# Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

| | |
|---|---|
| **Form Status: Approved** | |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Overall Rating:** | Exemplary |
| **Decision:** | |
| **Portfolio/Project Number:** | 00086605 |
| **Portfolio/Project Title:** | Economic and Social Empowerment for Roma and Egyptians |
| **Portfolio/Project Date:** | 2015-10-01 / 2019-12-31 |

---

**Strategic**                                      **Quality Rating:  Exemplary**

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:**

> As evidenced by the minutes of the Project Management Committee Meetings and the Quarterly Project Risk Logs.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

| # | File Name | Modified By | Modified On |
|---|-----------|-------------|-------------|
| 1 | Evaluationreport-05.2019FinalVersion_1172_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Evaluationreport-05.2019FinalVersion_1172_301.pdf) | mirjeta.ramizi@undp.org | 10/1/2019 10:17:00 AM |
| 2 | QuarterlyReportingandRiskLog-ESERE-1APRIL2019-30June2019_1172_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/QuarterlyReportingandRiskLog-ESERE-1APRIL2019-30June2019_1172_301.doc) | mirjeta.ramizi@undp.org | 10/1/2019 10:01:00 AM |
| 3 | QuarterlyReportingandRiskLog-ESERE-Jan-Mar2019_1172_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/QuarterlyReportingandRiskLog-ESERE-Jan-Mar2019_1172_301.doc) | mirjeta.ramizi@undp.org | 10/1/2019 10:01:00 AM |
| 4 | ESEREMinutesof7thPMCmtg_1172_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ESEREMinutesof7thPMCmtg_1172_301.pdf) | mirjeta.ramizi@undp.org | 10/1/2019 10:02:00 AM |
| 5 | ESEREMinutesof6thPMCmtg_1172_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ESEREMinutesof6thPMCmtg_1172_301.doc) | mirjeta.ramizi@undp.org | 10/1/2019 10:02:00 AM |
| 6 | ESEREMinutesof5thPMCmtg_1172_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ESEREMinutesof5thPMCmtg_1172_301.doc) | mirjeta.ramizi@undp.org | 10/1/2019 10:03:00 AM |
| 7 | ESEREMinutesof4thPMCmtg-14Sep2017_1172_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ESEREMinutesof4thPMCmtg-14Sep2017_1172_301.doc) | mirjeta.ramizi@undp.org | 10/1/2019 10:03:00 AM |
| 8 | ESEREMinutesof3ndPMCmtg-19Jan2017_1172_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ESEREMinutesof3ndPMCmtg-19Jan2017_1172_301.doc) | mirjeta.ramizi@undp.org | 10/1/2019 10:03:00 AM |
| 9 | ESEREMinutesof2ndPMCmtg-13Sept2016draft_1172_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ESEREMinutesof2ndPMCmtg-13Sept2016draft_1172_301.doc) | mirjeta.ramizi@undp.org | 10/1/2019 10:03:00 AM |
| 10 | ESEREMinutesof1stPMC-4May2016_1172_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ESEREMinutesof1stPMC-4May2016_1172_301.doc) | mirjeta.ramizi@undp.org | 10/1/2019 10:03:00 AM |

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:**

As evidenced by the Project Final Evaluation Report.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

| # | File Name | Modified By | Modified On |
|---|-----------|-------------|-------------|
| 1 | Evaluationreport-05.2019FinalVersion_1172_302 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Evaluationreport-05.2019FinalVersion_1172_302.pdf) | mirjeta.ramizi@undp.org | 10/1/2019 10:19:00 AM |

**Relevant**                                                    **Quality Rating:  Exemplary**

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:**

ESERE interventions adopted an integrated approach to the economic and social inclusion of vulnerable communities built around the four action areas mentioned above. The project has demonstrated that integrated approaches better reach the target population and the family units and ensure social inclusion and protection. All interventions and actions are coordinated and supported by the Mayor, Local Department of Social Protection, Department of Employment, Regional Employment Office, and other partners. The Municipality is required to ensure the sustainability of the interventions, including securing the premises, hiring qualified staff, covering running and maintenance costs of infrastructure interventions, , and expanding the approach to other target areas. Different municipalities have incorporated different measures for future action and sustainability. Some such measures include cost sharing the project activities, expanding the illiteracy curricula to other schools in the municipality, adopting free education for Roma population in target schools, among others.

