/22/2016 7:14:20 PM

Relevant

Quality Rating: **Exemplary**

4. Are the project's targeted groups being systematically engaged, with a priority focus on the excluded and marginalized, to ensure the project remains relevant for them? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

- 3: *Systematic and structured feedback has been collected over the past year from a representative sample of beneficiaries, with a priority focus on the excluded and marginalized, as part of the project's monitoring system. Representatives from the targeted groups are 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 to select this option)*
- 2: Targeted groups have been engaged in implementation and monitoring, with a priority focus on the excluded and marginalized. Beneficiary feedback, which may be anecdotal, has been collected over the past year to ensure the project is addressing local priorities. This information has been used to inform project decision making. (all must be true to select this option)
- 1: Some beneficiary feedback may have been collected over the past year, but this information has not been used to inform project decision making. This option is also selected if no beneficiary feedback has been collected.
- Not Applicable

Evidence

Management Response

Women, youth and indigenous populations are explicitly targeted. Please see attached annual report.

5. Is the project generating knowledge – particularly lessons learned (i.e., what has worked and what has not) – and has this knowledge informed management decisions and changes/course corrections to ensure the continued relevance of the project towards its stated objectives, the quality of its outputs and the management of risk? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

- 3: *Knowledge and lessons learned backed (gained, for example, from Peer Assists, After Action Reviews or Lessons Learned Workshops) by credible evidence from evaluation, corporate policies/strategies, analysis and monitoring have been discussed in project board meetings and reflected in the minutes. There is clear evidence that the project's theory of change has been adjusted, as needed, and changes were made to the project to ensure its continued relevance. (both must be true to select this option)*
- 2: Knowledge and lessons learned backed by relatively limited evidence, drawn mainly from within the project, have been 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 to select this option)
- 1: There is limited or no evidence that knowledge and lessons learned have been collected by the project team. There is little or no evidence that this has informed project decision making.

Evidence

Management Response

The evidence is collected on a continuous basis and there are 3-4 global and regional workshops per year to exchange lessons learned as well as around 9 country-level workshops to exchange lessons and the national level. In 2016 we held our annual meeting with the EU/DPA to share lessons learned across

partners. The lessons will also be part of a revised guidance note on IM to be released 2017/2018.

6. Are the project's measures (through outputs, activities, indicators) to address gender inequalities and empower women relevant and producing the intended effect? If not, evidence-based adjustments and changes have been made. (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

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

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

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

Evidence

Yes, please see annual report.

Management Response

7. Is the project sufficiently at scale, or is there potential to scale up in the future, to meaningfully contribute to development change? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

3: *There is credible evidence that the project is reaching a 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 is currently not 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 is not at scale, and there are no plans currently to scale up the project in the future.

Evidence

The Insider Mediation project currently operates in 9 countries and also has a regional dimension. The work of the project directly contributes to the development of national infrastructures of peace and Government as well as civil society capacity development. Insider Mediation work is at scale, however, the work could also be beneficial for additional countries.

Social & Environmental Standards

Quality Rating: Exemplary

8. Does the project seek to further the realization of human rights using a human rights based approach? (select from options 1-3 that best reflects this project)

3: *Credible evidence that the project furthers the realization of human rights, on the basis on applying a human rights based approach. Any potential adverse impacts on enjoyment of human rights are actively identified, managed and mitigated through the project's management of risks. (all must be true to select this option)*

2: Some evidence that the project furthers the realization of human rights. Potential adverse impacts on the enjoyment of human rights have been identified, and are adequately mitigated through the project's management of risks.

1: No evidence that the project aims to further the realization of human rights. Limited or no evidence that potential adverse impacts on enjoyment of human rights are managed.

Evidence

The project specifically targets the promotion and strengthening of Human Rights and key implementation partners are often based in National Human Right Institutions. Honduras, Bolivia and Guatemala are excellent case studies covered in the attached annual report.

Management Response

9. Are social and environmental impacts and risks (including those related to human rights, gender and environment) being successfully managed and monitored in accordance with project document and relevant action plans? (for projects that have no social or environmental risks the answer is “Yes”)

- Yes
- No

Evidence

The three cross-cutting issues, human rights, gender and environment are actively monitored and integrated into the project document. The project partner EU has a strong track record of supporting environmental impact assessments.

10. Are unanticipated social and environmental issues or grievances that arise during implementation assessed and adequately managed, with relevant management plans updated? (for projects that have not experienced unanticipated social and environmental risks or grievances the answer is “Yes”)

- Yes
- No

Evidence

Yes, this is both actively monitored and addressed. For example, In Bolivia, which is currently experiencing a draught, the Insider Mediation work is being re-adjusted to best address the changed social and environmental situation. In Bolivia, the Ministry of Energy and the Ministry of Mining are key implementation partners who are leading the projects work on addressing the environmental impacts of the draught crisis.

Management & Monitoring

Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory

11. Is the project’s M&E Plan being adequately implemented? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

- 3: The project has a comprehensive and costed M&E plan. Baselines, targets and milestones are fully populated. Progress data against indicators in the project’s RRF is being 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, including during evaluations and/or After Action Reviews, are used to take corrective actions when necessary. (all must be true to select this option)
- 2: *The project has a costed M&E Plan, and most baselines and targets are populated. Progress data against indicators in the project’s RRF is collected on a regular basis, although there may be some slippage in following the frequency stated in the Plan and data sources are not always reliable. Any evaluations conducted, if relevant, meet most decentralized evaluation standards. Lessons learned have been captured but may not have been used to take corrective actions yet. (all must be true to select this option)*
- 1: The project has an M&E Plan, but costs are not clearly planned and budgeted for, or are unrealistic. Progress data is not being regularly collected against the indicators in the project’s RRF. Evaluations may not meet decentralized evaluation standards. Lessons learned are rarely captured and used. Select this option also if the project does not have an M&E plan.

Evidence

The project is actively monitored and evaluated. A mid-term evaluation will take place in Q1, 2017.

Management Response

List of Uploaded Documents

File Name	Modified By	Modified
LogFrame_final_august_2016.doc	kristoffer.tangri@undp.org	12/22/2016 7:15:37 PM

12. Is project’s governance mechanism (i.e., the project board or equivalent) functioning as intended? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

3: The project's governance mechanism is operating well, and is a model for other projects. It has met in the agreed frequency stated in the project document and the minutes of the meetings are on file. There is 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 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.) (all must be true to select this option)

2: The project's governance mechanism has met in the agreed frequency and the minutes of the meeting are on file. A project progress report has been submitted to the project board or equivalent 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 year and/or the project board or equivalent is not functioning as a decision making body for the project as intended.

Evidence

Management Response

The project has both a project management board, which includes DPA, EU and UN Women as well as representatives of project partner Governments and Civil Society but also a project group composed of EU, DPA and UNDP participants. Both groups meet regularly and the coordination and cooperation among partners is excellent despite the challenge to connect across these large and complex organisations.

List of Uploaded Documents

File Name	Modified By	Modified
RE_EUUN_Project_Board_meeting_msg	kristoffer.tangri@undp.org	12/22/2016 7:16:04 PM

13. Are risks to the project adequately monitored and managed? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

3: The project has actively monitored risks every quarter including consulting with key stakeholders at least once in the past year to identify continuing and emerging risks to project implementation and to assess if the main assumptions remain valid. There is clear evidence that relevant management plans and mitigating measures are being fully implemented to address each key project risk, and have been updated to reflect the latest risk assessment. (all must be true to select this option)

2: The project has monitored risks every quarter, as evidenced by an updated risk log. Some updates have been made to management plans and mitigation measures.

1: The risk log has not been updated every quarter as required. There may be some evidence that the project has monitored risks that may affect the project's achievement of results, but there is no explicit evidence that management actions have been taken to mitigate risks.

Evidence

Management Response

There are regular risk monitoring calls among all key stakeholders at both the global project management level and the country-level as well as ad hoc calls as needed to monitor and address potential risks to the project implementation. UNDP undertook two risk assessment missions in 2016 which resulted in adjustment to country-level projects as needed.

Efficient

Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory

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

Yes

No

Evidence

The project has secured substantial funding from the European Union, however, the recent decline in the EUR-USD exchange rate has negatively affected the resource base for this project. So far, no additional funds have been secured to cover the gap.

15. Are project inputs procured and delivered on time to efficiently contribute to results? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

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

Evidence

The project primarily engages in ad hoc procurement, especially of consultants and for workshops. All key procurement needs at the global and country-level are integrated into annual work plans.

Management Response

16. Is there regular monitoring and recording of cost efficiencies taking into account the expected quality of results? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

- 3: *There is evidence that the project regularly reviews costs against relevant comparators (e.g., other projects or country offices) or industry benchmarks to ensure the project maximizes results that can be delivered with given resources. The project actively coordinates with other relevant ongoing projects and initiatives (UNDP or other) to ensure complementarity and seek efficiencies wherever possible (e.g. joint activities.) (both must be true to select this option)*
- 2: The project monitors its own costs and gives anecdotal examples of cost efficiencies (e.g., spending less to get the same result,) but there is no systematic analysis of costs and no link to the expected quality of results delivered. The project coordinates activities with other projects to achieve cost efficiency gains.
- 1: There is little or no evidence that the project monitors its own costs and is considering ways to save money beyond following standard procurement rules.

Evidence

The project has engaged in collaboration with other DPA, EU and UNDP projects to ensure synergies for cost-savings. For example, workshops have been held back-to-back with other events to save funds and the project is closely collaborating with the UNDP-DPA Joint Programme on National Capacities for Conflict Prevention. At country-level, project managers have been encouraged and have actively sought to identify opportunities for partnerships and cost savings.

Effective

Quality Rating: Exemplary

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

- Yes
- No

Evidence

The project is fully on track. Please see annual report.

18. Have there been regular reviews of the work plan to ensure that the project is on track to achieve the desired results, and to inform course corrections if needed? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

- 3: Quarterly progress data has informed regular reviews of the project work plan to ensure that the activities implemented are most likely to achieve the desired results. There is evidence that data and lessons learned (including from evaluations and/or After Action Reviews) have been used to inform course corrections, as needed. Any necessary budget revisions have been made. (both must be true to select this option)
- 2: There has been at least one review of the work plan during the year to assess if project activities are on track to achieving the desired development results (i.e., outputs.) There may or may not be evidence that data or lessons learned has been 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 are delivered on time, no link has been made to the delivery of desired development results. Select this option also if no review of the work plan by management has taken place over the past year.

Evidence**Management Response**

The work plan both at global and country-level is regularly reviewed and adjusted among the key implementation partners, UNDP, DPA and the EU.

19. Are targeted groups being systematically identified and engaged, prioritizing the marginalized and excluded, to ensure results are achieved as expected? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

- 3: The project is targeting 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 are being reached as intended. The project has engaged regularly with targeted groups over the past year to assess whether they are benefiting as expected and adjustments were made if necessary to refine targeting. (all must be true to select this option)
- 2: The project is targeting 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 has been some engagement with beneficiaries in the past year to assess whether they are benefiting as expected. (all must be true to select this option)
- 1: The project does 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 may have been some engagement with beneficiaries to assess whether they are benefiting as expected, but it has been limited or has not occurred in the past year.
- Not Applicable

Evidence

Yes, please see annual report for details.

20. Are at least 40 per cent of the personnel hired by the project, regardless of contract type, female?

- Yes
- No

Evidence

More than 40% of country-level project managers and consultants hired for this project are women.

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

21. Are stakeholders and national partners fully engaged in the decision-making, implementation and monitoring of the project? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

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

- 2: National systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) are used in combination with other support (such as country office support or project systems) to implement and monitor the project, as necessary. All relevant stakeholders and partners are fully and actively engaged in the process, playing an active role in project decision-making, implementation and monitoring. (both must be true to select this option)
- 1: There is relatively limited or no engagement with national stakeholders and partners in the decision-making, implementation and/or monitoring of the project.
- Not Applicable

Evidence**Management Response**

National partners from Government and Civil Society are the key implementation partners of this project. They lead on both the implementation and monitoring of the project with support and guidance from the project managers based in the Country Offices of UNDP.

22. There is regular monitoring of changes in capacities and performance of national institutions and systems relevant to the project. The implementation [arrangements](#) have been adjusted according to changes in partner capacities. (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

- 3: *In the past year, changes in capacities and performance of national institutions and systems have been comprehensively assessed/monitored using clear indicators, rigorous methods of data collection and credible data sources including HACT assurance activities. Implementation arrangements have been formally reviewed and adjusted, if needed, in agreement with partners according to changes in partner capacities. (both must be true to select this option)*
- 2: In the past year, aspects of changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems have been monitored by the project using indicators and reasonably credible data sources including HACT assurance activities. Some adjustment has been made to implementation arrangements if needed to reflect changes in partner capacities. (both must be true to select this option)
- 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**Management Response**

National capacities have been assessed in partnership with the EU and are continuously assessed.

23. The transition and phase-out arrangements are reviewed regularly and adjusted according to progress (including financial commitments and capacity). (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

- 3: *The project's governance mechanism has reviewed the project's sustainability plan in the past year, including arrangements for transition and phase-out, to ensure the project is on track in meeting the requirements set out by the plan. The plan has been adjusted according to progress as needed. (both must be true to select this option)*
- 2: There has been a review of the project's sustainability plan, including arrangements for transition and phase-out, to ensure the project is on track in meeting the requirements set out by the plan.
- 1: The project may have a sustainability plan, but there has not been a review of this strategy since it was developed. Also select this option if the project does not have a sustainability strategy.

Evidence**Management Response**

The second phase of the project started in May 2015 based on a joint partner assessment that this project needs to continue. The project sustainability, both of impact and finance is regularly monitored and adjusted.

QA Summary/Project Board Comments:

This QA only applies to Project Output 7003. Output 7003 has been extended to May 30, 2018. Additional supporting documents are available if required.