

# Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

**Form Status: Approved**

**Overall Rating:** Needs Improvement

**Decision:**

**Portfolio/Project Number:** 00087400

**Portfolio/Project Title:** Respuesta y recuperación ante desastres naturales

**Portfolio/Project Date:** 2017-04-01 / 2022-06-30

**Strategic**

**Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

1. Did the project pro-actively identified changes to the external environment and incorporated them into the project strategy?

- ☐ 3: The project team identified relevant changes in the external environment that may present new opportunities or threats to the project's ability to achieve its objectives, assumptions were tested to determine if the project's strategy was valid. There is some evidence that the project board considered the implications, and documented the changes needed to the project in response. (all must be true)
- ☒ 2: *The project team identified relevant changes in the external environment that may present new opportunities or threats to the project's ability to achieve its objectives. There is some evidence that the project board discussed this, but relevant changes did not fully integrate in the project. (both must be true)*
- ☐ 1: The project team considered relevant changes in the external environment since implementation began, but there is no evidence that the project team considered these changes to the project as a result.

**Evidence:**

The relevant external changes that happened during the project implementation were the Covid-19 pandemic and the change of high authorities in public institutions due to political instability and new elections. In this scenario, we were able to adapt some of the activities to include the impact of the pandemic in the Peruvian and migrant/refugee population. These new adaptations were discussed and approved by the project board. On the other hand, despite of the new government authorities (chiefs and ministers), our partners' technical teams remained the same and that allowed us to keep coordinating and sign agreements to continue with the planned activities under any change of authority.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ActaProyectoHIPECHO31.08.21-PNUDF_9757_301.pdf">ActaProyectoHIPECHO31.08.21-PNUDF_9757_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ActaProyectoHIPECHO31.08.21-PNUDF_9757_301.pdf)</a>	andrea.medina@undp.org	10/18/2021 11:23:00 PM

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 contributed directly to building resilience to crisis and shocks (development setting 3) which all indicators are in line with.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

**Relevant****Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

3. Were the project's targeted groups systematically identified and engaged, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized, to ensure the project remained relevant for them?

- ☐ 3: Systematic and structured feedback was collected over the project duration from a representative sample of beneficiaries, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized, as part of the project's monitoring system. Representatives from the targeted groups were active members of the project's governance mechanism (i.e., the project board or equivalent) and there is credible evidence that their feedback informs project decision making. (all must be true)
- ☐ 2: Targeted groups were engaged in implementation and monitoring, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized. Beneficiary feedback, which may be anecdotal, was collected regularly to ensure the project addressed local priorities. This information was used to inform project decision making. (all must be true to select this option)
- ☒ 1: *Some beneficiary feedback may have been collected, but this information did not inform project decision making. This option should also be selected if no beneficiary feedback was collected*
- ☐ Not Applicable

**Evidence:**

There was a priority focus on one of the project's targeted groups (refugee and migrant population) for which we elaborated a survey "Knowing the refugee and migrant population in Metropolitan Lima" carried out by UNDP during the current context of pandemic, collects the sociodemographic profile and characterization of livelihoods, economic autonomy, and cultural inclusion, contributing to the socioeconomic integration of this population. There is also a document of opportunity diagnosis to complement the survey.

**Management Response:**

The survey will serve as a key tool for decision makers in the local management of human mobility in favor of local and inclusive public policies.

### List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	03_Conociendo_a_la_población_refugiada_y_migrante_en_Lima_metropolitana_9757_303 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/03_Conociendo_a_la_población_refugiada_y_migrante_en_Lima_metropolitana_9757_303.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/03_Conociendo_a_la_población_refugiada_y_migrante_en_Lima_metropolitana_9757_303.pdf</a> )	andrea.medina@undp.org	10/18/2021 11:38:00 PM
2	04_Diagnóstico_de_oportunidades_9757_303 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/04_Diagnóstico_de_oportunidades_9757_303.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/04_Diagnóstico_de_oportunidades_9757_303.pdf</a> )	andrea.medina@undp.org	10/18/2021 11:38:00 PM

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:

There is a section of good practices and lessons learned in each intermediate report. Besides, the lessons learned, limitations and opportunities were shared on project board meetings; also, the project team reunite before the reporting season to add or update any new lesson learned. A systematization is conducted at the end of the project (during report period).

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	ReporteSemestral_1_2021_HIPECHO05.08.21_9757_304 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ReporteSemestral_1_2021_HIPECHO05.08.21_9757_304.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ReporteSemestral_1_2021_HIPECHO05.08.21_9757_304.docx</a> )	andrea.medina@undp.org	10/18/2021 11:53:00 PM
2	ActaProyectoHIPECHO31.08.21-PNUDF_9757_304 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ActaProyectoHIPECHO31.08.21-PNUDF_9757_304.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ActaProyectoHIPECHO31.08.21-PNUDF_9757_304.pdf</a> )	andrea.medina@undp.org	10/18/2021 11:53:00 PM
3	TDRSistematizacionProyectoHIP20192021ultimo_9757_304 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/TDRSistematizacionProyectoHIP20192021ultimo_9757_304.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/TDRSistematizacionProyectoHIP20192021ultimo_9757_304.docx</a> )	andrea.medina@undp.org	10/18/2021 11:57:00 PM

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:**

Result 1 targeted the local government and the refugee and migrant population as well as host population. Coverage, through planning actions for the design and preliminary preparation of a socioeconomic integration strategy / plan in the context of human mobility, through a process led by the local government and in coordination with key actors, such as district municipalities, the private sector, and civil society; as well as the integration of the human mobility approach in the construction of the new Local Development Plan of the Municipalidad Metropolitana de Lima (2022, 2035), will undoubtedly contribute to expanding the coverage and scaling the initiative in favor of the development, empowerment and integration of the refugee population and migrant and host population.

Result 2 targeted SINAGERD entities and contributed to the design of instruments to improve the functionality, operability, and accountability of SINAGERD; as well as for the management of post-disaster rehabilitation, involving PCM, INDECI, CENEPRED, Sectors and sub-national governments, which makes its scaling possible and necessary.

\*The documents attached are a draft, there is not yet a final and approved version.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/EstrategiaMetropolitanaMovilidadHumanav17.09_9757_305.pdf">EstrategiaMetropolitanaMovilidadHumanav17.09_9757_305 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/EstrategiaMetropolitanaMovilidadHumanav17.09_9757_305.pdf)</a>	andrea.medina@undp.org	10/19/2021 12:08:00 AM
2	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Anexo_MatricesEstrategiaMetropolitanavf_9757_305.xlsx">Anexo_MatricesEstrategiaMetropolitanavf_9757_305 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Anexo_MatricesEstrategiaMetropolitanavf_9757_305.xlsx)</a>	andrea.medina@undp.org	10/19/2021 12:08:00 AM

**Principled****Quality Rating: Needs Improvement**

6. Were the project's measures (through outputs, activities, indicators) to address gender inequalities and empower women relevant and produced the intended effect? If not, evidence-based adjustments and changes were made.

- ☐ 3: The project team gathered data and evidence through project monitoring on the relevance of the measures to address gender inequalities and empower women. Analysis of data and evidence were used to inform adjustments and changes, as appropriate. (both must be true)
- ☒ 2: *The project team had some data and evidence on the relevance of the measures to address gender inequalities and empower women. There is evidence that at least some adjustments were made, as appropriate. (both must be true)*
- ☐ 1: The project team had limited or no evidence on the relevance of measures to address gender inequalities and empowering women. No evidence of adjustments and/or changes made. This option should also be selected if the project has no measures to address gender inequalities and empower women relevant to the project results and activities.

**Evidence:**

The diagnosis of opportunities (attached) raised relevant information on the urgent need to incorporate the gender approach in public policy proposals that contribute to the socio-economic integration of the refugee, migrant and host population. It is concluded that the referred exercise is currently incipient, however there is room to promote it through decision makers such as the Municipalidad Metropolitana de Lima's (MML) Women and Equality Management. The diagnosis also starts from a characterization of the refugee, migrant and host population, which differentiates between men and women.

The design and preliminary preparation of the Human Mobility Plan / Strategy with a focus on the socioeconomic integration of the refugee and migrant population and host population included the active participation and thematic contribution of 9 offices of the MML, including the Office of Women and Equality. Therefore, the preliminary matrix of the Human Mobility Plan (attached) transversally incorporates the gender perspective and proposes the strengthening of the services of the MML and local governments for the care of the refugee and migrant population with a strong gender perspective. Specific activities have been contemplated, such as workshops, awareness talks and training for municipal officials who provide services to the refugee and migrant population about the specific risks that this population may be having from a gender perspective, which also includes monitoring of these services.

During the implementation of the Plan, a test was carried out through a pilot edition of Guerrero Emprendedor (a volunteer program that accompanies businesses in progress for socioeconomic reactivation), where more than 70% of the refugee and migrant population participating were women. This made it possible to collect a series of projections and perspectives for future editions to be considered to make the gender approach more visible as systems of care, gender-based violence, training of women's leaderships in a subsequent stage of Guerrero Emprendedor.



### List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ConociendoalaPoblacionRefugiadaMigrantePNUD2021_9757_306">ConociendoalaPoblacionRefugiadaMigrantePNUD2021_9757_306</a> (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ConociendoalaPoblacionRefugiadaMigrantePNUD2021_9757_306.pdf)	andrea.medina@undp.org	10/19/2021 1:18:00 AM
2	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/GuerreroEmprendedorMigrantesyRefugiados_9757_306">GuerreroEmprendedorMigrantesyRefugiados_9757_306</a> (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/GuerreroEmprendedorMigrantesyRefugiados_9757_306.pdf)	andrea.medina@undp.org	10/19/2021 1:18:00 AM
3	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Diagnostico_de_oportunidadesPNUD2021_9757_306">Diagnostico_de_oportunidadesPNUD2021_9757_306</a> (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Diagnostico_de_oportunidadesPNUD2021_9757_306.pdf)	andrea.medina@undp.org	10/19/2021 1:19:00 AM
4	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/EstrategiaMetropolitanaMovilidadHumanav17.09_9757_306">EstrategiaMetropolitanaMovilidadHumanav17.09_9757_306</a> (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/EstrategiaMetropolitanaMovilidadHumanav17.09_9757_306.pdf)	andrea.medina@undp.org	10/19/2021 1:19:00 AM

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:**

There were a couple of environmental and social risks identified in the risk log: social tensions and the covid-19 pandemic. Each of them required to change some activities and the implementation strategy of the project. Also, the project team reunite before the reporting season to add or update any risk, which are included in the intermediate reports.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	ReporteSemestral_1_2021_HIPECHO05.08.21_9757_307 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ReporteSemestral_1_2021_HIPECHO05.08.21_9757_307.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ReporteSemestral_1_2021_HIPECHO05.08.21_9757_307.docx</a> )	andrea.medina@undp.org	10/19/2021 1:21:00 AM

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:**

No grievances were received.

### List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

## 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 was may be some slippage in following the frequency stated in the Plan and data sources was not always reliable. Any evaluations conducted, if relevant, met most decentralized evaluation standards. Lessons learned were captured but were used to take corrective actions. (all must be true)*
- ☐ 1: The project had M&E Plan, but costs were not clearly planned and budgeted for, or were unrealistic. Progress data was not regularly collected against the indicators in the project's RRF. Evaluations did not meet decentralized evaluation standards. Lessons learned were rarely captured and used. Select this option also if the project did not have an M&E plan.