UNDP and EU have also drawn important lessons from the implementation of this project, with the main recommendations pointing to the need for both strengthening of policy capacities, as well as for concrete integrated actions at the local level for boosting skills, employment, social integration and social protection. This project draws the conclusion that both national and local level measures as well as both policy and community specific interventions must be applied for meaningful impact. This is the only way to peel back the different and pervasive layers of marginalization in a systemic manner to allow for meaningful integration and inclusion. National partners have also drawn important lessons from the implementation of this project, with the main recommendations pointing to the need for further strengthening of policy capacities, inter-institutional coordination, as well as for concrete integrated actions at the local level for boosting employability and social protection for vulnerable groups.

Please find evidence at the enclosed Minutes of the Project management committee meetings and the final progress report of the project.

### List of Uploaded Documents

| # | File Name | Modified By | Modified On |
|---|-----------|-------------|-------------|
| 1 | Evaluationreport-05.2019FinalVersion_1172_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Evaluationreport-05.2019FinalVersion_1172_303.pdf) | mirjeta.ramizi@undp.org | 10/1/2019 10:22:00 AM |
| 2 | finalreportESERErvs-Copy_1172_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/finalreportESERErvs-Copy_1172_303.pdf) | mirjeta.ramizi@undp.org | 10/1/2019 10:30:00 AM |

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:**

Please find evidence at the enclosed Minutes of the Project management committee meetings and the final progress report of the project.

### 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:**

Results of ESERE project are quite remarkable and this is confirmed by the evaluation findings. In the context of the programme, 557 Roma and Egyptians gained skills and found employment, 326 are supported with start-ups or income generation activities; the living conditions of more than 10,000 Roma and Egyptians are improved through community upgrading infrastructure projects; 231 Roma and Egyptians who have not had the possibility to complete basic education are enrolled and follow regularly the school/classes through the "Early part time primary education" and "Basic Literacy and Life Skills" models; More than 1,771 Roma and Egyptians enjoy improved access to basic services through the Pilot Model of Integrated Community Based Social Services; 300 public servants are trained on behavioural change, improved social care services and are coached and are actively using ROMALB system which is generating annually the progress report on the National Action Plan on the Integration of Roma and Egyptians.

The external independent evaluation of the project conducted in April-May 2019 defined ESERE as "a showcase of support to Roma integration policies for the Western Balkans", "a strong model for mainstreamed social inclusion in Albania" and "an example of full involvement of the community in every step of implementation, and systematic reflection of the needs in the project".

It acknowledges ESERE's "highly efficient when considering that the project has not only exceeded its targeted results but has established a qualitative, functioning model while producing profound changes in service delivery approach within a project cycle".

It impacted "in the transformation of communities and stakeholders' awareness, attitudes and work practices" and considers " ESERE is not just a project; it indeed embodies a model for Roma and Egyptian inclusion. Establishing ESERE as a successful system of inclusion of these most marginalized communities is the long-term goal and this is the reason why donor supporting should be considered as a social investment which should be pursued until it is proven fully sustainable for Roma and every other vulnerable group."

Relevance: ESERE has accurately responded to targeted community social inclusion challenges by applying a transformative approach that has stimulated all stakeholders – from community members to institutions and the civil society - constituting the integration set-up, to work more efficiently together, while deliver tangible results.

ESERE is an example of full involvement of the community in every step of implementation, and systematic reflection of the needs in the project. It was highly participatory and flexible to adapt to changes in the context that presented upcoming needs. ESERE is designed in line with the Albanian government priorities on R&E inclusion, but also feeding in the EU Progress Reports requirements and the UN SDGs.

ESERE has been thoughtfully designed to be suppo rtive of strategic and policy priorities: from the comm unity, municipal level to the national level – providing a major boost to NAPIRE's results. The project also contributes to achieving other relevant sectoral priori ties: Youth, Employment, Gender Equality, Anti-discr imination etc. In addition, ESERE is a showcase of s upport to Roma integration policies for the Western Balkans.

Efficiency: ESERE has been highly efficient when co nsidering that the project has not only exceeded its t argeted results but has established a qualitative, fun ctioning model while producing profound changes in service delivery approach within a project cycle.

Effectiveness: There is unanimity that ESERE´s effe ctiveness lies primarily in its integrated approach: ad dressing one need alone does not eradicate the pro blem, empowering the family in different fronts make s the difference. Another element of success is the c apitalization of UNDP´s experience in the R&E issue s throughout the time.

While ESERE has delivered timely, quantitative outp uts, the quality of its results at the municipal and cen tral level, has been recognized and praised. Of high est significance, is the project's construction of an ef fective change of mentalities within the institutions b ut also within communities, about their respective m utual perceptions, interactions and awareness of bel onging to one coherent, effective system. ESERE ha s also contributed to bridging the gap between the R oma and Egyptian communities and the institutions of their country by showing the way for a better outre ach to communities and more coherent, more coordi nated response to the integration and basic living ne eds of the targeted groups.

Impact: ESERE has made an impact on all aspects on the complex, multidimensional facets of the integr ation process and reality of Roma and Egyptian com munities in Albania. Beyond the effects of activities, t he main impact lies in the transformation of commun ities and stakeholders' awareness, attitudes and wor k practices.

Sustainability: ESERE has produced sustainable res ults both for its end beneficiaries – as the majority of those engaged in professional upgrading and self-e mployment activities showed durable perspectives – and for the formal social inclusion set up in Albania. The model established has achieved a strong degre e of institutionalization and can be made sustainable with further consolidation support.

Gender Equality and Human Rights: Both dimension s have been strongly and effectively integrated in th e design and addressed as a priority during impleme ntation. Gender and anti-discrimination-specific activ ities have been tailored based on the social inclusio n obstacles and challenges girls and women and the

obstacles and challenges girls and women and their discriminated groups are experiencing.

Lessons learned and best practices
A myriad of lessons learned have been identified. However, ESERE is much more than the sum of best practices as they are all coherently assembled in the architecture of the bottom-up social integration model.

Conclusions
Roma and Egyptian communities remain socially excluded in other regions of Albania and more resources are necessary to expand the ESERE model. ESERE is not just a project; it indeed embodies a model for R&E inclusion. Establishing ESERE as a successful system of inclusion of these most marginalized communities is the long-term goal and this is the reason why donor supporting should be considered as a social investment which should be pursued until it is proven fully sustainable. It seems relevant to assert that "If ESERE can make it with Roma, ESERE can make it with any marginalized, vulnerable population", given that it is the most excluded and vulnerable group in all aspects but also the most discriminated population.
Please find more details on this topic at the uploaded Final Evaluation Report.

## List of Uploaded Documents

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

No documents available.

**Principled**                                    **Quality Rating: Highly 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:**

> Gender and anti-discrimination-specific activities have been tailored based on the social inclusion obstacles and challenges girls and women and their discriminated groups are experiencing. Gender disaggregated data has been systematically collected and analyzed. Please find more details at the enclosed List of activities contributing to gender equality and also at the Final Evaluation Report and Final Project Report.

### List of Uploaded Documents

| # | File Name | Modified By | Modified On |
|---|-----------|-------------|-------------|
| 1 | ESERElistofactivitiescontributingtogenderequality_1172_306 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ESERElistofactivitiescontributingtogenderequality_1172_306.doc) | mirjeta.ramizi@undp.org | 10/1/2019 10:38:00 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:**

> Please find more information at the Final Progress Report, minutes of the Project management committee meetings and Quarterly Reporting on Risk Logs.

### 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:**

Please find more information at the Final Progress Report, minutes of the Project management committee meetings and Quarterly Reporting on Risk Logs.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

| # | File Name | Modified By | Modified On |
|---|-----------|-------------|-------------|
| No documents available. | | | |

---

**Management & Monitoring**                    **Quality Rating:  Exemplary**

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:**

> Please find more information at the Final Progress R
> eport, minutes of the Project management committe
> e meetings and Final Evaluation Report.

---

**List of Uploaded Documents**

| # | File Name | Modified By | Modified On |
|---|-----------|-------------|-------------|
| No documents available. | | | |

---

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:**

> Please find more information at the Final Progress R
> eport and the minutes of the Project management co
> mmittee meetings.

