

Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

Form Status: Approved

Overall Rating:	Satisfactory
Decision:	
Portfolio/Project Number:	00112976
Portfolio/Project Title:	Support for Cultural Heritage Monuments - Phase 6
Portfolio/Project Date:	2018-05-01 / 2021-02-28

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:

Weekly stakeholder meetings were held where project priorities and social/political environment/context were discussed as well as entry points for new activities and decision taken accordingly. Minutes of meetings were kept and decisions recorded. This enabled the project to quickly adjust to new realities to the uncertain situation caused by the Covid-19 pandemic. As highlighted in the project's evaluation: "The project has been efficiently managed despite a constraining environment amplified by the COVID-19 pandemic and challenging conditions related to the number and level of complexity of the project's interventions.[..]. A key strength was the very positive and trusting relationship between project partners, UNDP, EU and the TCCH [which constitute the project steering committee]. The commitment, dedication, attitude and problem-solving approach was critical in obtaining the results." Moreover, the project's steering committee was informed of challenges pertaining to the external environment and possible implications and any changes needed in response were agreed and documented.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	FINAL-PSCminutesforCH6_CH7_9391_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FINAL-PSCminutesforCH6_CH7_9391_301.pdf)	irini.anastassiou@undp.org	12/31/2021 3:27:00 PM
2	1.CH6EvaluationReport_2020_ExecutiveSummary_p.5-7_5915_201_9391_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/1.CH6EvaluationReport_2020_ExecutiveSummary_p.5-7_5915_201_9391_301.pdf)	irini.anastassiou@undp.org	12/31/2021 3:27:00 PM
3	1.PSCno10CH6-CH7-18June2020_5915_201_9391_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/1.PSCno10CH6-CH7-18June2020_5915_201_9391_301.pdf)	irini.anastassiou@undp.org	12/31/2021 3:27:00 PM
4	1.SourpMagar_PSCad-hocvirtualdecision_5915_201_9391_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/1.SourpMagar_PSCad-hocvirtualdecision_5915_201_9391_301.pdf)	irini.anastassiou@undp.org	12/31/2021 3:28:00 PM
5	1.UNDP-TCCHlogmeetings2020-2021_9391_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/1.UNDP-TCCHlogmeetings2020-2021_9391_301.docx)	irini.anastassiou@undp.org	12/31/2021 3:28:00 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:

This project falls under the development setting of building resilience to shocks and crises; particularly output 3.2.1 of the UNDP Strategic Plan, National Capacities strengthened for reintegration, reconciliation, peaceful management of conflict and prevention of violent extremism in response to national policies and priorities. While the project's RRF did not explicitly refer to an SP output indicator, it substantially contributed to the PMO's RRF, towards SP output indicator 3.2.1.3 – Number of countries supported by UNDP, upon request, to establish or strengthen national infrastructures for peace. This was done through the implementation of confidence building measures as agreed by the Technical Committee on Cultural Heritage, a bi-communal committee that works towards providing a mutually acceptable mechanism for the implementation of practical measures for the proper maintenance, preservation, physical protection and restoration of Cultural Heritage throughout Cyprus.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	2.CH6_DoA_ResultsFramework_5915_202_9391_302 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2.CH6_DoA_ResultsFramework_5915_202_9391_302.pdf)	irini.anastassiou@undp.org	12/31/2021 3:30:00 PM
2	UNDPCyprusPMOMonitoringPlan2018-2021_9391_302 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/UNDPCyprusPMOMonitoringPlan2018-2021_9391_302.docx)	irini.anastassiou@undp.org	12/31/2021 3:30:00 PM

Relevant**Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

3. Were the project's targeted groups systematically identified and engaged, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized, to ensure the project remained relevant for them?

