

Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

Form Status: Approved

Overall Rating:	Highly Satisfactory
Decision:	
Portfolio/Project Number:	00089307
Portfolio/Project Title:	Diaspora for Development
Portfolio/Project Date:	2016-12-05 / 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:

There are evidences that the Project Team continuously monitored and tracked the changes in external environment throughout the project duration. Some of the important changes included the politically-related changes embodied in the dismissal of Minister of the BiH Ministry of Human Rights and Refugees in March 2021- this Ministry represented one of the key institutional partners of the Project. The BiH Strategy for Diaspora was developed under the auspices of the Project, however it was not adopted by BiH authorities due to political turmoil. Another important change in this context was the withdrawal of LSUs from Republika Srpska from the Project. All these changes were properly identified and addressed by the Project and presented to the Project Board for consequent approval. In addition, another important change in external environment is related to the outbreak of COVID-19 pandemics, which affected the dynamics of project implementation, especially in the economic pillar of the Project where certain diaspora-related investments and job creation projects were jeopardized. The Project responded accordingly to these changes through the adjusted individual responses and focused on increasing support towards digital competitiveness and utilization of digital tools as a way of securing business continuity of supported private sector investments and partners. More information can be found in the attached minutes from 9th Project Board and final project report.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	9thPBMinutes_11235_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/9thPBMinutes_11235_301.docx)	muamer.mulahasanovic@undp.org	12/15/2021 11:34:00 AM
2	Final_Narrative_Report_D4D_Dec2021_11235_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Final_Narrative_Report_D4D_Dec2021_11235_301.docx)	muamer.mulahasanovic@undp.org	12/15/2021 3:03:00 PM

2. Was the project aligned with the thematic focus of the Strategic Plan?

- 3: *The project responded to at least one of the development settings as specified in the Strategic Plan (SP) and adopted at least one Signature Solution .The project's RRF included all the relevant SP output indicators. (all must be true)*
- 2: The project responded to at least one of the developments settings¹ as specified in the Strategic Plan. The project's RRF included at least one SP output indicator, if relevant. (both must be true)
- 1: While the project may have responded to a partner's identified need, this need falls outside of the UNDP Strategic Plan. Also select this option if none of the relevant SP indicators are included in the RRF.

Evidence:

The Project was designed to essentially respond to two areas of UNDP development work, as specified by the Strategic Plan (SP) 2014-2017. By facilitating transfer of knowledge, specific skills, technologies and know-how from diaspora and/or diaspora businesses to a company, business association or cluster in Bosnia and Herzegovina the Project addressed one new/emerging SP development area - sustainable production technologies. Later on, the Project was aligned also with the UNDP SP 2018-2021, to respond to the Outcome 1. Advance poverty eradication in all its forms and dimensions and 2. Accelerate structural transformations for sustainable development. It contributed to several indicators, in particular 1.2.1.1. National and sub-national governments have improved capacities to plan, budget, manage and monitor basic services and 1.1.2.3. Country has an improved enabling environment for expansion of decent work and livelihoods.

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:

Based on submitted evidences, it can be concluded that targeted groups were systematically identified and engaged during the Project's duration, following the provisions set forth in the DOA. Although the marginalized groups were not the primary target, the Project paid due attention on the inclusion of marginalized groups including women and youth as highlighted in the External evaluation report. One of the provided evidences that confirms this is the "Public call for diaspora-related transfer of knowledge and skills", through which the applications from companies led/owned by women and applications that ensured at least 30% women participation were given additional points during the evaluation process. Furthermore, based on the D4D OMS, out of 402 new jobs created under the Project's umbrella, 30% are women. More information can be found in the enclosed D4D External evaluation report, Public call and D4D OMS.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	D4DEExternalEvaluationReport_11235_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/D4DEExternalEvaluationReport_11235_303.pdf)	muamer.mulahasanovic@undp.org	12/15/2021 11:40:00 AM
2	D4DOMSDec2021Eng_11235_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/D4DOMSDec2021Eng_11235_303.docx)	muamer.mulahasanovic@undp.org	12/15/2021 11:40:00 AM
3	Publiccallfordiaspora-relatedtransferofknowledgeandskills_11235_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Publiccallfordiaspora-relatedtransferofknowledgeandskills_11235_303.docx)	muamer.mulahasanovic@undp.org	12/15/2021 11:40:00 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:

The Project generated relevant lessons learned and institutional knowledge as evidenced in the findings of Independent External Evaluation commissioned by the Donor (Evaluation report is previously attached). This has been further elaborated in annual project progress reports (attached), along with the "Transfer of diaspora knowledge 2018-2020" publication produced by the Project (attached). The Publication encompasses the main knowledge and lessons learned concerning the diaspora engagement in the overall socio-economic development of the country.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	D4D_Transferofknowledgepublication_11235_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/D4D_Transferofknowledgepublication_11235_304.pdf)	muamer.mulahasanovic@undp.org	12/15/2021 11:42:00 AM
2	15March2021NarrativeReport2020final_11235_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/15March2021NarrativeReport2020final_11235_304.docx)	muamer.mulahasanovic@undp.org	12/15/2021 3:05:00 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:

Grounded on the documentation provided by the Project, it can be concluded that the Project fully met the goals set out in the DOA, whereby certain indicators related to inclusion/coverage of beneficiaries were considerably exceeded. For instance, the total number of 2,539+ diaspora members contributed to policy recommendations, while the initial target was 1,000 members. The Project created 402 new jobs against the initial target of 320 jobs. That being said, the Project deployed a comprehensive M&E framework, regularly tracking and monitoring the numbers of beneficiaries (e.g. diaspora members, private sector companies, institutional partners etc.) engaged in the Project. The Project also contained a sustainability component, e.g. the BiH Ministry of human rights and refugees have taken the responsibility and managing of "Interactive BiH Diaspora portal" after the completion of the Project (available at <https://dijaspora.mhrr.gov.ba/>). More details can be found in previously enclosed project evaluation report, annual progress reports and D4D OMS.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Principled

Quality Rating: **Satisfactory**

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

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

Evidence:

The Project deployed a comprehensive M&E framework, including gender segregated data, as per enclosed evidences. As outlined in the Section 3 of this QA form, although the marginalized groups were not the primary target, the Project paid due attention on the inclusion of marginalized groups including women and youth. Through the public calls implemented under the Project, special focus was on provision of support to companies led/owned by women and projects that will ensure at least 30% women participation. Out of 402 new jobs created under the Project's umbrella, 30% are women. More details can be found in previously attached Project evaluation report, annual reports and OMS.

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:

Social and environmental impacts were monitored as a part of the regular risk monitoring log in ATLAS.

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 grievances occurred during the Project implementation.

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:

Comprehensive M&E framework was developed and tracked during the project duration, including baselines, targets and milestones. As previously stated, in 2020 the Donor commissioned an external evaluation of the Project based on prescribed evaluation standards, including gender UNEG standards. Lessons learned were used by the Project to undertake corrective actions where needed. More information can be found in the attached D4D Local Governance Tracking Matrix and D4D Diaspora Oriented Governance Scorecard.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	1-LGTrackingFormdec2021_11235_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/1-LGTrackingFormdec2021_11235_309.xlsx)	muamer.mulahasanovic@undp.org	12/15/2021 12:52:00 PM
2	Dec.2019-Mar2020DiasporaOrientedGovernanceScorecard_11235_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Dec.2019-Mar2020DiasporaOrientedGovernanceScorecard_11235_309.xlsx)	muamer.mulahasanovic@undp.org	12/15/2021 12:52:00 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:

Throughout the duration of the Project, the governance mechanism (Project Board) functioned appropriately in accordance with its mandate. The Project Board was consisted of representatives of BiH Ministry of Human Rights and Refugees, UNDP, BiH Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Swiss Embassy to BiH, e-Diaspora Switzerland and IOM Office in BiH. In total 11 meetings of the Project Board were held (in average, one meeting each 6 months). The Project Board served as the decision-making authority, highest body for strategic guidance, fiduciary, management oversight and coordination. The Project Board was in charge for approval of annual work plans, it supervised the overall implementation progress and authorized any major deviation therefrom. As evidence, attached are minutes from the 2 most recent PB meetings.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	BIH_ZapisnikPB28-Apr-2021_English_11235_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/BIH_ZapisnikPB28-Apr-2021_English_11235_310.docx)	muamer.mulahasanovic@undp.org	12/15/2021 1:05:00 PM
2	9thPBMinutes_11235_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/9thPBMinutes_11235_310.docx)	muamer.mulahasanovic@undp.org	12/15/2021 1:05:00 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:

The Project had a comprehensive risk and mitigation strategy, which were regularly assessed and monitored, based on the outcome level with identified mitigation measures. Project risks were monitored during the PB meetings, along with proper identification and regular monitoring in ATLAS. Additionally, project risks were assessed and included in annual and final report (previously attached).

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Efficient**Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory**

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

- Yes
 No

Evidence:

According to the submitted evidences, the Project managed to mobilize substantive funds that greatly exceeded the targets. For example, the contribution of local governments amounted to 48% against the initial target of 20%. The value of private sector investments amounted to BAM 6.5 million, while the initial target was BAM 3 million. This was highlighted in the previously attached final project report and D4D OMS.

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 procurement annual procurement plans and kept them updated on the regular basis.

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 provided evidences regarding the optimization of project-related costs and alignment with relevant comparators and value for money boundaries where applicable. The Project collaborated with other UNDP's projects in order to achieve synergetic effect. For example, the Project used the list of BiH municipalities that had been previously supported to design and adopt local development strategies through the ILDP project, to be provided with TA for mainstreaming diaspora engagement in the local development strategies. The Project also collaborated with the RELOAD project in the sphere of municipal capacity building implemented by ADS. As evidence for coordination and collaboration with other UNDP's projects, below is attached a LOA signed between UNDP and ADS.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	LOA-ADS-UNDP-ILDP-SDG-D4D_2020_11235_314 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/LOA-ADS-UNDP-ILDP-SDG-D4D_2020_11235_314.pdf)	muamer.mulahasanovic@undp.org	12/15/2021 1:16:00 PM

Effective**Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory**

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

- Yes
 No

Evidence:

Yes, the Project delivered its expected outputs as evidenced in previously attached D4D OMS and project final report.

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:

The Project had regular reviews of annual work plans (AWP) that were accordingly adjusted during the year and corresponding budget revisions were made as well. Attached is the latest AWP for 2021.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	D4DAWP2021_11235_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/D4DAWP2021_11235_316.xlsx)	muamer.mulahasanovic@undp.org	12/15/2021 1:14:00 PM

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

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

Evidence:

Throughout the project implementation, the targeted groups were systematically identified and engaged. Namely, as a direct result of the identifying and engaging target groups for diaspora engagement, 2,568 women and men benefitted from employment and livelihood opportunities (against the target set at 1,400 within the project logical framework). This was achieved: i) by capacitating institutions to design and implement supportive policies for an effective cooperation with diaspora members, ii) by enabling LGs to interact proactively with diaspora and facilitate their engagement in local development, and iii) by identifying and supporting targeted investment channels and business support schemes that boosted cooperation between BIH private sector and business diaspora towards economic growth. More information can be found in the Final project report, External evaluation report and D4D OMS.

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:

The Project was based on Direct Implementation Modality (DIM) as foreseen by the DoA. The Project actively collaborated with key national partners (e.g. the BiH Ministry for human rights and refugees that had a leadership role when it comes to diaspora engagement). Additionally, key partners were part of the Project Board, thus they were included in the design, implementation and decision-making.

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 [arrangements⁸](#) 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:

As previously elaborated, the Project was based on the DIM modality. Comprehensive TA programme was implemented through the Project aimed at capacity development and transfer of knowledge (ToK) to the key national counterparts. Based on evidences provided, more than 357 public institutions (3.788 participants) benefitted from ToK through engagement of 64 diaspora experts from 18 countries. The project also used relevant HACT assurance mechanisms. More details can be found in previously attached D4D OMS, final project report and below attached HACT spot check.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	HACTSpotcheckreport_11235_319 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/HACTSpotcheckreport_11235_319.pdf)	muamer.mulahasanovic@undp.org	12/15/2021 1:12:00 PM

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 provided credible evidences that relevant phase-out arrangements have been agreed with project partners. The Project's exit strategy, focused on sustainability of frameworks and practices contributing to diaspora's engagement in development of BiH, was presented and discussed during the last PB meeting and consequently adopted by the PB. More information can be found in the previously attached final project report and below attached overview of Project's exit strategy adopted by the PB.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	LessonsLearnedandExitStrategy_11235_320 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QA/FormDocuments/LessonsLearnedandExitStrategy_11235_320.docx)	muamer.mulahasanovic@undp.org	12/15/2021 1:11:00 PM

QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments

According to the information and evidences provided by the Diaspora for Development (D4D) Project, the Project has been implemented in accordance with UNDP's Quality Standards.