---

**List of Uploaded Documents**

| # | File Name | Modified By | Modified On |
|---|-----------|-------------|-------------|
| No documents available. | | | |

---

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:**

> Please find more information at the Final Progress Report, minutes of the Project management committee meetings and Quarterly Reporting on Risk Logs.

| **List of Uploaded Documents** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **#** | **File Name** | **Modified By** | **Modified On** |
| No documents available. | | | |

---

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

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:**

> ESERE has been highly efficient when considering t
> hat the project has not only exceeded its targeted re
> sults but has established a qualitative, functioning m
> odel while producing profound changes in service de
> livery approach within a project cycle.
>
> There is unanimity that ESERE´s effectiveness lies
> primarily in its integrated approach: addressing one
> need alone does not eradicate the problem, empow
> ering the family in different fronts makes the differen
> ce. Another element of success is the capitalization
> of UNDP´s experience in the R&E issues throughout
> the time.
>
> While ESERE has delivered timely, quantitative outp
> uts, the quality of its results at the municipal and cen
> tral level, has been recognized and praised. Of high
> est significance, is the project's construction of an ef
> fective change of mentalities within the institutions b
> ut also within communities, about their respective m
> utual perceptions, interactions and awareness of bel
> onging to one coherent, effective system. ESERE ha
> s also contributed to bridging the gap between the R
> oma and Egyptian communities and the institutions
> of their country by showing the way for a better outre
> ach to communities and more coherent, more coordi
> nated response to the integration and basic living ne
> eds of the targeted groups.
> Please find more information at the Final Progress R
> eport and the Final Project Evaluation.

**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 project had a procurement plan and kept it updated. Operational bottlenecks were addressed regularly through appropriate management actions.

| | 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:**

> ESERE resources have been utilized in an efficient manner when considering the results achieved and strong progress toward the higher objective of making Roma and Egyptian inclusion work thanks to a system designed to be sustainable.
>
> All project funds have been exhausted while most outputs have been delivered and several key target results have already been exceeded.
>
> The project means have been used efficiently owing to the fact that the distribution of funds has been guided by a detailed strategy. ESERE's multidimensional approach is reflected through a justified balance of resource allocation prioritizing the local level, granting substantial resources to the Roma and Egyptian civil society (circa 7.5% of total budget) and an adequate level of support to the essential budget post for human resources (circa 20 % of total budget). One project is not enough to address the Roma and Egyptians integration needs in all sectors, let alone social housing which, by nature, requires high-scale levels of funds. However, the ESERE budget has been striking a fair balance of direct assistance between essential integration needs (circa 25% of total budget allocated to infrastructure and circa 11% to employment promotion programme component).
>
> Indeed, an appropriate focus has been placed on hu

Indeed, an appropriate focus has been placed on human resources as a key leverage to achieving results and success (Efficiency is the result of human performance & defined by ESERE team commitment). This budget share does not only correspond to providing project employment but should be seen as a longer-term investment of individuals who have played and who are likely to continue playing an essential role into keeping functional the complex mechanism of Roma and Egyptian social inclusion.

The size of the ESERE project in terms of budget appears to create large impact with a contained use of resources. Indeed, smaller projects than this one does not achieve the desired impact as they address partially the needs of the R&E communities. Larger projects would probably be not fully cost-effective. The size of ESERE project has apparently created the "economy of scale" effect for which with a given number of staff available, a larger impact is achieved.   The crucial role of physical field presence backed by a management of proximity also active at the central level have been key factors of efficiency.

ESERE is a complex project to manage in that it operates numerous activities – 19 across 4 components –, through different modalities (competitive call for proposal, contracting, counselling, field work…), with multiple partners, in four different geographical locations, at various level, including the regional and central government level.

The evaluation has found ESERE management has efficiently handled the demanding management task through a well-adjusted project steering committee structure but at least, equally importantly, the level of dedication and the high relevance of staff profile and personalities are to be accounted for the strong impact the project has made in the field.

The ESERE team is one wealth of the project resources: All staff have been engaged in social inclusion– often of Roma and Egyptian communities – for many years and are enjoying a unique understanding of the concrete challenges faces by excluded populations. With half of ESERE originating from those communities, they have been at the center of establishing relations and building trust between parties that previously would not talk to each other.
The spirit and human commitment of the team has been very strongly praised by all stakeholders, starting from the communities itself.

The efficiency of coordination mechanisms is the result of continuous improvement and adjustment of lessons learned from previous interventions.

The UNDP has a long experience of direct work with communities at grassroot level combined with a long history of cooperation with Albanian central and local institutions. ESERE implementation mechanisms derive from experience and practice and the parallel active interaction of the Tirana-based coordination tea

m and the day-to-day exchanges between the four Local Coordinators, placed in municipal buildings, together with the Community Exchange Workers have ensured a constant coordination with involved actors and a timely management of issues related to the implementation of activities.
Please find more details at the Final Evaluation Report of the project.

## List of Uploaded Documents

| # | File Name | Modified By | Modified On |
|---|-----------|-------------|-------------|
| No documents available. | | | |

**Effective**                                    **Quality Rating:  Exemplary**

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

◉ *Yes*
○ No

**Evidence:**

ESERE is rich in substance with nineteen activities gathered around four strategic components that are very different in nature, involving numerous actors in a national and four local contexts. This makes ESERE a complex project to implement that requires a well-articulated delivery mechanism.
This mechanism is primarily the result of previous interventions which modalities have improved with experience over time. The project document provides a detailed explanation of the thorough background analysis work (legal/policy analysis, stakeholder mandates, capacity gap analysis, analysis of social exclusion factors, communities social development indicators…) that has been performed prior to the start of the project and which has provided the basis for developing the project approach and implementation modalities.
The direct impacts on the communities are numerous. If taking the example of following the life cycle of a Roma or Egyptian child, the range of ESERE impacts could be summarized like this.
☐     Infant age: Better nutrition at the community center. Birth registration. Protection from potential domestic violence thanks to social workers monitoring. Better health through medical checks at the community center.
☐     Young age: Early educational exclusion owing t

o CSO/Community Centres close follow-up and atte
nding pre-school classes. Prevention of language-ba
sed exclusion thanks to an early practice of the Alba
nian language.

☐    Teenage: Prevention of exploitation and trafficki
ng thanks to joint ESERE staff, civil society and soci
al services individual case management. Prevention
of drop out from school. Early detection of future pro
fessional failure, thanks to counselling and orientatio
n between higher studies or chosen vocational traini
ng.

☐    Adult age: For women: Prevention of domestic
violence through social worker counselling. Preventi
on of extreme exclusion through adult literacy classe
s, strengthening of self-confidence through participat
ion to various cultural and professional activities. Civ
il status registration, health card issuance bringing in
clusion to the health care system. Reduction of pove
rty through professional upgrading schemes. Preven
tion of re-exclusion through complementary support
services such as child guardianship.

☐    Elder age: Prevention of health deterioration thr
ough medical follow-up and prevention from isolatio
n through socializing activities.

The above is a very brief summary of the impacts an
d does not include the myriad of situations of further
exclusion avoided through an increased social care
of the Roma and Egyptian communities.

ESERE has also produced a strong impact that coul
d be situated between a direct and indirect results of
the intervention: A change of minds and a change of
paradigm.

The other key impact – besides improving the lives o
f assisted Roma and Egyptian communities – is the
change of minds of "all involved parties".

☐    Roma and Egyptian communities have a differe
nt stand towards public institutions and a faith in the
social inclusion system. Communities have witnesse
d the concrete actions of municipal authorities and p
ublic civil servants, but they have also captured the
willingness to support from actors they would previo
usly felt ignored by. A very strong illustration of this c
hange is summarized by the following situation. A R
oma woman who is now a regular user of the local c
ommunity center and who occasionally visit the rem
ote employment office in Durrës has admitted that b
efore ESERE, she did not even know where the offic
e was located".

☐    Municipal authorities have become pro-active i
n solving the multiple integration obstacles of the co
mmunities. The four municipalities engaged have su
pported financial several activities from their budgets
but have also hired staff permanently in the social se
rvices section to assist Roma and Egyptian populati
on. Most importantly, local governments have under
stood their responsibilities and are asking for more c

apacity to assist social inclusion.

☐ The Ministry of Health and Social Welfare, the Ministry of Education have demonstrated a genuine i ntention and strong commitment to support the inclu sion process at its level. The allocation of adequate f unds is yet awaited.

ESERE has made key stakeholders change their mi ndsets and collaborate closer than ever before. Toge ther with the relevant multi-level integrated approach and mentality transformation, the evaluation has fou nd that the project has largely contributed to a chang e of paradigm when it comes to Roma and Egyptian communities' integration in Albania.

### 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:

Please see the Quarterly Progress Reports and Risk Logs.

