

Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

Form Status: Approved

Overall Rating:	Satisfactory
Decision:	
Portfolio/Project Number:	00104196
Portfolio/Project Title:	Innovative durable solutions for IDPs and returnees
Portfolio/Project Date:	2017-06-12 / 2022-03-31

Strategic

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

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

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

Evidence:

The RE-INTEG was a integrated, multi-sectoral programme implemented by UN agencies (UN-Habitat, UNHCR, UNDP) in collaboration with local NGOs between 2017-2021. The project's overall objective was to facilitate and support durable solutions for Internally displaced persons (IDPs) and refugee-returnees (RRs) in Mogadishu. The aim was to improve the living conditions of IDPs and RRs through the strengthening of governance systems, improved housing conditions, land and property rights and social, economic and political inclusion. UNDP implemented the so called component Result 2.3: Medium term employment activities to support sustainable job creation and increased employability for IDPs and returnees. The incubator was disadvantaged by the lack of an initial feasibility study, the delays brought about by COVID 19 between Feb and August 2020 and turnover of UNDP personnel in the CO and in the UN Team. While the team in UNDP considered changes, this was late in the project life. By the time a new manager joined, the project was already in its final six months of implementation and substantive changes were no longer possible.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	SAANQA1_10689_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SAANQA1_10689_301.PDF)	laura.rio@undp.org	11/21/2021 4:33:00 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 development settings 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:

This was a UN Joint Programme developed to address displacement one of Somalia country priority . It responded to UNDP setting "Build resilience to shocks and crises" of the UNDP Strategic Plan 2017-2021 and two signature solutions i.e., (1): Keeping people out of poverty and Signature solution and (3): Enhance national prevention and recovery capacities for resilient societies.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	InnovativedurablesolutionsforIDPsandreturneesinMogadishu_Prodoc_10689_302 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/InnovativedurablesolutionsforIDPsandreturneesinMogadishu_Prodoc_10689_302.pdf)	laura.rio@undp.org	11/21/2021 4:37:00 PM

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:

Yes targeted groups were engaged and benefited from the project. 500 youths (67% IDPs and 33% returnees) from six districts received training on basic entrepreneurship, marketing, and financial aspects in business. Out of these, 120 youths were taking further trainings (March 2021). Ten ideas for businesses were pitched to a panel from Mogadishu University, other universities, banks, and NGOs. Three of the proposals were given grants - a bakery for IDP camps (\$1,000), honey production (\$800), and rugs and mats (\$500). The final report prepared by the manager of the Incubator (February 2021) noted achievements as 78 people benefitting from business support services including drop-in services; training in entrepreneurship and employment; coaching and mentorship support for 42 entrepreneurs; and a business challenge programme which attracted over 75 applicants.

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:

The main lesson learned was the importance of conducting an initial feasibility study to examine whether there were underserved sectors in terms of numbers of enterprises, with this potentially directing the incubator towards these sectors rather than focusing on internally displaced persons (what proved a contentious issue in poor communities hosting IDPs). In fact the feasibility study should have been a suitable prerequisite to project initiation to allow review of pilot findings and alignment to contextual realities or issues identified. On livelihoods and employment training programmes, there is a need to consider the entire continuum from the activity to outcome/impact generation. There is need to allocate fund to support post-training follow up and support – linkage of activity outputs to intended outcomes. The business incubator provided a range of services and seems to have been attracting clientele which suggests a market for these services. Continuing in this role could be considered. A business development hub may also be the right instrument if clients are interested in informal necessity entrepreneurship and self-employment as a way of providing livelihoods.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	BusinessIncubatorSustainabilityPlan_Meeting20210318_10689_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/BusinessIncubatorSustainabilityPlan_Meeting20210318_10689_304.docx)	laura.rio@undp.org	11/21/2021 4:41:00 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 success of the incubator to date has been in providing business development services through what is, in effect, a business development hub. It provides a range of services and seems to have been attracting clientele which suggests a market for these services. Continuing in this role could be considered. A business development hub may also be the right instrument if clients are interested in informal necessity entrepreneurship and self-employment as a way of providing livelihoods.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	THIRDPARTYMONITORINGREINTEGREPORTO1Q2_10689_305 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/THIRDPARTYMONITORINGREINTEGREPORTO1Q2_10689_305.pdf)	laura.rio@undp.org	11/21/2021 4:43:00 PM