- 3: Systematic and structured feedback was collected over the project duration from a representative sample of beneficiaries, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized, as part of the project's monitoring system. Representatives from the targeted groups were active members of the project's governance mechanism (i.e., the project board or equivalent) and there is credible evidence that their feedback informs project decision making. (all must be true)
- 2: *Targeted groups were engaged in implementation and monitoring, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized. Beneficiary feedback, which may be anecdotal, was collected regularly to ensure the project addressed local priorities. This information was used to inform project decision making. (all must be true to select this option)*
- 1: Some beneficiary feedback may have been collected, but this information did not inform project decision making. This option should also be selected if no beneficiary feedback was collected
- Not Applicable

Evidence:

The project is driven and guided by the Technical Committee on Cultural Heritage (TCCH) which represents local communities who are the beneficiaries. TCCH has identified the strategy and priority list of sites to be preserved or restored, in line with the project's objective. TCCH was fully involved in all stages of the implementation except for the administrative and financial matters for which UNDP was responsible. UNDP held weekly meetings with TCCH representatives and its Advisory Board coordinators. Identification of the cultural heritage sites to be conserved were discussed and decided at the meetings. Communities engaged directly the TCCH, including on emergency works. Decisions were also taken on interaction with authorities or entities and on outreach with the communities and the general public. Meeting notes were shared with TCCH at the end of each meeting. Moreover, site visits were organized together with TCCH to monitor the works, while ad hoc virtual decisions of the Project Board were also taken several times.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	3.CH6_DoA_GovernanceandManagementMechanismandAnnexB_9391_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/3.CH6_DoA_GovernanceandManagementMechanismandAnnexB_9391_303.pdf)	irini.anastassiou@undp.org	12/31/2021 3:33:00 PM
2	3.CH6_FinalReport_extract_9391_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/3.CH6_FinalReport_extract_9391_303.pdf)	irini.anastassiou@undp.org	12/31/2021 3:34:00 PM
3	3.CH6EvaluationReport_2020_p.9_9391_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/3.CH6EvaluationReport_2020_p.9_9391_303.pdf)	irini.anastassiou@undp.org	12/31/2021 3:36:00 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:

The project's design was informed by a lessons' learned exercise that took place in July 2017. Weekly meetings with the TCCH and its Advisory Board formed the basis for discussing progress and lessons learned, monitoring of project progress as well as corporate policies and strategies related to the implementation of the project. Discussions and decisions were reflected in the meetings' minutes. Changes were made to ensure the project's continued relevance. This is most clear from the prompt reaction to the situation that emerged with Covid-19 that required a lot of problem solving and responsiveness, which is described in the project's final report. As reported in the project's evaluation "Despite a constraining environment and very challenging operating conditions linked to the COVID-19 pandemic, the legal and contractual imperatives of working on both sides of the island with bi-communal teams, the project has shown high efficiency and responsiveness capacity to meet the deadlines and workplan objectives. All of the planned physical outputs as stated in the DoA related to CH have been achieved, or quantitative targets exceeded (for designs and conservation/restoration works)".

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	4.CH6_DoA_LessonsLearned_9391_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/4.CH6_DoA_LessonsLearned_9391_304.pdf)	irini.anastassiou@undp.org	12/31/2021 3:38:00 PM
2	4.PSCmeeting_8.09.2021_CH6lessonslearned_9391_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/4.PSCmeeting_8.09.2021_CH6lessonslearned_9391_304.pdf)	irini.anastassiou@undp.org	12/31/2021 3:38:00 PM
3	4.PSCno10CH6-CH7-18June2020_9391_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/4.PSCno10CH6-CH7-18June2020_9391_304.pdf)	irini.anastassiou@undp.org	12/31/2021 3:38:00 PM
4	FinalNarrativeReport_CyprusCH6_9391_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FinalNarrativeReport_CyprusCH6_9391_304.pdf)	irini.anastassiou@undp.org	12/31/2021 3:39:00 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:

This project was Phase 6 of a portfolio of projects that commenced in 2010. A number of designs and conservation works have been undertaken during Phase 6, exceeding the project's initial targets. The fact that a larger number of works was concluded than initially targeted, shows both the project's contribution to the overall objective of supporting the reconciliation process and increasing the level of trust between the communities, as well as the great number of cultural heritage monuments that remain to be protected. This is supported by the project's evaluation which identified evidence (mostly anecdotal) that the project is contributing to confidence building. In view of this, a 7th Phase of this initiative commenced in 2019 with a budget of 5.2m euros, which was extended for 12 months, with an additional amount of 2.5m euros, while there are ongoing discussions for an 8th Phase of this project.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	FinalNarrativeReport_CyprusCH6_9391_305 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FinalNarrativeReport_CyprusCH6_9391_305.pdf)	irini.anastassiou@undp.org	12/31/2021 3:41:00 PM
2	5CH7-DoA-coverpage_9391_305 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/5CH7-DoA-coverpage_9391_305.pdf)	irini.anastassiou@undp.org	12/31/2021 3:41:00 PM
3	5.CH6EvaluationReport_2020_p.17_9391_305 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/5.CH6EvaluationReport_2020_p.17_9391_305.pdf)	irini.anastassiou@undp.org	12/31/2021 3:41:00 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:

While the project was not designed as a gender responsive intervention, efforts were made for gender balance in the composition of the contractors' teams as well in the community involvement component of the project. In particular, there was parity composition of the Heritage Youth Ambassadors (20 female and 20 male youth), while UNDP was recommending to the contractors that their technical teams should include female participation. Moreover, the project was led by an all-female UNDP team.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	6.CH6EvaluationReport_2020_gender_p.24_9391_306 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/6.CH6EvaluationReport_2020_gender_p.24_9391_306.pdf)	irini.anastassiou@undp.org	12/31/2021 3:44:00 PM
2	6.CH6FinalReport_communityengagement_9391_306 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/6.CH6FinalReport_communityengagement_9391_306.pdf)	irini.anastassiou@undp.org	12/31/2021 3:44:00 PM

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 included both a risk analysis and a SESP. As noted by the evaluator, the most effective risk management strategy consisted in the regular PSC meetings that allowed the primary stakeholders to reach a decision and a consensus on difficulties and problems encountered and allowed the project to reach its expected objectives. Risks due to Covid-19 were considered and a Covid-19 Action Plan for Cultural Heritage projects was developed, which included risks and proposed actions. Moreover, an emergency preparedness and response plan to Covid-19 on construction sites was put in place.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	7.CH6_DoA_Risk_9391_307 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/7.CH6_DoA_Risk_9391_307.pdf)	irini.anastassiou@undp.org	12/31/2021 3:46:00 PM
2	7.CH6EvaluationReport_2020_risk_p.16_9391_307 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/7.CH6EvaluationReport_2020_risk_p.16_9391_307.pdf)	irini.anastassiou@undp.org	12/31/2021 3:47:00 PM
3	7.PSCno10CH6-CH7-18June2020_9391_307 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/7.PSCno10CH6-CH7-18June2020_9391_307.pdf)	irini.anastassiou@undp.org	12/31/2021 3:47:00 PM
4	7.Responsetocovid19-ACTIONPLANS-CH6_9391_307 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/7.Responsetocovid19-ACTIONPLANS-CH6_9391_307.pdf)	irini.anastassiou@undp.org	12/31/2021 3:47:00 PM
5	7.SESP_CH6_9391_307 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/7.SESP_CH6_9391_307.pdf)	irini.anastassiou@undp.org	12/31/2021 3:47:00 PM
6	7.UNDPPersonnelCOVID-19protocolsites-updated29April2020_9391_307 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/7.UNDPPersonnelCOVID-19protocolsites-updated29April2020_9391_307.pdf)	irini.anastassiou@undp.org	12/31/2021 3:47:00 PM

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:

Information concerning the possibility to submit a social or environmental complaint or to report fraud, abuse or misconduct are available on the website of the UNDP PMO in Cyprus.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Management & Monitoring**Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

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

- 3: The project had a comprehensive and costed M&E plan. Baselines, targets and milestones were fully populated. Progress data against indicators in the project's RRF was reported regularly using credible data sources and collected according to the frequency stated in the Plan, including sex disaggregated data as relevant. Any evaluations conducted, if relevant, fully meet decentralized evaluation standards, including gender UNEG standards. Lessons learned, included during evaluations and/or After-Action Reviews, were used to take corrective actions when necessary. (all must be true)
- 2: *The project costed M&E Plan, and most baselines and targets were populated. Progress data against indicators in the project's RRF was collected on a regular basis, although there 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 project had a Monitoring and Evaluation Plan. The project's RFF was fully populated with baselines and targets, and data against indicators were recorded annually. Monitoring activities were conducted primarily through the weekly meetings with TCCH and the frequent discussions with PSC. Progress reports were prepared annually as per donor and UNDP requirements. A project evaluation was conducted as per the Evaluation Plan, based on international evaluation standards. This evaluation noted that there is scope for improvement of the project's Results Framework. In terms of output level targets, the project was on track to meet all its targets and data were adequately collected and reported. However, concerning the higher-level objective of confidence building, the evaluator noted that while it was evident that the project was on track to achieve its overall objective of contributing to confidence building, evidences to this effect were anecdotal, and the project lacked the required tool to systematically report and provide evidence on this. Therefore, the evaluator proposed that a systematic perception survey should take place at the end of each phase to provide evidence of the changes in line with the overall objective of confidence building.

List of Uploaded Documents			
#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	9.editedfinaleval_9391_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/9.editedfinaleval_9391_309.pdf)	irini.anastassiou@undp.org	12/31/2021 3:49:00 PM
2	9.PSCno10CH6-CH7-18June2020_9391_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/9.PSCno10CH6-CH7-18June2020_9391_309.pdf)	irini.anastassiou@undp.org	12/31/2021 3:49:00 PM
3	CH6Interimnarrativereport_Final_9391_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CH6Interimnarrativereport_Final_9391_309.pdf)	irini.anastassiou@undp.org	12/31/2021 3:50:00 PM
4	FinalNarrativeReport_CyprusCH6_9391_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FinalNarrativeReport_CyprusCH6_9391_309.pdf)	irini.anastassiou@undp.org	12/31/2021 3:51:00 PM
5	UNDPFinalFinancialReport-CyprusCH6_9391_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/UNDPFinalFinancialReport-CyprusCH6_9391_309.xlsx)	irini.anastassiou@undp.org	12/31/2021 3:51:00 PM
6	UNDPProgressNarrativeReport-CyprusCH6_9391_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/UNDPProgressNarrativeReport-CyprusCH6_9391_309.pdf)	irini.anastassiou@undp.org	12/31/2021 3:50:00 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 governance mechanism is operating very well as noted in the project's evaluation. The evaluator highlighted that "The Project Steering Committee (PSC) which comprises the donor, the TCCH and UNDP to ensure oversight and decision-making regarding project implement, was shown to have very good working relationship and this allowed a good, shared understanding of the project situation and a positive, constructive and flexible response to address the emerging problems and needs". He has also recognized the project's governance mechanism as a good practice. In addition to the PSC meetings, the regular weekly meetings between UNDP and TCCH ensured a strong governance mechanism and coordination. Minutes of all meetings with PSC or TCCH are on file. An annual progress report was prepared, while updates on the project's progress were shared with the PSC.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	10.UNDP-TCCHlogmeetings2020-2021_9391_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/10.UNDP-TCCHlogmeetings2020-2021_9391_310.docx)	irini.anastassiou@undp.org	12/31/2021 3:53:00 PM
2	10.CH6EvaluationReport_2020_p.15-1619-20_9391_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/10.CH6EvaluationReport_2020_p.15-1619-20_9391_310.pdf)	irini.anastassiou@undp.org	12/31/2021 3:52:00 PM
3	10.PSCno10CH6-CH7-18June2020_5915_210_9391_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/10.PSCno10CH6-CH7-18June2020_5915_210_9391_310.pdf)	irini.anastassiou@undp.org	12/31/2021 3:53:00 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’s risks were reviewed and new risks related to Covid-19 were identified and recorded. A Covid-19 Action Plan for Cultural Heritage projects was developed, which included risks and proposed actions. Challenges caused by Covid-19 and their mitigation measures were discussed with the Project Steering Committee. An example of this is that, an emergency preparedness and response plan to Covid-19 on construction sites was put in place.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	11.PSCno10CH6-CH7-18June2020_9391_311 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/11.PSCno10CH6-CH7-18June2020_9391_311.pdf)	irini.anastassiou@undp.org	12/31/2021 3:54:00 PM
2	11.Responsetocovid19-ACTIONPLANS-CH6_9391_311 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/11.Responsetocovid19-ACTIONPLANS-CH6_9391_311.pdf)	irini.anastassiou@undp.org	12/31/2021 3:54:00 PM
3	11.UNDPPersonnelCOVID-19protocolonsites-updated29April2020_9391_311 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/11.UNDPPersonnelCOVID-19protocolonsites-updated29April2020_9391_311.pdf)	irini.anastassiou@undp.org	12/31/2021 3:54:00 PM

