

Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

Form Status: Approved

Overall Rating:	Highly Satisfactory
Decision:	
Portfolio/Project Number:	00107283
Portfolio/Project Title:	Via Dinarica: Second project phase
Portfolio/Project Date:	2018-06-01 / 2022-05-31

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:

Based on provided evidences, the Project identified relevant changes in the external environment during the implementation. Namely, the most significant change in this regard was the outbreak of COVID-19 pandemics in 2020 which affected the dynamic of project implementation. The Project responded accordingly to the situation, adjusting the affected activities, mainly those from the Project's rural tourism pillar. Having in mind the fact that tourism sector was the most affected one, through the public calls implemented under the auspices of the Project, special focus was placed on job retention in supported private sector entities, along with delivery of trainings to project beneficiaries on how to adjust the business to the emerged COVID-19 circumstances (out of 7 implemented public calls, 6 were adjusted to COVID-19). Furthermore, as per initial ProDoc, attendance at relevant fairs was foreseen (e.g. fairs in Berlin, Belgrade et c.). Given the epidemiological situation, the Project supported virtual attendance at the mentioned fairs. Other changes in this regard, that are important to mention, is the change of Minister of the Ministry of Trade and Tourism of Republika Srpska, along with changes of mayors in partner LSUs as a result of local elections. The Project Board was involved in all these activities, it regularly considered the implications and approved the response activities to be undertaken by the Project. More information can be found in the attached meeting minutes.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	ViaDinaricaProjectBoardMinutes_11335_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QA/FormDocuments/ViaDinaricaProjectBoardMinutes_11335_301.pdf)	muamer.mulahasanovic@undp.org	12/29/2021 3:38:00 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:

As evidenced by the cover page of the revised Project Document, the project is aligned with the UNDP Strategic Plan 2018-2021, Outcome 2. Accelerating structural transformations for sustainable development, especially through innovative solutions that have multiplier effects across the SDGs; signature solutions #1 Keeping people out of poverty and #4 Promote nature-based solutions for a sustainable planet. The project included at least one relevant indicator from the SP IRRF: 1.1.2.3.B.2, Direct creation of employment in private sector (Number of employments created for male, female, marginalized).

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:

Grounded on the provided evidences, it can be concluded that the Project's target groups were systematically identified and engaged throughout the Project duration. The Project deployed a comprehensive M&E framework, which was regularly updated, including marginalized groups and gender segregated data. For example, the Project reported that out of 31 created full time jobs, 18 are women. Also, through all public calls, additional points were given to the project applications that will ensure employment of women and youth and the applications from private sector entities that are owned/led by woman. Additional marginalized group that was targeted and engaged in the Project implementation are the rural households, where the majority of them can be considered as marginalized due to the fact they are located in remote and hardly accessible areas, with limited access to finance and other opportunities. As part of regular monitoring, the Project collected feedback and progress data from the supported beneficiaries and included the lessons learned and feedback in decision making. The Project Board actively participated in the Project - it was consisted of representatives of the Ministry of Foreign Trade and Economic Relations of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the FBiH Ministry of tourism and environment, the Republika Srpska Ministry of trade and tourism, USAID, AICS and UNDP. As evidence, below are enclosed the public calls implemented under the auspices of the Project.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	ViaDinarica_Javnipoziv_JLSdiversifikacija_Jul2021_Smjernice_11335_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ViaDinarica_Javnipoziv_JLSdiversifikacija_Jul2021_Smjernice_11335_303.docx)	muamer.mulahasanovic@undp.org	12/29/2021 3:43:00 PM
2	ViaDinarica_Javnipoziv_JLSdiversifikacija_Mart2021_Smjernice_11335_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ViaDinarica_Javnipoziv_JLSdiversifikacija_Mart2021_Smjernice_11335_303.docx)	muamer.mulahasanovic@undp.org	12/29/2021 3:44:00 PM
3	ViaDinarica_Javnipoziv_JLSdiversifikacija_Sep2020_Smjernice_11335_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ViaDinarica_Javnipoziv_JLSdiversifikacija_Sep2020_Smjernice_11335_303.docx)	muamer.mulahasanovic@undp.org	12/29/2021 3:44:00 PM
4	ViaDinarica_Javnipoziv_lancivrijednosti_Jul2021_Smjernice_11335_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ViaDinarica_Javnipoziv_lancivrijednosti_Jul2021_Smjernice_11335_303.docx)	muamer.mulahasanovic@undp.org	12/29/2021 3:44:00 PM
5	ViaDinarica_Javnipoziv_lancivrijednosti_Mart2021_Smjernice_11335_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ViaDinarica_Javnipoziv_lancivrijednosti_Mart2021_Smjernice_11335_303.docx)	muamer.mulahasanovic@undp.org	12/29/2021 3:45:00 PM

