

## Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

---

**Form Status: Approved**

<b>Overall Rating:</b>	Satisfactory
<b>Decision:</b>	
<b>Portfolio/Project Number:</b>	00099902
<b>Portfolio/Project Title:</b>	Transferencia competencias regionales
<b>Portfolio/Project Date:</b>	2017-07-01 / 2019-12-31

**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:**

En marzo de 2018 hubo un cambio de Gobierno y por tanto se revisó el proyecto de acuerdo con las prioridades de la nueva Administración, considerando además las implicaciones de las nuevas normativas aprobadas para darle más autonomía a las regiones. Durante el año 2018, se promulgaron las leyes 21.073 y 21.074, ambas en dirección a fortalecer el proceso de descentralización que enfrenta el país. A partir de lo anterior, el Comité Directivo del proyecto ajustó la teoría de cambio y los objetivos del proyecto, a través de una revisión sustantiva, para incorporar el nuevo contexto y prioridades de las nuevas autoridades, así como también extender el período de implementación.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/InformeFinal9990204112019VF_3467_301.pdf">InformeFinal9990204112019VF_3467_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/InformeFinal9990204112019VF_3467_301.pdf)</a>	cesar.pagliai@undp.org	2/4/2020 7:19:00 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:**

El proyecto se encuentra vinculado al área 1 del Plan Estratégico: Erradicar la pobreza en todas sus formas y dimensiones. Específicamente se encuentra vinculado al producto 1.2.1 y con el indicador 1.2.1.1: Número de países donde los gobiernos nacionales y subnacionales han mejorado sus capacidades para planificar, presupuestar, gestionar y monitorear servicios básicos.

**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:**

El proyecto no considera grupos excluidos o marginados en su implementación, sino la participación activa y permanente de funcionarios y funcionarias de los gobiernos regionales, por medio de jornadas, encuentros y charlas de difusión sobre el proceso de descentralización. Estas jornadas permitieron capturar las necesidades locales en cuanto a desafíos de reorganización y transferencia de competencias, contemplados en la Ley 21.074 de fortalecimiento de la regionalización del país.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

4. Did the project generate knowledge, and lessons learned (i.e., what has worked and what has not) and has this knowledge informed management decisions to ensure the continued relevance of the project towards its stated objectives, the quality of its outputs and the management of risk?

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

**Evidence:**

El equipo de proyecto ha considerado la recopilación de las lecciones aprendidas que se originaron durante la implementación del proyecto en cada uno de los informes anuales. Además, todas las lecciones aprendidas e información relacionada a la implementación del proyecto fueron sistematizadas en el informe final del proyecto.

### List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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

- 3: There was credible evidence that the project reached sufficient number of beneficiaries (either directly through significant coverage of target groups, or indirectly, through policy change) to meaningfully contribute to development change.
- 2: *While the project was not considered at scale, there are explicit plans in place to scale up the project in the future (e.g. by extending its coverage or using project results to advocate for policy change).*
- 1: The project was not at scale, and there are no plans to scale up the project in the future.

#### Evidence:

Si bien el proyecto no fue diseñado para ser escalado o ya que consideró en su implementación a cada una de las regiones, la Subsecretaría de Desarrollo Regional deberá implementar los productos elaborados por el proyecto en el marco del proceso de descentralización que se inicia a partir de 2021. Para continuar con el trabajo tendrá a su disposición la información levantada en cada región, así como los procesos necesarios que se elaboraron para fortalecer las capacidades subnacionales de los gobiernos regionales una vez que inicien su funcionamiento. Ver Acta de cierre del proyecto.

### List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Actadecierre99902firmada07112019_3467_305">Actadecierre99902firmada07112019_3467_305 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Actadecierre99902firmada07112019_3467_305.pdf)</a>	cesar.pagliai@undp.org	3/3/2020 7:16:00 PM

Principled

Quality Rating: **Satisfactory**

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

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

**Evidence:**

El proyecto realizó un levantamiento y sistematización de la información de línea base sobre desarrollo sostenible de cada región, en el cual se abordaron las desigualdades de género en participación laboral, políticas educacionales, así como los principales problemas de violencia y salud, con el fin de establecer los desafíos de planificación regional para la definición de las transferencias de competencias y perfilar el rol de la nueva División de Desarrollo Social y Humano de cada región.