Efficient

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

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

- Yes
- No

Evidence:

All project results under outputs 1,2 and 4 were completed, while results exceeded the initial targets. So me activities for output 3 on community engagement and education were impacted by Covid-19, however they were reviewed and adjusted.

List of Uploaded Documents			
#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	12.CH6EvaluationReport_2020_9391_312 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/12.CH6EvaluationReport_2020_9391_312.pdf)	irini.anastassiou@undp.org	12/31/2021 3:58:00 PM
2	12.CH6finalreport_communityengagement_9391_312 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/12.CH6finalreport_communityengagement_9391_312.pdf)	irini.anastassiou@undp.org	12/31/2021 3:57:00 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's procurement plan was initially updated on the PROMPT platform and was reviewed on an annual basis, a separate live document was also kept for the completed, ongoing, and ad-hoc procurement cases throughout the year. Throughout the implementation period, UNDP Project Manager and Senior Programme Manager reviewed any procurement related inputs and addressed them through management actions as needed.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	13.ProcurementPlan2020_CH6_9391_313 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAF/ormDocuments/13.ProcurementPlan2020_CH6_9391_313.xlsx)	irini.anastassiou@undp.org	12/31/2021 3:58:00 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:

UNDP estimate was prepared for each tender/case, where costs were reviewed based on technical specifications and local market benchmarks, as well as against relevant comparators including other UNDP Cyprus ongoing or past projects. Given that procurement was mainly provided by local suppliers, there were no comparators from other country offices. The budget was reviewed on a monthly basis, based on monthly financial reports and required updates were done accordingly.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Effective

Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory

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

- Yes
- No

Evidence:

The project has exceeded its expected targets, as evident from the project evaluation.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	15.CH6finalreport_resultstable_9391_315 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/15.CH6finalreport_resultstable_9391_315.pdf)	irini.anastassiou@undp.org	12/31/2021 4:00:00 PM
2	15.editedfinaleval311220_9391_315 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/15.editedfinaleval311220_9391_315.pdf)	irini.anastassiou@undp.org	12/31/2021 3:59:00 PM

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 work plan has been formally updated yearly. Monthly reviews of financial reports were done, which supported quarterly discussions on the progress related to the work plan, which was adjusted if needed. In 2020, a revision of the work plan and budget was signed in December to reflect annual work plan.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	AWP_11270-2018_CH6_initial_9391_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFo rmDocuments/AWP_11270-2018_CH6_initial_9391_316.pdf)	irini.anastassiou@undp.org	12/31/2021 4:01:00 PM
2	AWP_11270-2019_CH6_initial_9391_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFo rmDocuments/AWP_11270-2019_CH6_initial_9391_316.pdf)	irini.anastassiou@undp.org	12/31/2021 4:02:00 PM
3	AWP-111270-2020_CH6_rev1_9391_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFo rmDocuments/AWP-111270-2020_CH6_rev1_9391_316.pdf)	irini.anastassiou@undp.org	12/31/2021 4:02:00 PM
4	AWP-111270-2020_CH6_initial_9391_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFo rmDocuments/AWP-111270-2020_CH6_initial_9391_316.pdf)	irini.anastassiou@undp.org	12/31/2021 4:02:00 PM
5	AWP-111270-2021_CH6_initial_9391_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFo rmDocuments/AWP-111270-2021_CH6_initial_9391_316.pdf)	irini.anastassiou@undp.org	12/31/2021 4:02:00 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:

The project is implemented in full consultation with the Technical Committee on Cultural Heritage (TCC H) which includes among its members representatives from both the Turkish-cypriot and Greek-cypriot communities, which are the project's main stakeholders / target group. Other stakeholders identified are young people and civil society organisations. Targeted activities were implemented in collaboration with TCC H with the aim to increase community engagement in the protection and preservation of cultural heritage. A bi-communal youth campaign was launched to engage young people across the divide.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	17.CH6EvaluationReport_2020_ExecutiveSummary_p.5-7_9391_317 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/17.CH6EvaluationReport_2020_ExecutiveSummary_p.5-7_9391_317.pdf)	irini.anastassiou@undp.org	12/31/2021 4:04:00 PM
2	17.TechnicalCommitteeonCulturalHeritageSeeksHeritageYouthAmbassadors_UNDPinCyprus__9391_317 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/17.TechnicalCommitteeonCulturalHeritageSeeksHeritageYouthAmbassadors_UNDPinCyprus__9391_317.pdf)	irini.anastassiou@undp.org	12/31/2021 4:04:00 PM
3	17.CH6finalreport_communityengagement_9391_317 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/17.CH6finalreport_communityengagement_9391_317.pdf)	irini.anastassiou@undp.org	12/31/2021 4:05:00 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 is implemented by UNDP PMO in Cyprus with close collaboration with the Technical Committee on Cultural Heritage (TCCH) and the EU office in Cyprus. Therefore, procurement, monitoring and evaluation procedures of UNDP PMO were used, with support provided by the UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub and UNDP Brussels office when necessary. Both TCCH and the EU are actively engaged in the process. TCCH is fully engaged in the project decision-making, implementation and monitoring, apart from administrative and financial matters for which UNDP is the responsible party.

List of Uploaded Documents			
#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	18.CH6finalreport_implementationandmodusoperanti_9391_318 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/18.CH6finalreport_implementationandmodusoperanti_9391_318.pdf)	irini.anastassiou@undp.org	12/31/2021 4:07:00 PM

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:

This project has been fully implemented by UNDP.

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's methodology has been specifically designed to strengthen capacities and ensure local ownership. The TCCH defines the overall strategy and identifies the priorities. UNDP implements the projects in close collaboration with the TCCH. Once the conservation works are completed, they are formally handed over to the TCCH. TCCH then hands over the project to the caretaker. The project also incorporated a community engagement and educational component to provide opportunities for members of both communities to engage in the protection and promotion of their shared cultural heritage. Nevertheless, TCCH, together with UNDP and the EU saw that there is scope to continue supporting the work of TCCH as there are still many monuments to be protected and preserved, and therefore, a follow-up phase (phase 7) has been designed and is currently implemented, while a phase 8 is also planned. TCCH was exploring modalities in order to ensure the protection of the monuments beyond the project implementation period through use-and-maintenance of the sites and monuments. TCCH's capacity to leverage local funds for cultural heritage projects, as evident from other funded projects is also a good indication of sustainability.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	20CH7-DoA-coverpage_9391_320 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/20CH7-DoA-coverpage_9391_320.pdf)	irini.anastassiou@undp.org	12/31/2021 4:09:00 PM
2	20.CH6EvaluationReport_2020_pp.2324_9391_320 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/20.CH6EvaluationReport_2020_pp.2324_9391_320.pdf)	irini.anastassiou@undp.org	12/31/2021 4:09:00 PM
3	20.NicosiaWallsvegetationremoval_9391_320 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/20.NicosiaWallsvegetationremoval_9391_320.pdf)	irini.anastassiou@undp.org	12/31/2021 4:09:00 PM

QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments

Approved as in full compliance