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:

Lessons learned and obtained knowledge were included in annual progress reports prepared by the Project, as evidenced in the enclosed project progress reports. The Project commissioned the Via Dinarica Value Chain Assessment (attached below) which incorporated, among other findings, lessons learned and provided guidelines for programming and design of project activities. Additionally, a concept note for the next phase of Via Dinarica was prepared and submitted to AICS for consideration (attached) - lessons learned from the current phase were embodied in the project proposal. The Project Board was engaged in activities regarding the lessons learned and integrating them into the Project, both on the strategic and operational levels.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	ViaDinaricaVC-FinalReport_11335_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ViaDinaricaVC-FinalReport_11335_304.pdf)	muamer.mulahasanovic@undp.org	12/29/2021 3:58:00 PM
2	ViaDinaricaSemi-AnnualReportUSAID_June2021_11335_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ViaDinaricaSemi-AnnualReportUSAID_June2021_11335_304.docx)	muamer.mulahasanovic@undp.org	12/29/2021 3:52:00 PM
3	ViaDinarica_December2018_August2021_AICSRReport_11335_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ViaDinarica_December2018_August2021_AICSRReport_11335_304.docx)	muamer.mulahasanovic@undp.org	12/29/2021 3:53:00 PM
4	Sustainable_tourism_concept_ViaDinaricaIII_11335_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Sustainable_tourism_concept_ViaDinaricaIII_11335_304.docx)	muamer.mulahasanovic@undp.org	12/29/2021 3:56:00 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:

As per provided evidences, the Project reached sufficient number of beneficiaries against the initial targets set out in the ProDoc, whereby some of the targets were exceeded. For instance, the Project reported that 88 producers and service providers benefited from improved tourism development opportunities against the initial target of 58. That being said, the Project deployed a comprehensive M&E framework (attached below), regularly tracking and monitoring the numbers of beneficiaries engaged in the Project. The Project also contained a sustainability component as discussed in the Section 20 of this QA Assessment.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	MELPlanActivityBiHProject2.1_ViaDinarica_July21_11335_305 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MELPlanActivityBiHProject2.1_ViaDinarica_July21_11335_305.docx)	muamer.mulahasanovic@undp.org	12/29/2021 4:10:00 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:

As previously elaborated, the Project deployed a comprehensive M&E framework, which was regularly updated, containing the data on marginalized groups and gender segregated data. Through all public calls additional points were given to applications that will ensure participation and employment opportunities to women and youth. Such an approach led to a balanced gender structure among the project beneficiaries - e.g. out of 31 full-time jobs created, 18 were women, out of 42 part-jobs created under the Project, 18 are for women.

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 and periodically reviewed. During the project design, SESP was addressed and included in the ProDoc.

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 duration. In this regard, it is important to underline the fact that, as part of all public calls, applicants had an opportunity to appeal against the evaluation results as evidenced in previously enclosed public calls. The Project secured that all appeals were properly recorded and addressed by the Evaluation Committee(s).

List of Uploaded Documents

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

No documents available.