Principled**Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

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

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

Evidence:

Future investment aimed to support small scale business enterprises should consider ways to support a spiring or small scale enterprises (that is largely dominated by women and youth) such as; provision of start-up capital or creating access to credit facilities with financial institutions. Overall, as a joint programme, the project was successful in addressing some gender inequalities in accessing services. Out of the 93 stakeholders representing the government, district and local level authorities who were trained on durable solutions, 33 were women. The project was also very deliberate in enhancing gender balance in the targeted beneficiary communities of IDPs and RRs during the rights awareness creation forums and public outreach awareness campaign where 76% of the audience and target group were women and girls. IE C materials that were disseminated were also gender sensitive in the way the messaging was designed, how it was disseminated, distributed and display modes.

List of Uploaded Documents

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

No documents available.

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

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

Environmental risks: on the component to promote low cost and environmentally friendly cooking fuels, the program successfully conducted training for IDPs and RRs on producing low-cost and environmentally friendly cooking fuels. The program provided training to 120 men on sustainable Prosopis cutting, construction of improved-energy efficient charcoal kilns and charcoal production. Likewise, 200 women were trained on charcoal briquette production and business and financial management. On political and social risks: these greatly delayed project implementation. The project experienced delays in decision making at B RA level, specifically following the assassination of the Mayor and four senior members of the regional administration on 24 July 2019, followed by a month-long interregnum before the new Mayor took over office. This affected the business incubator as the choice of the business incubator site was delayed.

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:

No evidence that project beneficiaries and participants were informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism and no record of grievances. Under this UN joint programme, however UNDP was able to address complaints by project affected people, including UNDP implementing partner (BRA) and contractors. While UNDP faced some challenges in arriving at resolutions, project affected people were informed and took active part in addressing grievances. This was done through joint verification missions and monitoring visits. A third party monitoring visit and end of project evaluation provided an opportunity for owners of business and enterprises that benefited from training offered by the incubator to reflect on the assistance and whether/how it had brought a positive change in their lives.

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 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 collected progress data for the reporting period, the project closure and handover to BRA and the final evaluation (as detailed in the ToR). Lessons learned were compiled too. The design of the project's M&E framework of the joint programmed did not make sufficient provisions to measure achievements at the outcome and impact levels. The Joint Steering Committee (JSC) and Technical Working Group (TWG) ensured implementation of the M&E Plan at regular events that brought together all project partners. These forums facilitated sharing of feedback on various experiences and lessons learned. As a result, over the project cycle time, there was increased clarity in respect to roles of the partners hence improving working relationships with BRA.

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:

The Steering Committee met regularly. The project filed minutes on a shared drive. Progress and annual reports were also submitted. Project governance mechanisms include regular coordination meeting between partners and the donor as well as interactive-hands-on and real-time sessions between agencies and donors. This helped to forge working relationships. Leadership and senior support coupled with good will by heads of agencies in dealing with the donor (EU) and BRA facilitated monitoring. There was a high turnover of key staff at the UN agencies which significantly affected coordination.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	24062021EUReintegmeetingUNHUNDPBRA DepMayorAdminFinance_10689_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/24062021EUReintegmeetingUNHUNDPBRADepMayorAdminFinance_10689_310.pdf)	laura.rio@undp.org	11/21/2021 7:18:00 PM
2	16062021EUReintegUNDPBRAEUmeetingIn cubatorUNDP_10689_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/16062021EUReintegUNDPBRAEUmeetingIncubatorUNDP_10689_310.pdf)	laura.rio@undp.org	11/21/2021 7:19:00 PM
3	20200325_EUReintegJSCMinutes_25March 2020_10689_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/20200325_EUReintegJSCMinutes_25March2020_10689_310.pdf)	laura.rio@undp.org	11/21/2021 7:30:00 PM
4	EUReintegJSCMinutes_2ndMay2018_10689 _310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/EUReintegJSCMinutes_2ndMay2018_10689_310.pdf)	laura.rio@undp.org	11/21/2021 7:30:00 PM
5	Final_4thInterimEU-REINTEGnarrativereport _29.05.2019_10689_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Final_4thInterimEU-REINTEGnarrativereport_29.05.2019_10689_310.pdf)	laura.rio@undp.org	11/21/2021 7:30:00 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:

There is no evidence of a risk log but the Project Team monitored project risks, especially political and operational and reviewed them regularly at meetings of the technical working group. The Project Board and Technical Group meetings convened regularly to review situation. Covid-19 disrupted the project implementation and compounded existing risks that impacted project timely delivery.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Efficient**Quality Rating:** Satisfactory

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

- ☒ Yes
☐ No

Evidence:

Project resources were adequate. Financial and operational management have adhered to donor and best practice requirements. The funds were utilized to achieve the outputs, outcomes and impacts as per the project documents. in line with internal control mechanisms. These include national partner' financial risk management under UNDP direct implementation, audits, procurement plans, letters of agreement, spot checks and financial and operational procedures. Project resources were disbursed in accordance with the project contractual agreement.

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:

Procurement procedures were strictly adhered to with clear documentation on bids for works and supplies; invoices and payment processing. A procurement plan is part of UNDP Annual Works plan which is a pre-requisite for project implementation and reporting. procurement was mainly for goods and services incurred to run the business incubator.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	2020RE-INTEGAWP6Feb2020YA_10689_313 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2020RE-INTEGAWP6Feb2020YA_10689_313.xls)	laura.rio@undp.org	11/21/2021 8:12:00 PM
2	RE-INTEGAWPrevisedCOVID19YA11.6.2020_10689_313 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/RE-INTEGAWPrevisedCOVID19YA11.6.2020_10689_313.xlsx)	laura.rio@undp.org	11/21/2021 8:13:00 PM

14. Was there regular monitoring and recording of cost efficiencies, taking into account the expected quality of results?

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

Evidence:

While resources were used to set up business incubator and deliver training in line with rules and procedures yet the output was delivered partially in terms of sustainability .

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:

There were delays in project implementation due to late funds disbursement as well as political instability and covid-19 interruptions hence not all the expected outputs were delivered. This necessitated a no cost extension to the project. While the program successfully completed the renovation, equipping and handing over of the social enterprise incubator for IDP entrepreneurs, as well as training there were concerns raised on the rationale behind the incubator and its effectiveness and sustainability in the long run.

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:

Through the Joint Steering Committee (JSC) and monthly Technical Working Group (TWG), programme activities were directed and coordinated from a central platform. Regular coordination meetings of the JSC and TWG have been held mainly in Mogadishu thus enabling the decision makers, managers and technicians to guide project activities. Joint review forums were also held bringing together all project partners. These forums facilitated sharing of feedback on various experiences and lessons learned.

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:

Under this result, the program successfully conducted awareness-raising events to reach out to aspiring entrepreneurs in IDP settlements, followed by Social Entrepreneurship Course where 500 IDPs were trained on basic entrepreneurship training and financial literacy. However cooperation with the IDPs and returnees was not formally structured which limited full ownership of the processes by the targeted communities. In sensitization and messaging strategies among the camp communities, use of structured/well planned and scheduled community barazas (public meetings) was considered most effective.

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:

UNDP monitored capacities and performance of implementing partners under the direct request for payment modality through letters of agreement, annual workplans and project spot checks and third party monitoring visits in line with HACT assurance activities. UNDP also carried out joint reviews and on site verifications with the national implementing agency.

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:

UNDP monitored capacities and performance of implementing partners under the direct request for payment modality through letters of agreement, annual workplans and project spot checks and third party monitoring visits in line with HACT assurance activities. UNDP also carried out joint reviews and on site verifications with the national implementing agency.

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 produced two sustainability plans including transition and phase-out in a number of meetings. The project could not mobilise additional funding beyond 2021. The government committed to continuing with the activities through other channels. The business incubator was affected in particular and was not operationalized even after being handed over to the BRA

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments

UNDP and UN-Habitat saw the importance of linking the business incubator to a wider ecosystem to see where the Saanqaad incubator fits best, for example to the work of the UN Joint Programme on Local Government, the UNIDO network of business incubators and its support to youth and business and skills development and/or the work of UNFPA to support youth entrepreneurship. With EU support under Re-Integrating exhausted efforts should be made to identify funding resources including the private sector for future support.