A nivel de resultados, el proyecto contribuyó en el fortalecimiento de los futuros gobiernos regionales para que puedan contar con mejores datos y registros administrativos con enfoque territorial que les permita identificar las brechas existentes entre hombre y mujeres en cada una de las regiones. Ver informe Final.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

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

No documents available.

7. Were social and environmental impacts and risks successfully managed and monitored?

- 3: Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. Appropriate assessments conducted where required (i.e., Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) for Substantial and 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 Substantial and 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, Substantial, 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:**

El proyecto no identificó riesgos sociales ni ambientales y tuvo categoría de riesgo bajo.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

8. Were grievance mechanisms available to project-affected people and were grievances (if any) addressed to ensure any perceived harm was effectively mitigated?

- 3: Project-affected people actively informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism (SRM/SECU) and how to access it. If the project was categorized as High, Substantial, 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 Substantial or 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 se recibió ninguna queja en el marco del proyecto o por lo tanto no fue necesario iniciar los protocolos para responder a las personas afectadas.

**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:**

El proyecto realizó un plan de M&E definido en el plan anual de proyecto, con metas y presupuesto claro. Los datos de progreso del proyecto respecto a los indicadores se recopilaron de manera regular y fueron registrados en el informe final e informes anuales de proyecto, junto con el nivel de cumplimiento de las metas. Además, ante el contexto de cambio de autoridades, los planes de trabajo, productos, actividades y metas del marco de resultados fueron ajustados por medio de una revisión sustantiva, para así responder a los objetivos planteados por las contrapartes nacionales. Ver revisión sustantiva del proyecto.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	<a href="http://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/RevisiónSustantiva4_2014_3467_309.pdf">RevisiónSustantiva4_2014_3467_309 (http://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/RevisiónSustantiva4_2014_3467_309.pdf)</a>	cesar.pagliai@undp.org	2/4/2020 8:20:00 PM

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

- 3: The project's governance mechanism operated well, and was a model for other projects. It met in the agreed frequency stated in the project document and the minutes of the meetings were all on file. There was regular (at least annual) progress reporting to the project board or equivalent on results, risks and opportunities. It is clear that the project board explicitly reviewed and used evidence, including progress data, knowledge, lessons and evaluations, as the basis for informing management decisions (e.g., change in strategy, approach, work plan.) (all must be true to select this option)
- 2: *The project's governance mechanism met in the agreed frequency and minutes of the meeting are on file. A project progress report was submitted to the project board or equivalent at least once per year, covering results, risks and opportunities. (both must be true to select this option)*
- 1: The project's governance mechanism did not meet in the frequency stated in the project document over the past year and/or the project board or equivalent was not functioning as a decision-making body for the project as intended.

**Evidence:**

El Comité Directivo del proyecto se reunió en la frecuencia acordada y las actas de la reunión están archivadas. Se ha presentado un informe de progreso del proyecto al comité donde han quedado consignadas las decisiones con respecto al proyecto y su ejecución, y una vez al año se han revisado los resultados, riesgos y oportunidades. Además, la reunión de cierre del proyecto se realizó en noviembre de 2019, junto con la firma del acta de cierre del mismo.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ActaReuniónTécnican1PJ99902_3467_310.pdf">ActaReuniónTécnican1PJ99902_3467_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ActaReuniónTécnican1PJ99902_3467_310.pdf)</a>	cesar.pagliai@undp.org	3/5/2020 3:13:00 PM
2	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ActaReuniónTécnica3P9990203.01.2018_fdo_3467_310">ActaReuniónTécnica3P9990203.01.2018_fdo_3467_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ActaReuniónTécnica3P9990203.01.2018_fdo_3467_310.pdf)</a>	cesar.pagliai@undp.org	3/5/2020 3:13:00 PM
3	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Actadecierre99902firmada07112019_3467_310">Actadecierre99902firmada07112019_3467_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Actadecierre99902firmada07112019_3467_310.pdf)</a>	cesar.pagliai@undp.org	3/5/2020 3:16:00 PM

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

- 3: The project monitored risks every quarter and consulted with the key stakeholders, security advisors, to identify continuing and emerging risks to assess if the main assumptions remained valid. There is clear evidence that relevant management plans and mitigating measures were fully implemented to address each key project risk and were updated to reflect the latest risk assessment. (all must be true)
- 2: *The project monitored risks every year, as evidenced by an updated risk log. Some updates were made to management plans and mitigation measures.*
- 1: The risk log was not updated as required. There was may be some evidence that the project monitored risks that may affected the project's achievement of results, but there is no explicit evidence that management actions were taken to mitigate risks.

**Evidence:**

El proyecto ha monitoreado los riesgos cada trimestre, consignados en cada informe anual. Se han realizado actualizaciones a los planes de gestión y las medidas de mitigación han sido diseñadas para reducir los riesgos potencialmente al mínimo. Los riesgos enfrentados, y donde se implementaron las medidas de mitigación contempladas fueron: Demora de transferencias; Cambio de gobierno; Técnico; y de Difusión. De todos los problemas abordados el que tuvo mayor impacto fue el político, es decir, el cambio de Gobierno y Autoridades, que llevó a que las nuevas contrapartes replantearan los objetivos del proyecto. No obstante, a partir de sus necesidades se elaboró una revisión sustantiva que permitió ajustar el proyecto e incorporar los requerimientos de las nuevas autoridades, para así continuar con la implementación y etapa final de trabajo.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

**Efficient****Quality Rating: 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:**

El presupuesto inicial consideró recursos económicos suficientes para el desarrollo del proyecto. No obstante, el retraso de la transferencia de recursos significó tener que ajustar el inicio efectivo del proyecto a diciembre de 2017. Por otro lado, el cambio de autoridades generó un reordenamiento del proyecto con el objetivo de alinear el proyecto con su agenda. No se agregaron nuevos recursos al proyecto, pero la nueva planificación ajustó los productos en función del presupuesto disponible. Ver revisión sustantiva del proyecto, acta de cierre e informe final

**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:**

El proyecto contó con planes de adquisiciones debidamente validados y ejecutados. Ver plan de adquisiciones

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/99902ProjectProcurementPlanDetailedReport2019_3467_313.pdf">99902ProjectProcurementPlanDetailedReport2019_3467_313 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/99902ProjectProcurementPlanDetailedReport2019_3467_313.pdf)</a>	cesar.pagliai@undp.org	2/4/2020 8:37:00 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:**

Existió un monitoreo mensual de los costos durante la ejecución y una gestión oportuna de los procesos de adquisiciones, adaptando los mecanismos de adquisiciones a los distintos tipos de actividades ejecutadas y buscando sinergias con otras actividades en curso. El informe final contiene la información referida a la entrega de productos en función a las metas y los costos planificados.

**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:**

El proyecto ha cumplido con los productos comprometidos según el plan de trabajo establecido y según la revisión sustantiva realizada para ajustar los productos y metas a partir de la solicitud de la contraparte. Durante el año 2018, se ejecutaron y entregaron 3 de los 6 productos originalmente comprometidos en el Documento de Proyecto (Propuesta de estructuración del Manual de apoyo a la implementación de la estructura organizacional de los GORE, Evaluación del Piloto de Fomento Productivo y Construcción de aprendizajes, retroalimentación y redes de colaboración), siendo los otros tres productos reformulados en 2 nuevos productos (Acciones preparatorias para la implementación de transferencias y Diseño e Implementación de una estrategia de participación social). En el informe final se consigna el cumplimiento de los dos productos solicitados por las nuevas autoridades, junto con la recepción de los 3 productos elaborados en la etapa original.

El principal logro del proyecto fue apoyar la implementación de las leyes 21.070, 21.073 y 21.074, junto con la elaboración de una propuesta para fortalecer las capacidades de los nuevos GORE, a través de un modelo de gestión que facilitará la implementación del proceso de descentralización en los gobiernos regionales, complementado además con la implementación de un sistema de registro y monitoreo de los datos públicos georreferenciados de la región. Ambos procesos fueron mejorados con el objetivo de fortalecer las capacidades subnacionales de los nuevos gobiernos regionales para mejorar y optimizar los recursos disponibles y para focalizar la prestación de servicios públicos en la región

Ver revisión sustantiva e informe final

**List of Uploaded Documents**

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

No documents available.

16. Were there regular reviews of the work plan to ensure that the project was on track to achieve the desired results, and to inform course corrections if needed?

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

**Evidence:**

Se elaboraron y ejecutaron los respectivos Planes Anuales de Trabajo bajo la aprobación del Comité Directivo del proyecto. Se adjunta último Plan de Trabajo de 2019. Además, los planes de trabajo fueron ajustados según las necesidades del Comité Directivo del proyecto y para facilitar su implementación. Revisar plan de trabajo adjunto y actas de Comité Directivo.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/AWP17-199990204.08.2017_3467_316.PDF">AWP17-199990204.08.2017_3467_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/AWP17-199990204.08.2017_3467_316.PDF)</a>	cesar.pagliai@undp.org	2/4/2020 8:45:00 PM

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

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

**Evidence:**

El proyecto no consideró la incorporación de grupos vulnerables o marginados en la implementación y diseño de trabajo. Quienes si participaron activamente fueron los funcionarios/as del Servicio Administrativo y de los Consejos Regionales de los gobiernos regionales en jornadas de trabajo y capacitación.

**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:**

El proyecto se ejecuta bajo la modalidad "CO Support to NIM". No obstante, la contraparte participó constantemente durante la ejecución del proyecto y en la toma de decisiones. Ver Acta de Cierre del proyecto

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Actadecierre99902firmada07112019_3467_318">Actadecierre99902firmada07112019_3467_318 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Actadecierre99902firmada07112019_3467_318.pdf)</a>	cesar.pagliai@undp.org	2/4/2020 8:51:00 PM

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:**

El proyecto centro su foco de trabajar en el fortalecimiento de capacidades de los nuevos gobiernos regionales que iniciaran sus funciones en 2021. Para cumplir con dicho objetivo se crearon sistema de información que le permitirán a las nuevas instituciones descentralizadas contar con datos relevantes para poder ejercer sus funciones públicas y entregar servicios de mejor calidad y focalizados en la población que mas lo necesita. Además, se contribuyó en el desarrollo de capacidades de los equipos regionales para que puedan elaborar planes regionales de desarrollo de forma autónoma.

**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:**

El proyecto plantea una clara estrategia de salida, que no fue modificada en la Revisión Sustantiva, ya que permite que cada GORE realice el proceso de descentralización y transferencia de competencias desde la administración central del Estado. Para ello son claves los productos elaborados por el proyecto para que los gobiernos regionales puedan contar con información que les permitirá gestionar y analizar los datos territoriales con el objetivo de entregar prestar servicios considerando las variables particulares de cada región.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

**QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments**

Según los comentarios efectuados en la reunión de cierre, se ha establecido que es necesario realizar un proceso de reflexión al interior de SUBDERE respecto de cómo este servicio se vinculará en el futuro con las regiones y sobre la importancia de entender que su relación no será de un servicio dependiente sino de un organismo relacionado con el Ejecutivo, y externamente, ha significado una modificación en cuanto a cómo el Estado e instituciones en su conjunto se relacionan con los GORE; ello implicará el desarrollo de un modelo de articulación y vinculación distinto al existente, lo que exige un continuo proceso de fortalecimiento, debido a la existencia de un modelo de administración pública que está en proceso de modernización.

Esto es parte de la descentralización, en la medida que los instrumentos (soluciones) están disponibles más cerca de donde se produce la necesidad (problemas) se pueden acelerar las mejoras en la calidad de vida de la comunidad. En particular, SUBDERE debe continuar guiando un proceso continuo de fortalecimiento de los gobiernos regionales; este proceso debe ser coordinado y acompañado por los sectores involucrados y/o vinculados a este proceso de desarrollo que enfrenta el país. Además, comunicacionalmente se debe fortalecer este proceso, lo que implica informar permanentemente a la ciudadanía sobre el estado del proceso y el llamado a la ciudadanía para que se vincule.