Management & Monitoring**Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory**

9. Was the project's M&E Plan adequately implemented?

- 3: *The project had a comprehensive and costed M&E plan. Baselines, targets and milestones were fully populated. Progress data against indicators in the project's RRF was reported regularly using credible data sources and collected according to the frequency stated in the Plan, including sex disaggregated data as relevant. Any evaluations conducted, if relevant, fully meet decentralized evaluation standards, including gender UNEG standards. Lessons learned, included during evaluations and/or After-Action Reviews, were used to take corrective actions when necessary. (all must be true)*
- 2: The project costed M&E Plan, and most baselines and targets were populated. Progress data against indicators in the project's RRF was collected on a regular basis, although there was may be some slippage in following the frequency stated in the Plan and data sources was not always reliable. Any evaluations conducted, if relevant, met most decentralized evaluation standards. Lessons learned were captured but were used to take corrective actions. (all must be true)
- 1: The project had M&E Plan, but costs were not clearly planned and budgeted for, or were unrealistic. Progress data was not regularly collected against the indicators in the project's RRF. Evaluations did not meet decentralized evaluation standards. Lessons learned were rarely captured and used. Select this option also if the project did not have an M&E plan.

Evidence:

As previously stated, the comprehensive M&E frame work was developed and tracked during the project duration, including baselines, targets and milestones (previously attached). Lessons learned and generated knowledge were used by the Project to undertake corrective actions where needed. It is important to underline the fact that the Project's Participatory Review is in progress, with expected completion in the following days. The findings will be incorporated in the Final Project Report which is due by mid-2022 and submitted to the donors.

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:

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 the Ministry of Foreign Trade and Economic Relations of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the FBiH Ministry of tourism and environment, the Republika Srpska Ministry of trade and tourism, USAID, AICS and UNDP. The PB meetings were held on annual basis, with frequent communication with all members throughout the Project duration. The PB served as a decision making body of the Project and was actively involved in the implementation, especially when it comes to design of public calls, endorsement of results etc. More information can be found in previously attached PB minutes.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

11. Were risks to the project adequately monitored and managed?

- 3: The project monitored risks every quarter and consulted with the key stakeholders, security advisors, to identify continuing and emerging risks to assess if the main assumptions remained valid. There is clear evidence that relevant management plans and mitigating measures were fully implemented to address each key project risk and were updated to reflect the latest risk assessment. (all must be true)
- 2: *The project monitored risks every year, as evidenced by an updated risk log. Some updates were made to management plans and mitigation measures.*
- 1: The risk log was not updated as required. There was may be some evidence that the project monitored risks that may affected the project's achievement of results, but there is no explicit evidence that management actions were taken to mitigate risks.

Evidence:

The Project had an appropriate risk and mitigation strategy, which was regularly assessed and monitored in ATLAS, with identified mitigation measures, including COVID-19 related measures. 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 from the key national stakeholders to extend the scope of activities. Close to USD 730,000 were mobilized from external sources (USD 230,000 from the FBIH Ministry of tourism and environment and USD 500,000 from partner LSUs) which exceeded the initial target of USD 343,000 set out in the ProDoc. As evidences, below are attached 4 FAs signed with institutional partners.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	FAKalinovikAdd2_Sep21_ENG_11335_312 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FAKalinovikAdd2_Sep21_ENG_11335_312.pdf)	muamer.mulahasanovic@undp.org	12/29/2021 4:24:00 PM
2	FAViaDinaricaProzorRama_11335_312 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FAViaDinaricaProzorRama_11335_312.pdf)	muamer.mulahasanovic@undp.org	12/29/2021 4:24:00 PM
3	FA_FMOIT_ViaDinarica2019_eng_signed_11335_312 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FA_FMOIT_ViaDinarica2019_eng_signed_11335_312.pdf)	muamer.mulahasanovic@undp.org	12/29/2021 4:24:00 PM
4	FA_FMOIT_ViaDinaricall_Sep18_11335_312 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FA_FMOIT_ViaDinaricall_Sep18_11335_312.pdf)	muamer.mulahasanovic@undp.org	12/29/2021 4:24:00 PM

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 (examples are below attached).

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	ViaDinaricaProject_ProcurementPlan_Detail edReport_11335_313 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ViaDinaricaProject_ProcurementPlan_DetailedReport_11335_313.pdf)	muamer.mulahasanovic@undp.org	12/29/2021 4:26:00 PM
2	ViaDinaricaProjectProcurementPlanDetailed Report_11335_313 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ViaDinaricaProjectProcurementPlanDetailedReport_11335_313.xlsx)	muamer.mulahasanovic@undp.org	12/29/2021 4:26:00 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:

The Project provided evidences regarding the optimization of project-related costs and alignment with relevant comparators and value for money boundaries where applicable, especially in procurement segment of the Project (attached below is a CAP Approval for one of the implemented procurement processes, containing the value for money analysis). The Project collaborated with other UNDP's projects in order to achieve synergetic effect, e.g. frequent collaboration with UNDP's EE sector, Innovation Lab etc. Additionally, the Project used the RELOAD methodology during the design of relevant public calls. Furthermore, the Project had frequent collaboration with UNDP's Comms Department, having in mind the specific nature the project and a need for promotion of Via Dinarica brand.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	CAPMinutes_RfQ094-21_LOT1LOT2_11335_314 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CAPMinutes_RfQ094-21_LOT1LOT2_11335_314.pdf)	muamer.mulahasanovic@undp.org	12/29/2021 4:28:00 PM

Effective**Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

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

- Yes
 No

Evidence:

According to the evidences, the Project has delivered the expected outputs. It is important to underline the fact that the Project's Participatory Review is in progress, with expected completion in the following days. The findings will be incorporated in the Final Project Report which is due by mid-2022 and submitted to the donors.

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. AWP's included all 4 components of the Project (USAID-funded component, AICS-funded component, FBIH Ministry of Tourism and Environment component and LSUs-funded component). Attached below are 2 AWP's.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	107283_92139_2020CombinedAWP_040220_11335_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/107283_92139_2020CombinedAWP_040220_11335_316.xlsx)	muamer.mulahasanovic@undp.org	12/29/2021 4:31:00 PM
2	CopyofViaDinaricaUSAID_2021AWP_June21_11335_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CopyofViaDinaricaUSAID_2021AWP_June21_11335_316.xlsx)	muamer.mulahasanovic@undp.org	12/29/2021 4:31:00 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 and geographical areas were systematically identified and engaged. Most of the public calls implemented under the Project were geographically-focused. Namely, the Project reached the planned number of beneficiaries - created 31 full time jobs (18 women), 42 part-time jobs (18 women) and contributed to retention of more than 50 jobs (19 women). Furthermore, 61 nature-based tourism service providers supported with grants and technical assistance, along with 24 producers and processors of domestic products and 3 selling points supported with grants and technical assistance to make them integral part of Via Dinarica offer. The targeted groups were identified based on credible data sources on their needs and exclusion from development opportunities (e.g. rural population from remote and hardly accessible areas). During the implementation, the Project regularly collected feedback from beneficiaries through tailored questionnaires and used their feedback to adjust the implementation modality where needed. As part of regular project monitoring, the supported beneficiaries were frequently visited and the Project Team collected their feedback and relevant information regarding the implementation of supported projects.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	FinalmonitoringteamreportAgroFondTrebinje_11335_317 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FinalmonitoringteamreportAgroFondTrebinje_11335_317.pdf)	muamer.mulahasanovic@undp.org	12/29/2021 4:37:00 PM
2	FinalmonitoringteamreportPDVolujak_11335_317 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FinalmonitoringteamreportPDVolujak_11335_317.pdf)	muamer.mulahasanovic@undp.org	12/29/2021 4:38:00 PM
3	FinalMonitoringTeamReport-TajnaPriodeCapljina_11335_317 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FinalMonitoringTeamReport-TajnaPriodeCapljina_11335_317.pdf)	muamer.mulahasanovic@undp.org	12/29/2021 4:38:00 PM
4	LVGA_UdruzenjeTajnapriodeCapljina_signed_11335_317 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/LVGA_UdruzenjeTajnapriodeCapljina_signed_11335_317.pdf)	muamer.mulahasanovic@undp.org	12/29/2021 4:40:00 PM
5	LVGA_PDVolujak_11335_317 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/LVGA_PDVolujak_11335_317.pdf)	muamer.mulahasanovic@undp.org	12/29/2021 4:41:00 PM
6	LVGA_AFGTrebinja_11335_317 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/LVGA_AFGTrebinja_11335_317.pdf)	muamer.mulahasanovic@undp.org	12/29/2021 4:41:00 PM

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 institutional partners (e.g. the FBH Ministry of Tourism and Environment). Additionally, key national 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 [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:

According to the submitted evidences, the Project deployed relevant monitoring of changes in capacities and performance of the selected key stakeholders relevant to the Project. As evidenced in the enclosed HACT assessment, one of the Project's key partners was an NGO - "Terra Dinarica". During 2018 the undertaken HACT assessment of "Terra Dinarica" resulted with significant risk rating. The Project responded accordingly, through the relevant implementation mechanisms, to address the identified risks. During 2019, the HACT re-assessment of "terra Dinarica" was undertaken that resulted with moderate risk rating, evidencing that the Project's activities contributed to capacity development of the said NGO. In addition, the Project implemented frequent spot checks of implementing partners, in accordance with UNDP's rules and regulations.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	HACTTERRADINARICAMicroassessmentReport2018_11335_319 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/HACTTERRADINARICAMicroassessmentReport2018_11335_319.pdf)	muamer.mulahasanovic@undp.org	12/29/2021 4:44:00 PM
2	HACTTERRADINARICAMicro-reassessment ReportApril2019_11335_319 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/HACTTERRADINARICAMicro-reassessmentReportApril2019_11335_319.pdf)	muamer.mulahasanovic@undp.org	12/29/2021 4:44:00 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:

Based on evidences submitted by the Project, it can be concluded that the relevant phasing out arrangements have been agreed and communicated with the key stakeholders, including the Project Board. In terms of sustainability of intervention, the Project made an assessment which resulted in recommendation for establishment of the National Coordination Mechanism aimed at long-term sustainability of the intervention based on i) capacity building of Terra Dinarica and, ii) establishment of 3 Via Dinarica Hubs. In this regard, the Project developed the Terra Dinarica Capacity Development Plan along with secured commitment of the key institutional partners embodied in the signed MoUs. Furthermore, the Project has developed a project proposal for the next phase and submitted it to the donors. During the final Project's conference held in December 2021, one of the key panels was the one that was focused on the achieved results, lessons learned and follow-up recommendations. Additionally, through the UNDP's BRIDGE project which started in 2021, some of the planned BRIDGE activities will be based on the lessons learned and track record of the Via Dinarica Project, especially in the segment of mobilization of youth and environmental activism around the Via Dinarica Platform.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	CapacityDevelopmentPlan_TerraDinarica_11335_320 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CapacityDevelopmentPlan_TerraDinarica_11335_320.docx)	muamer.mulahasanovic@undp.org	12/29/2021 4:47:00 PM
2	MoUBlidinje_11335_320 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MoUBlidinje_11335_320.pdf)	muamer.mulahasanovic@undp.org	12/29/2021 4:47:00 PM
3	MoUSutjeska_11335_320 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MoUSutjeska_11335_320.pdf)	muamer.mulahasanovic@undp.org	12/29/2021 4:47:00 PM
4	MoUTreskavica_11335_320 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MoUTreskavica_11335_320.pdf)	muamer.mulahasanovic@undp.org	12/29/2021 4:48:00 PM
5	ViaDinarica_Proposal_InstitutionalCoordinationMechanism_11335_320 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ViaDinarica_Proposal_InstitutionalCoordinationMechanism_11335_320.doc)	muamer.mulahasanovic@undp.org	12/29/2021 4:48:00 PM
6	BriefingNotesandBakgroundViaDinaricaConference_11335_320 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/BriefingNotesandBakgroundViaDinaricaConference_11335_320.docx)	muamer.mulahasanovic@undp.org	12/29/2021 4:49:00 PM
7	BRIDGE_Signedprodoc_11335_320 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/BRIDGE_Signedprodoc_11335_320.pdf)	muamer.mulahasanovic@undp.org	12/29/2021 4:49:00 PM

QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments

According to the information and evidences provided by the Via Dinarica Project, the Project has been implemented in accordance with UNDP's Quality Standards.