### 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:**

ESERE has provided a highly relevant response to the needs to its target groups but also to the way to address inclusion challenges in a sustainable manner. The exclusion of Roma and Egyptian is multi-faceted and incredibly acute as it is not most but all of the dimensions of their human development that are endangered: literacy, higher education, health, livelihood, housing, domestic stability, acceptance by majority community, interaction with State Institutions. The experience of previous endeavors has taught practitioners that socio-economic inclusion will fail if only some of the obstacles are tackled separately.

The most recent regional Roma survey conducted by the World Bank provides an exhaustive illustration of the nature and multiplicity of the gaps and inclusion indicators reaching far below national averages, the field of education, labour market access, health, housing or documentation .

The multi-level (from grassroot to central), multi-dimensional (inclusive of all categories of stakeholders), and pluri-sectoral (education, employment, health…) activities deployed by ESERE is the holistic and combined response to the diversity of needs and priorities of targeted communities: from educational exclusion prevention, access to basic health services, child care services to decent labour market access

The project was designed to continuously consult the target groups on their needs through a community-based approach. Indeed, Community Counselling Forums were set and functional in all the regions with the aim to gauge and address the needs of the target groups in a participatory bottom-up approach. This way of working has built trust among the community and boosted empowerment of community members to feel ownership over the project.

In particular, the project has mainstreamed throughout the work packages a working model that boosts a

at the work packages a working model that boosts active citizenship and participation. At an initial stage, ESERE has led preparation of Local Analyses Packages that provide specific regional information on Roma and Egyptian communities. As mentioned, the 13 Community Counselling Forums (CCF) have served as direct channels that enhance consultation of citizens and reflection of their needs in the project. The high number of meetings organized by the CCFs (at least 246 until the time of reporting) is an evidence of the deep outreach of the project into the communities. During the focus groups discussions with the beneficiaries of the project, some beneficiaries expressed that "for the first time they felt that their opinion mattered, and their voice was being heard when planning activities for the Roma community".

In addition, another component of the project that seemed to duly assess the needs of the beneficiaries is the CSOs support package. A capacity and training needs assessment for R&E NGOs was conducted which identified a series of training topics. This preceded the launch of the Call for Proposals for the provision of small grants. Representatives of CSOs interviewed confirm their full involvement in the whole process and they serving as bridges between the project and the communities they are active in.

Owing to a presence at the community level and regular interaction with key municipal and central stakeholders, ESERE has been strongly positioned to react rapidly to specific field situation as well as to adapt to policy-level and concrete changes occurred in the field of Roma and Egyptian social inclusion. ESERE's close and constant interaction at grassroot, local and central level has given the project a close grasp with its context, placed it in a central position to adjust to changes in the sector. In actual fact, the present reports explain in further details how ESERE has been a strong factor of change in the sector during the 42 months of its implementation.
Please find more details at the final progress report and final project evaluation.

---

### List of Uploaded Documents

| # | File Name | Modified By | Modified On |
|---|-----------|-------------|-------------|
| No documents available. | | | |

---

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

Most of the practices introduced by ESERE have been adopted as regular practices of public services, including social services and employment offices.

The project has produced a series of structural results which will remain in place after the project termination. Most of these results are at policy level including institutional orders and decisions that have re-shaped the Albanian system in their spheres of action. More concretely, one of the most important lasting results has been the issuance of Order no .576, dated 16.12.2017 of the Ministry of Health and Social Protection for the referral system and free primary public health services.

ESERE and UNDP staff have strongly lobbied for the inclusion of all the categories of people in need in access to health system. In substance, the Order released the burden of being registered as unemployed person for having access to primary health services. In this way, categories in need are not necessarily obliged to be registered as unemployed at the respective employment offices for them to have free access to the health system. This is considered by the interviewees a major achievement of the project that will continue to have an indefinite impact in the future.

**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:**

Also, Micro Assessment for implementing partners w as applied regularly by the project. Please find more details in the final progress report of the project.

| **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 Project Management Committee periodically me t and reviewed the project's sustainability plan and t he project plan as duly implemented, including adjus tments. Please find more details in the Final Progres s Report.

## List of Uploaded Documents

| # | File Name | Modified By | Modified On |
|---|-----------|-------------|-------------|
| No documents available. | | | |

## QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments