

Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

Form Status: Approved	
Overall Rating:	Satisfactory
Decision:	
Portfolio/Project Number:	00100674
Portfolio/Project Title:	Urban Resilience Network
Portfolio/Project Date:	2017-01-01 / 2018-12-31

Strategic	Quality Rating: Satisfactory
<p>1. Did the project pro-actively identified changes to the external environment and incorporated them into the project strategy?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><input type="radio"/> 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)<input checked="" type="radio"/> 2: <i>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)</i><input type="radio"/> 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:

All the changes within SEE URBAN being the EU funded project were discussed with the DG ECHO. In that concern, following the first year of implementation and bearing in mind that even though all the activities have been implemented as planned with some finances still left unspent Project team intends to discuss additional activities to be added to the existing ones with each respective CO and additionally communicate these changes with the DG ECHO. Furthermore, Project team have substantively discussed new opportunities in terms of future project scaling up and in that sense developed a SEE URBAN phase 2 concept note which includes geographical and content wise expansion. In doing so, Project team took into consideration national priorities of all the 7 countries/territories taking part of this project meaning that current and future effects of project development are being constantly examined.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	_URBANAmendmentNo1signed_43_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/_URBANAmendmentNo1signed_43_301.pdf)	stanislav.kim@undp.org	5/17/2019 2:07:00 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:

SEE URBAN project was fully aligned with the regional programme outcome 3 and UNDP Strategic Plan, through tailored Results Frameworks and intended transformational changes that will respond to Signature Solution 3 but will have dividends under several Signature Solutions. Signature solution 3: Enhance national prevention and recovery capacities for resilient societies. The project responds to Urban Resilience building area of sustainable development in line with strengthening DRR networking modalities as per Sendai Framework for Action.

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:

SEE URBAN project audience are in fact DRR practitioners namely primary responders to disasters in 7 SEE countries/territories. Besides local level practitioners, project also involves national level DRR decision makers. Every single working meeting, workshop and/or roundtable organized as part of SEE URBAN project have had respective evaluation process which inter alia included disaggregation of data as per age, education, function/position and gender. This in fact allowed for a systematic and structure survey to be conducted allowing comparability between all participating countries/territories.

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:

SEE URBAN project concept was based on the fact that the previously acquired knowledge from an EU country namely Croatia is being shared as best practice example within 6 other SEE countries/territories with aspiration of becoming EU member country. In that sense, the project idea is that the local level DR R networking concept is presented to each of the project countries/territories and then adapted to its needs. Besides that, some ideas and concepts originated during the project implementation were then shared between project beneficiaries allowing for smooth transfer of lessons learned. See attached LL report in the text of the final report, as well as country specific LL.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	1-SEEUrbFinalReport5April2019_43_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/1-SEEUrbFinalReport5April2019_43_304.docx)	stanislav.kim@undp.org	5/17/2019 2:14:00 PM
2	Annex3.Countryspecificlessonslearned_43_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Annex3.Countryspecificlessonslearned_43_304.docx)	stanislav.kim@undp.org	5/17/2019 2:14:00 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:

The project budget allowed additional activities to be implemented. Therefore, SEE URBAN scaling up is expected with both current project partners (who expect scaling up in terms of content namely via PPP partnerships) and other project observing countries (who expect project scaling up in terms of geography). At this point of time, discussions re possible funding and donor finding for future project scaling up still in the process.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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:

SEE URBAN project have been systematically collecting disaggregated data with particular interest in gender inequalities in terms of women's participation in DRR decision making at local level. As a result of gender mainstreaming collected data have shown increase in women participation during the project implementation. Even though there are no specific budget expenditures/allocations for gender mainstreaming all the activities were done bearing in mind gender consideration. Also an increase was recorded when it comes to women's participation at the SEE URBAN meeting respectively from a total of 16% during 6 national introductory meetings to 20% during 6 national round-tables. This culminated with 35% female participation during the first SEE URBAN regional working meeting. You can find more information in section 4.3. Qualitative assessment of the activities of attached final report.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	1-SEEUrbnFinalReport5April2019_43_306 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QA/FormDocuments/1-SEEUrbnFinalReport5April2019_43_306.docx)	stanislav.kim@undp.org	5/17/2019 2:21:00 PM

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

- ☐ 3: Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. Appropriate assessments conducted where required (i.e., Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) for High risk projects and some level of social and environmental assessment for Moderate risk projects as identified through SESP). Relevant management plan(s) developed for identified risks through consultative process and implemented, resourced, and monitored. Risks effectively managed or mitigated. If there is a substantive change to the project or change in context that affects risk levels, the SESP was updated to reflect these changes. (all must be true)
- ☒ 2: *Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. Appropriate assessments conducted where required (i.e., Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) for High risk projects and some level of social and environmental assessment for Moderate risk projects as identified through SESP). Relevant management plan(s) developed, implemented and monitored for identified risks. OR project was categorized as Low risk through the SESP.*
- ☐ 1: Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. For projects categorized as High or Moderate Risk, there was no evidence that social and environmental assessments completed and/or management plans or measures development, implemented or monitored. There are substantive changes to the project or changes in the context but SESP was not updated. (any may be true)

Evidence:

Social and environmental impacts have been considered and are a part of risk log that is regularly reviewed so to ensure adequate project implementation. Worth noting is that particular attention was already given to the social vulnerability issues in terms of DRR so that all the future DRR actions in the SEE region are to consider increased risks of exposure to disasters with namely women, children, elderly, disabled etc. When it comes to environmental impacts, SEE URBAN is to address those issues during the implementation of capacity building as it will also develop approaches and skills to mainstream and integrate urban risk concerns in terms of environmental sustainability into development.

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 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:

During the project implementation no unanticipated social and environmental risks or grievances were experienced.

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 project relies on results and resource framework (RRF) and the project's outputs and activities are being implemented at an appropriate level so to cover main aspects of the project's theory of change. Outputs are accompanied by SMART results-oriented indicators whilst the monitoring and evaluation is defined as per the project document. Qualitative and quantitative monitoring and evaluation is made based on the indicators stated in the RRF. Reporting is made in line with results management guidelines, using the standard Atlas tools. SEE URBAN monitoring is being conducted in quarterly fashion so to fit planned milestones. At an annual level, project quality assurance and evaluation is conducted. Besides that, annual project progress report consisting of progress data showing the results achieved against pre-defined annual targets at the output level is developed. Similar, annual progress report is submitted to EC containing project results according to the established work plan and financial details.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Annex1.ProgressbyDOA_43_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Annex1.ProgressbyDOA_43_309.docx)	stanislav.kim@undp.org	5/17/2019 2:23:00 PM

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

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

Evidence:

The structure of the project board is clearly defined in the project document and is based on and fully in line with the UNDP standard requirements. The roles and responsibilities of the most important members of the management board are described. The project was monitored once per year through the discussions at Management Board meeting. Progress report is submitted to Management Board once per year for a revision and minutes of the meeting developed. Official donor report was prepared (both financial and narrative part) and also discussed with the Management Board.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	SEEUrbanBoardminutes_43_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SEEUrbanBoardminutes_43_310.pdf)	stanislav.kim@undp.org	5/17/2019 2:27:00 PM
2	SeeUrbanVirtualProjectBoardMinutes_19-02-2018_43_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SeeUrbanVirtualProjectBoardMinutes_19-02-2018_43_310.pdf)	stanislav.kim@undp.org	5/17/2019 2:28:00 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:

Risk log was a part of the project document. Newly emerging risks and risk monitoring will be regularly performed using the appropriate Atlas tools. Additionally, project is considering disaster risks for its potential of impeding its implementation. Monitoring is being conducted in quarterly manner in order to fit project milestones.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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:

Being that SEE URBAN was an EU funded project all the activities were planned in detail meaning that all the resources were pre-planned and included in the project budget. That said, all the three groups of costs namely personnel, travel and sub-contracting were estimated for each specific country/territory and for each specific activity. Therefore, resource mobilization was fully in line with the project document. As previously noted, since it seems that some of the activities were less costly than planned some of the activities were expanded for the year 2018 (and therefore additional resources procured) however this is the matter to be revised with the project board and the donor.

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 and delivery of planned project outputs was coordinated by IRH and via UNDP country offices that support the project implementation at the national/local level in 7 countries/territories of SEE. Besides that, COs are in coordination and constant communication with 4 Project beneficiaries namely in Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina (2) and the Republic of North Macedonia. The IRH project team constantly supported and coordinated implementation of project activities whereas compliance with the procurement rules and regulations as well as with project requirements is also coordinated.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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:

All the project costs were in detail budgeted for in the financial template of the project document. This also includes the co-funding part which was presented via the involvement of UNDP CO and IRH personnel. However, as already noted some savings have been noted in the sub-contracting budget line even though the overall result was fully achieved. In that sense, all activities were adapted/expanded so to achieve full project delivery.

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:

Project activities implemented were fully in line with the project AWP and aiming to achieve the expected outputs. Moreover, some of the project outputs were completed above the expected merit (e.g. more established local level DRR Platforms than originally planned). This is partially contributed to the fact that the project progress towards achieving projected outputs is regularly checked, coordinated and discussed between IRH, COs and national project beneficiaries.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Annex1.ProgressbyDOA_43_315 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Annex1.ProgressbyDOA_43_315.docx)	stanislav.kim@undp.org	5/17/2019 2:33:00 PM

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

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

Evidence:

The regular review of the AWP's was made in line with UNDP requirements and in relation to donor i.e. EU grant agreement. The AWP's therefore fully fits the signed donor agreement whilst as required project progress report is to be submitted to the donor annually. As part of the EU grant agreement 20% payment will be covered once the final project report will be submitted and in that concern the project will have to be in line with fulfilling planned outputs so that the final EU payment would be received and CO/IRH financial contributions reimbursed.

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:

SEE URBAN was targeting local level authorities dealing with DRR and as such is being implemented in 7 countries/territories of SEE. During the project implementation the target groups were assessed so to ensure that they are benefiting from the project. For example, 97% of 230 persons taking part of the survey during 12 working meetings have evaluated the idea as beneficial. At the regional level, 88% of survey participants have evaluated the idea as above average whilst 90% of them have noted above average regional success potential. Each meeting is being organized in cooperation between UNDP Country Office and the respective newly formed local level DRR Platform so to ensure that both specific groups and geographic areas are well represented.

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:

Besides UNDP, as Project Coordinator SEE URBAN project had four Project Beneficiaries (1 from Croatia, 2 from BIH and 1 from the Republic of North Macedonia). Even though Project Coordinator was the only point of contact with the EU as the donor all the other 4 Project Beneficiaries were crucial for project implementation. Therefore, they were fully engaged in the implementing process inclusive of planning and decision-making in close cooperation with respective COs. Each of the 7 representing countries/territories took part in the project has a team consisting of respective CO representatives and national/local level stakeholders who are jointly supporting project implementation and monitoring.

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**⁸ adjusted according to changes in partner capacities?

- ☐ 3: Changes in capacities and performance of national institutions and systems were assessed/monitored using clear indicators, rigorous methods of data collection and credible data sources including relevant HACT assurance activities. Implementation arrangements were formally reviewed and adjusted, if needed, in agreement with partners according to changes in partner capacities. (all must be true)
- ☐ 2: Aspects of changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems were monitored by the project using indicators and reasonably credible data sources including relevant HACT assurance activities. Some adjustment was made to implementation arrangements if needed to reflect changes in partner capacities. (all must be true)
- ☐ 1: Some aspects of changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems may have been monitored by the project, however changes to implementation arrangements have not been considered. Also select this option if changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems have not been monitored by the project.
- ☒ *Not Applicable*

Evidence:

Detailed capacity assessment, as per UNDP rules and regulations have been conducted involving all four Project Beneficiaries. Any change within the system and/or staff representing Project Beneficiaries was timely presented to the Project Coordinator. Moreover, in terms of regular monitoring of capacities of national institutions, every respective CO is in charge of determining capacities of their national/local level DRR stakeholders. With that in mind, project plans were adapted to the capacities of each particular country/territory based on the inputs received from respective COs and national DRR stakeholders in line with coordination pointers provided by IRH.

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 entire SEE URBAN project was conceived as a concept of best practice sharing of an example of DRR connectivity modelling from an EU country to the entire SEE region. That said, this best practice example was shared so to initiate establishment of local level DRR Platforms in other 6 countries/territories. All the established Platforms were using the inputs from the presented model but they were all adapted to the respective country specifics. Besides that, the establishment of Platforms was demand driven so whilst able to receive best practice sharing inputs all the Platforms have managed to create the sense of national ownership. Sustainability was furthermore strengthened via capacity building and the fact that all national/local level DRR Platforms are now interlinked regionally via SEE URBAN website which allows them to work together following the phase-out period.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments

During the Final Project Board Review (23 May -3 June 2019), the Project Board Members have approved the final progress report and final Quality Assessment report and recommended the operational closure of the project.