

Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

Form Status: Approved

Overall Rating:	Highly Satisfactory
Decision:	
Portfolio/Project Number:	00094479
Portfolio/Project Title:	Modernizing Vocational Education and Training (VET) Cent
Portfolio/Project Date:	2017-08-01 / 2021-12-31

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:

During the implementation period project team identified relevant changes and discussed all the new opportunities and threats in the PSC. According to the analyses following three directions prioritized to address implications and response to the current situations:

1. As a response to the COVID-19 outbreak, the project supported the State Agency on Vocational Education (SAVE) with production of medical masks through the purchasing of raw materials and some small equipment.
2. The project taking into account the current situation in the country and considering the new opportunities to support the VE centers with building up of self-financing system through the development of business plans in different directions (HVAC, Apartment Turnover Specialist, Textile, Welding, Furniture production). Using project budget's savings, the project also supported business plan's implementation with purchasing of mobile equipment, spare parts as well as installation of equipment.
3. As mentioned earlier, due to COVID-19 outbreak all VE Centers are closed, no trainings and events are allowed to be organized by the quarantine regime applied in the country, however, the project conducted series of webinars on career guidance for graduates, upskilling of VET's staff on pedagogical and didactical aspects, 68 TV classes produced and broadcasted in local TV and Youtube channel of the beneficiaries(video.edu.az).

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	BPFinansplanSantexnikaxidmetleri_7863_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/BPFinansplanSantexnikaxidmetleri_7863_301 .xls)	zahra.amrahova@undp.org	3/15/2021 8:55:00 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:

The project contributed to the outcome (UNDAF/CP D, RPD or GPD): UNAPF 2016-2020 Outcome 2.1: By 2020, Azerbaijan has enhanced institutional capacities for transparent, evidence-based and gender-responsive policy formulation and implementation. Strategic Plan Outcome 1. Growth and development are inclusive and sustainable, incorporating productive capacities that create employment and livelihoods for the poor and excluded.

Indicative Output(s) with gender marker: GEN2

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Relevant**Quality Rating: Highly 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:

The selection of the region to implement the activities (Ganja and Jalilabad) was done based on several factors: labor market relevance, priority sectors for country development, private sector interest and required infrastructure in place. All aforementioned mentioned factors were taken under consideration during whole implementation of the project and feedbacks were collected regularly to ensure the project addressed local priorities.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	FieldTripReport_VETLankaran_04.09.2018_updated19.09.201800000003_7863_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FieldTripReport_VETLankaran_04.09.2018_updated19.09.201800000003_7863_303.docx)	zahra.amrahova@undp.org	3/15/2021 9:58:00 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:

Tracking progress results has been achieved by continuous data gathering by the project team, and annually by integrating the structured information in Interim/narrative reports. The reports contained analysis by Expected Result, updated the Logframe matrix and the action plan of remaining activities, and assessed the partnerships and cooperation with other organizations. Reports covering the risks (through a risk matrix, risk log included in the ProDoc), and provide lessons learnt (elements of risk analysis and generation of lessons learnt are present in the reports). The project benefitted from lessons learnt from ETF and other similar project implemented by GIZ (also funded by EU).

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	FinalEvaluationReport-UNDPAZE-TVETProject-Jalilabad-May2020-finalforweb_7863_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FinalEvaluationReport-UNDPAZE-TVETProject-Jalilabad-May2020-finalforweb_7863_304.pdf)	zahra.amrahova@undp.org	3/15/2021 10:00:00 AM

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 results of the projects are very good - created a legal framework for VET Centers, established the VET Center in Ganja and Jalilabad, facilitated a Strategic Development Plan, modernized and endowed facilities, trained teachers and tested a validation mechanism, developed curriculums and teaching materials scaled up all over the country's VET centers i.e., Ganja, Ismayilli, Gabala, Tovuz and etc.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	İsitməvəsoyutmasistemlərində_7863_305 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/İsitməvəsoyutmasistemlərində_7863_305.pdf)	zahra.amrahova@undp.org	3/15/2021 9:51:00 AM
2	Məişətsoyuducuvəistiliksisemlərinəxidmətüzrəmütəxəssis_7863_305 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Məişətsoyuducuvəistiliksisemlərinəxidmətüzrəmütəxəssis_7863_305.pdf)	zahra.amrahova@undp.org	3/15/2021 9:52:00 AM

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:

As the project is not gender oriented no systematic data gathering was conducted. The project implemented according to CPD national priority to strengthen institutional capacities and effective public and social services, and UNAPF outcome 2 to enhance institutional capacities for transparent, evidence-based and gender-sensitive policy formulation and implementation. Special attention given to breaking gender stereotypes in the occupational choices to attract more women and girls to the VET specializations traditionally dominated by men. As an example, HVAC, Apartment Turnover specializations attracted woman participants, Fashion Designer and Drapper designer were develop as an specializations to involve more woman in VET sector. The other practical result can be 20 woman involved in the drapper designer specs in Jalilabad where gender stereotypes has been broken in the region. in the particular reporting period 40 woman are registered in the VET center after 50 years of enrollment.

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:

the project is not environmental project and no social or environmental risks are identified which may jeopardize sustainability of projects outcomes. Social and environmental sustainability enhanced through application of the UNDP Social and Environmental Standards. As an example, project carried out several renovation and maintenance works within the project. The action ensured that all renovation works are carried out in compliance with environmental standards. The new curricula for occupations in the industrial integrated environmental standards where appropriate.

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:

There were no anticipated risk or issues during the implementation period.

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:

The monitoring plan foresaw activities regarding tracking progress results, monitoring and managing risk, learning, quality assurance, performing reviews and take course corrections, and reporting. Tracking progress results has been achieved by continuous data gathering by the project team, and annually by integrating the structured information in Annual Reports. The Reports contained analysis by Expected Result, updated the Logframe matrix and the action plan of remaining activities, and assessed the partnerships and cooperation with other organizations. All M&E are presented in the reports.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	LogicalframeworkoftheGanjaproject_7863_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/LogicalframeworkoftheGanjaproject_7863_309.docx)	zahra.amrahova@undp.org	3/15/2021 12:43:00 PM

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

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

Evidence:

The project design followed the UNDP Rules and Regulations for Project Management, establishing a Management Steering Committee, and assigning the roles of Implementing Agency to the Ministry of Education, with the State Agency on Vocational Education as Government counterpart. The project Board (PSC) annually and explicitly reviewed the reports of the project with all accompanying data analysis, discussed implemented and planned activities each project reporting period. Minutes of Meetings are attached

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Sterringcomminutessigned2018_7863_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QA/FormDocuments/Sterringcomminutessigned2018_7863_310.pdf)	zahra.amrahova@undp.org	3/15/2021 12:45:00 PM
2	2ndSteeringComMeetingVET2019_7863_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QA/FormDocuments/2ndSteeringComMeetingVET2019_7863_310.pdf)	zahra.amrahova@undp.org	3/15/2021 12:45:00 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:

In overall the project exercised several risks that might have potentially arisen especially due to the extremely challenging timeframe. To track project risks the monitoring plan developed foresaw activities regarding tracking progress results, monitoring and managing and other risks that might arise to take course corrections. For instance, project mitigated financial risks with "looking into feasible financing options of the Ganja VET Competence Centre and propose recommendations on its mid and long-term financial sustainability". Another example can be PPP framework where concrete measures proposed to increase attractiveness for PPP models in VET to increase commitment from and incentivize the private sector, establish cost recovery mechanisms and introduction of tax and other fiscal incentives.
PPP framework attached

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	FrameworkforPPP_7863_311 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FrameworkforPPP_7863_311.docx)	zahra.amrahova@undp.org	3/15/2021 12:46:00 PM

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:

The project conducted adequate resource mobilization to achieve the best results. Thus, both projects managed by the one Project Management Unit. The cost of the Key technical experts also shared between two projects for the similar type of the work. This approach ensured effectiveness of the programme through the establishment of the close collaboration and aligning the activities of the both VET Centres and cost-efficiency due to the merge of the Project Implementation Unit, key technical expertise, office costs and other applicable budget items for the Programme

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 quarterly updated procurement plan. In 2017 and 2019 the project delivered more than 100% of the allocated budget procuring needed equipment, reconstruction, recruitment of international and local consultants. Some delay occurred due to the pandemic since February 2020. The procurement plan can be tracked in the Promt system of the UNDP.

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:

The project regularly reviewed costs against relevant comparators. as an example, the project was intended to carry out reconstruction works and the same activity planned under the NAMA project to construct energy efficient buildings for SOCAR. The project discussed the cost efficiency, energy efficiency aspects of construction works and carried out reconstruction rather simple maintenance considered in the project budget.

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:

The Project identified correctly the necessary steps to effectively run the activities. In the Inception Period (first three months), the project team, supported by a consultant, developed a Baseline Assessment Report (BAR) which included in-depth consultations with all project stakeholders in Baku and Ganja and Jalilabad regions. The analysis included also a very well designed and complex "Power/Interest Matrix". The analysis continued with identifying the baseline indicators and updated the project's logical framework. Using of monitoring tools, regular review by the PSC and other responsible PMU members the project management was effective and responsive to challenges, being the one of the main reasons for the success of the project so far. Still some delays occurred due to the pandemic and heavy situation in the frontline (conflict situation in the borders) starting from September 2020 to the end of the year.

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:

According to the UNDP Rules and Regulations for Project Management , a Project Steering Committee (PSC) was established, comprising of representatives of the UNDP, EU, MoE and VE Agency. This project board is responsible for the regular reviews and monitor the project work plan. Project conducted regular meetings with PSC members through the official PSC meetings, as well as meetings with EUD and annual monitoring missions conducted by the ETF. In addition to this, project interim annual reports with all appendices are submitted to donor for review and discussion.

Covid 19 pandemic brought several complex challenges and next internal discussions conducted with all members of the project board. Thus, project extension requested, budgets have been revised and course corrections agreed i.e., new opportunities used to support VE centers with income generation mechanisms through the business plan development and self financing mechanisms.

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:

Proposed Vocational Education programme was implemented in two regions of the country, namely Ganj a and Jalilabad. Both of the regions are top priority for The Ministry of Education and were selected due to many factors, such as labor market relevance, priority sectors for country development, private sector interest and required infrastructure in place.

The project also targeted the specific groups using credible data sources on their capacity needs i.e. Baseline Assessment and Labour Market Assessment have been conducted to identify capacity needs of the target groups which are youth, adults, professional, administrative and management staff of the centres, as well as unemployed men and women who were involved in trainings and capacity building activities organized by the project.

Access to people with disabilities ensured during the rehabilitation and renovation works in both centres. Public awareness and promotional resources produced by the project were included materials especially designed to change occupational stereotypes and attract more women to VET.

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:

3 PSC meetings were conducted during project implementation period. (2017-2020 years). PSC are the platforms where all stakeholders and partners are effectively and actively engaged in the process, monitoring, decision-making and implementation. PSC minutes of the meetings are attached.

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:

A capacity assessment has been completed. The project document identified activities that was undertaken to strengthen capacity of national institutions, but these activities were not part of a comprehensive strategy to monitor and strengthen national capacities. The project considered explicit strategy for the capacity building of the VET Centers, including development of the procedures, TOT and financial sustainability plans

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 supported a study on financing options blending various types of funds (state budget, private sector, income-generating activities etc.)

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments

The project is highly relevant for the country, as it addresses needs considered in national strategy papers. It is also aligned to UN/UNDP UNAPF and CPD, as detailed in the Chapter 2 (paragraphs 25-35). From the perspective of relevance and strategy, no further improvements are necessary. According to the Terminal evaluation consultant project was successfully implemented in terms of sustainability, efficiency, effectiveness, relevance and from strategic point of view where aforementioned aspects are rated as Highly Satisfactory. Additionally, some efforts are still needed to improve monitoring and evaluation system to ensure timely implementation of project activities as suggested by external international TE consultant. In overall, UNDP positioned properly the project from the strategic point of view, supporting the MoE both at national and at regional and local levels through project components.