### Evidence:

The M&E plan included risk management, monitoring of results, lessons learned, annual reports and project board meetings. The first three points were included in the intermediate and annual reports, the progress data was collected on a regular basis. Besides, two Project board meetings took place after the first and last year of implementation. Project reprogramming was due to the political context and institutional changes and the pandemic situation.

### List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ActaProyectoHIPECHO31.08.21-PNUDF_9757_309.pdf">ActaProyectoHIPECHO31.08.21-PNUDF_9757_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ActaProyectoHIPECHO31.08.21-PNUDF_9757_309.pdf)</a>	andrea.medina@undp.org	10/19/2021 1:23:00 AM

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:

A Project progress report was submitted to the project board once per year for the annual project board meetings.

### List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ActaJunta27062019-DIPECHO_9757_310.pdf">ActaJunta27062019-DIPECHO_9757_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ActaJunta27062019-DIPECHO_9757_310.pdf)</a>	andrea.medina@undp.org	10/19/2021 1:26:00 AM
2	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ActaProyectoHIPECHO31.08.21-PNUDF_9757_310.pdf">ActaProyectoHIPECHO31.08.21-PNUDF_9757_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ActaProyectoHIPECHO31.08.21-PNUDF_9757_310.pdf)</a>	andrea.medina@undp.org	10/19/2021 1:26:00 AM

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:**

The project monitored and updated risks and management plans or mitigation measures. There was an update exercise with all members of the team on the second trimester of the year when we identify which risks occurred and the mitigation measures that took place. Besides that, there were some updates on the level of impact and probability as well as management activities. The updated version of the risk management framework is on the last intermediate report (June 2021).

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	ReporteSemestral_1_2021_HIPECHO05.08.21_9757_311 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ReporteSemestral_1_2021_HIPECHO05.08.21_9757_311.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ReporteSemestral_1_2021_HIPECHO05.08.21_9757_311.docx</a> )	andrea.medina@undp.org	10/19/2021 1:30:00 AM

**Efficient****Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory**

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:**

Taking under consideration that the resources for this project came from different UN agencies, some management decisions were taken to avoid delay in the implementation of activities. This allowed us and our fellow partners to achieve all the results of the project.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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

- ☒ 3: *The project had a procurement plan and kept it updated. The project quarterly reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addressed them through appropriate management actions. (all must be true)*
- ☐ 2: The project had updated procurement plan. The project annually reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addressed them through appropriate management actions. (all must be true)
- ☐ 1: The project did not have an updated procurement plan. The project team may or may not have reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs regularly, however management actions were not taken to address them.

**Evidence:**

The procurement plan was continuously reviewed and updated by the administrative and project staff, and even though there were a few last-minute procurements, they were appropriately managed and addressed. All project inputs were procured and delivered on time which efficiently contributed to achieve every result.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/HIPECHOPlandeAdquisicionesv.oct2020_9757_313">HIPECHOPlandeAdquisicionesv.oct2020_9757_313 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/HIPECHOPlandeAdquisicionesv.oct2020_9757_313.xlsx)</a>	andrea.medina@undp.org	10/19/2021 5:44:00 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:**

The implementation strategies due to the restrictions associated with the pandemic included the optimization of resources and therefore, the expansion of activities framed in the results, which, in turn, were articulated with the activities and budgets of other projects in the DRM portfolio; for example, those financed by BHA / USAID and SDC.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
---	-----------	-------------	-------------

No documents available.

**Effective**

**Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

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

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

**Evidence:**

PNUD's outputs and activities were all delivered. Most outputs were documents of analysis, strategies, courses, and communicational campaigns regarding the integration of vulnerable groups and migrants, as well as disaster risk management tools and knowledge for public institutions. It is important to notice that several partners took part on the project's implementation, and we are currently elaborating the final report.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	ReporteSemestral_1_2021_HIPECHO05.08.21_9757_315 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ReporteSemestral_1_2021_HIPECHO05.08.21_9757_315.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ReporteSemestral_1_2021_HIPECHO05.08.21_9757_315.docx</a> )	andrea.medina@undp.org	10/19/2021 1:34:00 AM

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:**

During the project implementation, the team reunited at least on a quarterly basis to review if project activities were on track and most of the times it required a budget revision and update too. This exercise allowed us to execute all activities and delivered our expected outputs by the end of the implementation phase.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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

- ☐ 3: The project targeted specific groups and/or geographic areas, identified by using credible data sources on their capacity needs, deprivation and/or exclusion from development opportunities relevant to the project's area of work. There is clear evidence that the targeted groups were reached as intended. The project engaged regularly with targeted groups over the past year to assess whether they benefited as expected and adjustments were made if necessary, to refine targeting. (all must be true)
- ☒ 2: *The project targeted specific groups and/or geographic areas, based on some evidence of their capacity needs, deprivation and/or exclusion from development opportunities relevant to the project's area of work. Some evidence is provided to confirm that project beneficiaries are members of the targeted groups. There was some engagement with beneficiaries in the past year to assess whether they were benefiting as expected. (all must be true)*
- ☐ 1: The project did not report on specific targeted groups. There is no evidence to confirm that project beneficiaries are populations have capacity needs or are deprived and/or excluded from development opportunities relevant to the project area of work. There is some engagement with beneficiaries to assess whether they benefited as expected, but it was limited or did not occurred in the past year.
- ☐ Not Applicable

**Evidence:**

The first activity of the project results framework had to do with the integration of the Venezuelan population and their livelihoods in the event on any disaster risk. There was an actors mapping, surveys, and diagnostic documents (including opportunities for the public sector to socioeconomically integrate the immigrant community) elaborated, as well as communicational events to achieve the expected result.

### List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

### 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:

Every activity and output were permanently reviewed and monitored by the stakeholders, being PCM, IN DECI, CENEPRED regarding DRM and Municipalidad Metropolitana de Lima (MML) regarding the creation of opportunities for the protection and integration of the migrant population.

DRM actions were established based on prioritization made with stakeholders as part of annual planning process and socio-economic integration (human mobility) actions were established for the consolidation of results of previous activities.

### List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

19. Were there regular monitoring of changes in capacities and performance of institutions and systems relevant to the project, as needed, and were the implementation [arrangements](#)<sup>8</sup> 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:

DIM project.

Changes in capacities were monitored specifically associated to pandemic and political context and relevant strategies were considered and implemented as described in monitoring reports.

### List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

20. Were the transition and phase-out arrangements were reviewed and adjusted according to progress (including financial commitment and capacity).

- ☐ 3: The project's governance mechanism regularly reviewed the project's sustainability plan, including arrangements for transition and phase-out, to ensure the project remained on track in meeting the requirements set out by the plan. The plan was implemented as planned by the end of the project, taking into account any adjustments made during implementation. (both must be true)
- ☒ 2: *There was a review of the project's sustainability plan, including arrangements for transition and phase-out, to ensure the project remained on track in meeting the requirements set out by the plan.*
- ☐ 1: The project may have had a sustainability plan but there was no review of this strategy after it was developed. Also select this option if the project did not have a sustainability strategy.

#### Evidence:

The actions included in the plan are part of the cooperation agendas with counterpart entities based on multi-year operational prioritization, which favors the institutionalization of results, as well as continuity beyond project completion.

The Project presents a group of solutions that respond to the need to improve current capacities of government agencies, considering that the combination of their results in terms of social protection, disaster risk management and integration are part of the government's strategy to address the challenge posed by human mobility in the country's development process, especially by focusing on a constant disaster risk scenario. Also, the exit strategy of the project is determined from the moment of its formulation through the involvement of the interested parties in the identification of the challenges to be addressed. Likewise, this was reinforced during implementation through the leading role of the SINAGERD entities involved in terms of their roles and responsibilities within the framework of the PLANAGERD implementation.

#### List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
---	-----------	-------------	-------------

No documents available.

#### QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments

