

Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

Form Status: Approved

Overall Rating:	Satisfactory
Decision:	
Portfolio/Project Number:	00081451
Portfolio/Project Title:	Innovation Facility
Portfolio/Project Date:	2014-06-01 / 2021-12-31

Strategic

Quality Rating: Exemplary

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

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

Evidence:

Between 2014 and 2020 the Innovation Facility has been defined by widespread and small-scale experimentation across the organization. This entailed regular horizon scanning of new technologies and approaches, flexible planning across calendar years, and continuous formation of new partnerships with externals.

During the course of the project, the board has considered and acted on horizon scanning evidence. First, it has approved annual work plans, which in turn have been based on proactive identification of new opportunities and evolving analysis of the development context. Second, the board has enabled project extensions, for instance in Nov 2019 which allowed time for BPPS/CB and ExO to rethink the role of the Innovation Facility in the context of the emerging Corporate Innovation Strategy. Third, the board has approved expansion in board membership as a way to ensure optimal strategic guidance and ownership of the Innovation Facility's future work.

Towards the end of the project, the board considered and approved a more fundamental pivot from "single point solutions" towards a focus on systems transformation. This was based on changes in both the internal and external operating contexts (for details see Innovation Project QA Assessment report 2019). The pivot demonstrates how the project has pro-actively taken advantage of new opportunities and adapted its theory of change to respond to changes in the development context and changing national priorities. As part of this pivot, the Facility has initiated a series of so-called Deep Demonstrations, pilot projects undertaken with Country Offices in Latin America and the Caribbean, Africa, Europe and Asia.

Documentation:

- UNDP Innovation Board Meeting minutes 17 Sep 2018
- UNDP Innovation Board Meeting minutes 4 Nov 2019
- Denmark-UNDP Strategic Partnership Agreement 2020-2022
- Innovation Project QA Assessment report 2019
- IF 2.0 Concept Note

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Denmark-UNDPStrategicPartnershipAgreement2020-2022_6423_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Denmark-UNDPStrategicPartnershipAgreement2020-2022_6423_301.pdf)	soren.haldrup@undp.org	12/3/2020 7:50:00 PM
2	IFBoardMeeting2018_Summary-final17Oct_6423_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/IFBoardMeeting2018_Summary-final17Oct_6423_301.docx)	soren.haldrup@undp.org	12/3/2020 7:51:00 PM
3	IFBoardMeetingNov2019_6423_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/IFBoardMeetingNov2019_6423_301.docx)	soren.haldrup@undp.org	12/3/2020 7:52:00 PM
4	ConceptnotelFnewphase-final_6423_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ConceptnotelFnewphase-final_6423_301.pdf)	soren.haldrup@undp.org	12/3/2020 7:53:00 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 UNDP's Strategic Plan 2018-2021 aims to support countries to achieve the 2030 Agenda and the Sustainable Development Goals and related agreements. The plan focuses on interventions in poverty eradication, climate change, adolescent and maternal health, gender and empowerment, availability and use of disaggregated data, as well as peacebuilding.

The Innovation Facility has been closely aligned with this plan, deploying a wide range of innovations to tackle problems such as using mobile phones to tackle corruption, leveraging behavioral insights on gender based violence, and using new data to improve early warning systems.

With its pivot, the Innovation Facility project has remained highly aligned with the Strategic Plan. Specifically, the project has responded to SP Outcome 1: "Accelerated Delivery of top-quality programmatic results for the SDGs under Organisational Effectiveness and Efficiency" and SP output indicator 1.2.6: "Percentage of project outputs that a) pilot innovative tools and methodologies and, b) scale innovative tools and methodologies".

Documentation:

- Moon Shots and Puddle Jumps. UNDP Innovation Facility 2017-2018 Year in Review
- Denmark-UNDP Strategic Partnership Agreement 2020-2022
- UNDP Innovation Board Meeting minutes 4 Nov 2019

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	2017-18AnnualReportMoonshotsandpuddlejumps_6423_302 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2017-18AnnualReportMoonshotsandpuddlejumps_6423_302.pdf)	soren.haldrup@undp.org	12/3/2020 7:55:00 PM

Relevant**Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory**

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

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

Evidence:

The IF is committed to the Principles of Innovation and it encourages IF recipients to abide by these principles, including:

- Addressing privacy and security for beneficiaries, partners and stakeholders
- Designing with users, ensuring inclusion of multiple user types and stakeholders

The selection criteria in the IFs calls for proposals that have been structured to identify proposed projects that respond to and address “leave no one behind” by considering whether a solution benefits the most marginalized or contributes to gender equality and women’s empowerment.

Until its recent pivot, the IF project has operated through country-level initiatives, often in close collaboration with youth and gender teams in UNDP. 70% of the countries in which the IF invested between 2014 and 2015 were crisis-affected, least developed, landlocked or SIDS. In 2019, half of IF initiatives benefited youth and 3 in 5 of the IF projects have experimented with solutions for the most vulnerable groups, such as refugees, slum dwellers, migrants and women-headed households below the poverty line. 1 in 5 of IF solutions included the disabled or elderly.

The quantitative evidence is supported by qualitative data from innovation facility recipients: “To be very honest, previously, when they were designing a project, it would be one or two people sitting down writing the project proposal using the conventional interventions. Whereas now when we are facilitating these sessions we bring in a lot of different other stakeholders into the table at the project design stage, be it the government counterparts, or other strategic development partners.” (UNDP IF grant recipient Asia-Pacific).

Following the project’s pivot towards emphasis on system transformation, the IF had maintained a focus on beneficiaries, including the excluded and marginalized. For instance, informal market vendors and food supply workers in Angola and Zimbabwe (under the NextGenCities Africa initiative), youth in border communities (Burundi), and vulnerable communities in territorial districts in Colombia.

Documentation:

- Innovation Facility Review 2020
- Deep Demonstrations: the Journey Begins, Oct 2020 (<https://medium.com/@undp.innovation/deep-demonstrations-the-journey-begins-34bf063477bf>)

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	InnovationFacilityFinalReview2020_6423_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/InnovationFacilityFinalReview2020_6423_303.pdf)	soren.haldrup@undp.org	12/3/2020 8:26:00 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 IF has produced a continuous flow of lessons learned. These have been documented and shared in publications, webinars and have informed management decisions and course corrections to ensure continuous relevance of the project. See Question 1 above for more on how lessons, contextual changes and emerging opportunities have informed the project board's decisions to adapt the project's focus and theory of change.

In total, the IF has identified and tested 18 innovative approaches across 142 initiatives. These efforts have triggered the development of a wide range of knowledge products and 150 blog posts over the last two years of the Facility alone. A selection of knowledge products are listed under "documentation" below. A selection of the blog posts have been published on UNDP Innovation's Medium account (medium.com/@undp.innovation)

IF fund recipients have been encouraged to regularly publish original content on progress and lessons learned.

In 2017, 2018, 2019 the IF has also conducted surveys of IF recipients as part of the reporting requirements to monitor and track IF contribution to development impact through programmatic improvements related to cost- and time effectiveness in service delivery, and target group reach. It also solicited qualitative and quantitative results through evidence showing data trends.

The Team has also conducted corporate trend analyses based on ROAR innovation section data. The ROAR captures operational efficiency gains as a result of the deployment of innovative tools and methods.

In 2018, an independent evaluation was conducted. objectives of this evaluation were to assess the Innovation Facility project's implementation (not UNDP's broader innovation function and activities, which necessarily go well beyond the scope of a single project), and to provide key lessons and inputs to inform the next phase and role of the UNDP Innovation Facility. The evaluation found the project highly relevant to respond to an environment witnessing accelerated change and increased complexity.

Documentation:

- Innovation Facility Review (UNDP, 2020)
- Good Practice Guide on Scaling Innovation (IDIA, 2017)
- Measuring the Impact of Innovation (IDIA, 2017)
- A Guide to Data Innovation for Development – From idea to proof-of-concept (UNDP, 2016)
- Behavioural Insights at the United Nations – Achieving Agenda 2030 (UNDP 2016)
- Growing government innovation labs: an insider's guide (UNDP, 2017)
- Hacker's Toolkit (UNDP, 2017)
- The Future is Decentralised (UNDP, 2018)
- Innovation Facility Review 2020
- Moon Shots and Puddle Jumps. UNDP Innovation Facility 2017-2018 Year in Review (UNDP, 2018).
- IF Evaluation 2018
- ROAR Innovation Section Data Analytics 2016
- IF Survey results 2017
- Corporate Innovation Trend analysis
- IF survey results 2019

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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:

During the life of the project, IF funds have been used to both start up and scale innovations. The IF has traditionally funded projects with the potential for scale, though scaling has happened both vertically and diagonally.

Vertical scale: Private sector and non-government partnerships played a crucial role in all Innovation Facility projects that scaled up. Relevant proxy indicators (e.g. partnerships, attraction of co-financing) show strong evidence that projects have been taken to scale. For instance:

- \$150,000 worth of investments with the Egypt country office was followed by another \$2 million in investment by private sector partners on youth employment and other Areas.
- An \$80,000 investment in the Youth Co:Lab led to another \$29 million in follow-on investments by partners.
- An \$90,000 investment in Istanbul Innovation Days over 2-year period led to \$8 million in investments from a government partner and a development bank.

Generally, the resources required to enable scaling up projects were often significantly larger than the Innovation Facility's typical \$60-100k investment.

Diagonal scale: While the Innovation Facility was designed to provide funding for experiments or prototypes and, when successful, scaling up those experiments to cover a larger group of stakeholders, a large share of the value created by the Facility reflects dia

gonal scaling.

Scaling diagonally has meant that capabilities, relationships, or knowledge developed in one project often wound up being applied to — and creating an impact through — a different project elsewhere in the organization or through partners. Most notably, investments in social innovation labs (collaboration with governments) in Armenia, Georgia, North Macedonia, Moldova, and Sri Lanka were the basis for UNDP’s Accelerator Labs network. Similarly, the Accelerator Labs network was designed as part of work conducted by the Istanbul Innovation Days, which was also supported by the Facility. Often, projects had a greater tendency to scale diagonally rather than up because many innovation projects relied primarily on government to scale and, in the time it took to scale a project, champions.

Most recently, scale has been further ingrained into the DNA of the IF with the Facility’s pivot from single-point solutions towards broad system transformation. The ongoing Deep Demonstrations under the IF are by definition looking at inducing impact at scale (across a complex system) rather than at isolated intervention points.

Documentation:

- Innovation Facility Review (UNDP, 2020)

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 has had special measures to address gender inequalities and empower women. The measures fall into three categories: procedural requirements, collaborators and substantive focus.

Procedural: The evaluation criteria for the 2018 call for proposals included a gender marker. In the last funding round before the 2020 pivot, 40% of IF initiatives aimed to promote equity and women's empowerment: SDGs 5 and 10.

Collaborators: the IF has collaborated with gender focused teams in UNDP. For instance, project has often worked in close collaboration with youth and gender teams during country-level initiatives.

Substantive focus: a number of experiments under the IF have had an explicit gender focus. In 2019, half of IF initiatives benefited youth and 3 in 5 of the IF projects have experimented with solutions for the most vulnerable groups, such as refugees, slum dwellers, migrants and women-headed households below the poverty line. This includes: 'Behavioral Design to Combat Gender-Based Violence (South Africa, Georgia, Egypt), 'Access to Justice for Deaf & Hard of Hearing Survivors of Gender-Based Violence (Argentina). Gender also had a prominent focus in previous funding rounds, such as in 2016 where gender focused interventions were implemented in Tunisia (young talent among women and men), Viet Nam (gender norms), Myanmar (peer-support among rural women). Most recently, gender remains a focus area with the IF's pivot. The IF's NextGenCities Africa work has a focus on urban food systems and informal markets. Areas where women play an important role. For instance, in Angola informal employment accounts for 79.6% of total employment (nearly 8 million people), with women having higher informal employment rate (89.5%) than men (69.6%).

The efforts above have made strides to help address gender inequalities and empower women, though this is a focus the IF 2.0 will need to sustain and build on moving forward.

Documentation:

- Moon Shots and Puddle Jumps. UNDP Innovation Facility 2017-2018 Year in Review (UNDP, 2018).
- Spark, Scale, Sustain. UNDP Innovation Facility 2016 Year in Review (UNDP, 2016)
- Angola’s National Institute of Statistics (numbers released in Oct 2020)
- 2018 Fund Allocation for the Innovation Facility Call for Proposals (UNDP 2018)

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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

- 3: *Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. Appropriate assessments conducted where required (i.e., Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) for High risk projects and some level of social and environmental assessment for Moderate risk projects as identified through SESP). Relevant management plan(s) developed for identified risks through consultative process and implemented, resourced, and monitored. Risks effectively managed or mitigated. If there is a substantive change to the project or change in context that affects risk levels, the SESP was updated to reflect these changes. (all must be true)*
- 2: Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. Appropriate assessments conducted where required (i.e., Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) for High risk projects and some level of social and environmental assessment for Moderate risk projects as identified through SESP). Relevant management plan(s) developed, implemented and monitored for identified risks. OR project was categorized as Low risk through the SESP.
- 1: Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. For projects categorized as High or Moderate Risk, there was no evidence that social and environmental assessments completed and/or management plans or measures development, implemented or monitored. There are substantive changes to the project or changes in the context but SESP was not updated. (any may be true)

Evidence:

The IF is committed to the Principles of Innovation, which includes Principle 4: Build for Sustainability

- Plan for sustainability from the start, including planning for long-term financial health
- Use and invest in local communities and developers by default and help ease their own growth
- Engage with local governments to ensure integration into national strategy and identify high-level government advocates.

The IF encourages IF recipients to abide by these principles.

Documentation:

- Principles for Digital Development, <https://digitalprinciples.org/>

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 documentation of there having been an environmental or social issue that had to be managed by the project

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 IF has implemented a range of planned M&E activities. First, at a general level the IF has monitored the IRRF of the Project Document and updated annually the data in ATLAS based on ROAR reports and more detailed reports from COs that have received IF funding. In this context, the IF has also undertaken regular progress reporting to the project board.

Second, the IF has produced regular reports taking stock of implemented activities and lessons learned. The reports include the 2020 Innovation Facility Review (UNDP, 2020), Moon Shots and Puddle Jumps. UNDP Innovation Facility 2017-2018 Year in Review (UNDP, 2018), and Spark, Scale, Sustain. UNDP Innovation Facility 2016 Year in Review (UNDP, 2016). The 2020 Review alone is based on 32 interviews with recipient country offices (including leadership and program teams), regional offices, headquarters, and other partners; a desk review of reports and previous evaluations; and survey data from 42 project managers and innovation champions.

Third, the IF has undertaken a number of additional monitoring activities such as a 2018/19 “end of term” survey. The survey looked to capture development impact of IF projects and a range of other KPIs such as cost-effectiveness.

Fourth, the IF has recently increased emphasis on developing a more dynamic and rigorous monitoring and learning function, with more systematic collection and sensemaking of data and insights gained from implementation of Deep Demonstrations. Following the pivot, the IF has also established an implementation dashboard. The dashboard is updated by the fund manager and discussed with the SIU head on weekly management calls.

The sections above (under “strategic” and “relevance”) describe how corrective actions have been taken based on ongoing monitoring and learning activities.

Documentation:

- Innovation Facility Review (UNDP, 2020)
- Moon Shots and Puddle Jumps. UNDP Innovation Facility 2017-2018 Year in Review (UNDP, 2018).
- Spark, Scale, Sustain. UNDP Innovation Facility 2016 Year in Review (UNDP, 2016)

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	SparkScaleSustainAnnualReport2016V17_6423_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SparkScaleSustainAnnualReport2016V17_6423_309.pdf)	soren.haldrup@undp.org	12/3/2020 8:10:00 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 management board has met with certain frequency. Meeting minutes are on file. Most recently, the board met virtually end-2019. In November 2019 the board convened to endorse the extension of the IF project through 2020 and the expansion of the board composition. It met again in December to endorse the IF workplan.

Documentation:

- UNDP Innovation Board Meeting minutes 4 Nov 2019
- UNDP Innovation Board virtual endorsement of 2020 workplan, December 2020.

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:

Evidence

During the project, the Fund Manager undertook monthly fund status reviews and reporting to track project delivery and expenditure. An Operations Analyst supported this work. Corrective actions (incl. risk management) were taken when needed.

Following the pivot, the IF has established a number of regular risk management measures:

- An implementation dashboard is updated by the fund manager and discussed with the SIU head on weekly management calls.
- The fund manager and operations analyst conduct regular budget reviews to manage financial and fiduciary risks.
- The global innovation specialist and fund manager monitor delivery, reputational and impact risks on a continuous basis through weekly calls with country office and regional innovation leads

The sections above describe how corrective actions have been taken based on ongoing monitoring activities.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Efficient

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

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

- Yes
- No

Evidence:

The IF mobilized adequate resources to achieve the intended results. The Facility received an initial \$12 million investment from Denmark. The Facility has effectively achieved its key outputs. It has identified and tested 18 innovative approaches across 142 initiatives, triggered the development of a wide range of knowledge products and 150 blog posts over the last two years of the Facility, and led to specific process improvements at UNDP. A small number of projects produced outsized returns exceeding the initial \$12 m investment in the facility many times over. This is reminiscent of venture capital funds, where the returns on two of 10 investments cover the costs of the remaining eight. While the majority of the experiments supported by the Facility did not have considerable direct development impacts, just 9 projects are responsible for generating follow-on investments of \$70 m in development projects. This does not include a further \$140m follow-on investment for the Accelerator Labs, an initiative developed with capabilities built through the Facility’s support.

For 2020-2023, the IF has received an additional investment from Denmark amounting to \$9.8 million.

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 IF has undertaken a series of satisfactory procurement rounds since its inception. Between 2014 and 2019 the Facility has supported 142 initiatives in 87 countries with seed-funding and advisory support.

In 2019 the innovation team convened colleagues from across the organization (HQ, CBs, RBx, COs) to map critical bottlenecks that impede the organization. The resulting report has been brought to the attention of the BPPS director and the ExO.

Most recently the IF has established an LTA under which four vendors currently hold spots. The aim is to ensure and enhance procurement efficiency. For the 2020 procurement round, this LTA has ensured a relatively efficient and timely process compared to alternative procurement routes.

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 IF team has captured cost-efficiencies in its end of term survey. In 2017, IF projects on average had a 2.1x mobilization rate (meaning that every dollar of IF funding mobilized \$2.1 of additional resources). In 2019, 60% of IF projects reported improved cost-effectiveness of service or product delivery.

Overall, the initial \$12 million investment into the IF has catalyzed follow-on investments of \$70 million.

Documentation:

- Innovation Facility Review (UNDP, 2020)

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	InnovationFacilityFinalReview2020_6423_314 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/InnovationFacilityFinalReview2020_6423_314.pdf)	soren.haldrup@undp.org	12/3/2020 8:37:00 PM

Effective

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

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

- Yes
- No

Evidence:

The project has been on track and delivered its expected outputs, including:

1. Products and services offerings developed
 - Supported 142 initiatives in 87 countries with seed-funding and advisory support provided by a dedicated team of innovation specialists. These projects identified and tested over 18 innovative methods across UNDP and led to hundreds of new partnerships.
 - Helped reposition UNDP vis-à-vis governments and development partners in a number of countries as a technical partner for doing development differently over and above being a source of funding in fields such as governance and climate change.

2. Increased visibility, familiarity and understanding of UNDPs approach to innovation for development and Increased availability of qualified social innovators to support UNDP innovation for development work
 - The Facility's investments developed a network of innovation champions, confidence in using new approaches such as big data and behavioral insights, and capabilities at the country and regional level. These champions contributed their new expertise to existing projects and initiated new innovation projects beyond the Facility. Innovation Facility investments also helped constitute an innovation function at UNDP. This function has taken the form of a loose, interregional network of innovation specialists. The function has played an important role in joining up innovation activities across countries and spurring new ones. Notably, it has been crucial to the roll-out of the Accelerator Labs, powering the recruitment of Accelerator Lab teams, providing crucial guidance to those teams once they started, and supporting their integration into the work of Country Offices.

3. Improved organizational processes
 - At UNDP, the Facility led to cross-country and cross-regional collaborations as well as new forms of engagement with the private sector. In partner governments, the Facility led to the development of in-house innovation labs and new ways of designing policy.
 - Recently, the Innovation Facility has also been the cornerstone in UNDP's pivot towards system transformation. While the Facility has supported the development of a protocol supporting system transformation efforts in 7 countries, there has been a number of organizational spin-offs. The new 30 Accelerator Labs will be rolled out in part building on this method

ology. Malawi and Mongolia are applying it for transforming governance systems and managing climate-driven development transitions.

Documentation:

- Innovation Facility Review (UNDP, 2020)

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:

Reviews of course corrections in the project have happened both at the day-to-day operational level, and at the senior decision making level (project board).

The IF team has on a regular basis undertaken budget reviews and revisions against the workplan based on monitoring data and lessons learned. Details of this process and key actions from 2014-2019 are provided in a 2019 Fund Manager Handover note (see documentation below). More recently, the new Innovation Facility Fund Manager has with the Operations Analyst continued to conduct regular budget and work plan reviews during the implementation of 2020 IF activities.

The Project Board has approved the IF workplan (see IF Board Meeting Nov 2019) and reviewed implementation progress. Data and lessons learned have been used to inform course corrections. For instance, as described above (under “strategic”), the project board has considered and acted on data and lessons learned in reviewing and approving annual work plans, project extensions, expansion in board membership, and the recent pivot from “single point solutions” towards a focus on systems transformation.

Documentation:

- Malika Bhandakar Handover Note. Innovation Facility (UNDP 2019)
- IF Board Meeting Nov 2019
- IF Board Meeting Sep 2018
- IF Board meeting Feb 2017

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	27Feb2017IFBoardMeeting_6423_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormsDocuments/27Feb2017IFBoardMeeting_6423_316.pdf)	soren.haldrup@undp.org	12/3/2020 9:08:00 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 IF is committed to the Principles of Innovation and it encourages IF recipients to abide by these principles, including:

- Addressing privacy and security for beneficiaries, partners and stakeholders
- Designing with users, ensuring inclusion of multiple user types and stakeholders

The selection criteria in the IFs calls for proposals have been structured to identify proposed projects that respond to and address "leave no one behind" by considering whether a solution benefits the most marginalized or contributes to gender equality and women's empowerment.

Until its recent pivot, the IF project has operated through country-level initiatives, often in close collaboration with youth and gender teams in UNDP. 70% of the countries in which the IF invested between 2014 and 2015 were crisis-affected, least developed, landlocked or SIDS. In 2019, half of IF initiatives benefited youth and 3 in 5 of the IF projects have experimented with solutions for the most vulnerable groups, such as refugees, slum dwellers, migrants and women-headed households below the poverty line. 1 in 5 of IF solutions included the disabled or elderly.

The quantitative evidence is supported by qualitative data from innovation facility recipients: "To be very honest, previously, when they were designing a project, it would be one or two people sitting down writing the project proposal using the conventional interventions. Whereas now when we are facilitating these sessions, we bring in a lot of different other stakeholders into the table at the project design stage, be it the

government counterparts, or other strategic development partners.” (UNDP IF grant recipient Asia-Pacific).

Following the project’s pivot towards emphasis on system transformation, the IF had maintained a focus on beneficiaries, including the excluded and marginalized. For instance, informal market vendors and food supply workers in Angola and Zimbabwe (under the NextGenCities Africa initiative), youth in border communities (Burundi), and vulnerable communities in territorial districts in Colombia.

Documentation:

- Innovation Facility Review 2020
- Deep Demonstrations: the Journey Begins, Oct 2020
- 2018 Fund Allocation for the Innovation Facility Call for Proposals (UNDP 2018)

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	NTF2018InnovationFacilityCallforProposalsrev_6423_317 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/NTF2018InnovationFacilityCallforProposalsrev_6423_317.pdf)	soren.haldrup@undp.org	12/3/2020 9:16:00 PM

Sustainability & National Ownership

Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory

18. Were stakeholders and national partners fully engaged in the decision-making, implementation and monitoring of the project?

- 3: Only national systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) were used to fully implement and monitor the project. All relevant stakeholders and partners were fully and actively engaged in the process, playing a lead role in project decision-making, implementation and monitoring. (both must be true)
- 2: *National systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) were used to implement and monitor the project (such as country office support or project systems) were also used, if necessary. All relevant stakeholders and partners were actively engaged in the process, playing an active role in project decision-making, implementation and monitoring. (both must be true)*
- 1: There was relatively limited or no engagement with national stakeholders and partners in the decision-making, implementation and/or monitoring of the project.
- Not Applicable

Evidence:

The IF is committed to the Principles of Innovation and it encourages IF recipients to abide by these principles, including designing with users, ensuring inclusion of multiple user types and stakeholders.

IF funded initiatives have until 2019 been implemented in conjunction with existing UNDP projects in Country Offices. These existing projects have been aligned with principles of sustainability and national ownership. By introducing innovation elements into larger projects, these initiatives benefited from pre-existing relationships with government and implementation partners as well as amplified the impact of larger pools of resources. Generally, private sector and non-government partnerships have played a crucial role in all Innovation Facility projects

Following the project's pivot towards emphasis on system transformation, the IF had maintained a focus on engagement with stakeholders and partners. Across the Deep Demonstrations, the IF has a strong focus on engagement with a wide set of stakeholders – including beyond “the usual suspects” – to inform an understanding of challenges and possible entry points for solutions. For instance, the Tunisia country office have engaged with actors as diverse as a sociologist, social activist, football club supporter, movie director and public officials.

Documentation:

- Innovation Facility Review 2020
- What are we learning from (trying to) tackle systems transformation? (UNDP 2020) (<https://soren-vester-haldrup.medium.com/what-are-we-learning-from-trying-to-tackle-systems-transformation-60435be044ce>)

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:

N/A

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:

Sustainability at intervention level: All initiatives funded under the IF have been required to submit a scaling pathway and to work on scaling in different stages of the innovation process. Scaling and sustainability have also been a key part of the criteria by which p

Proposals have been selected. For instance, the 2018 Call for Proposals featured the following criterion: “does the proposal show scaling potential?”, which includes considerations of the role of other partners and routes for scale and whether an appropriate business model exists for an initiative to scale and be sustained.

Nevertheless, the 2020 IF review notes that “the experiment-and-scale strategy for innovation does not appear to produce a sufficiently steep increase in UNDP’s or its partners’ impact to achieve the SDGs”. This lesson has helped propel the recent pivot away from experimental single point solutions towards systems transformation.

Sustainability at the country level: the IF has had an impact on the Country Offices that have received funding under the facility. The Facility created space to test new approaches to development in an organization heavily focused on project delivery. IF support was most useful when built around “well-packaged” service lines whose value could easily be grasped within and outside the country office. The Innovation Facility had the most lasting impact on country offices where entrepreneurial staff built external demand for innovation and aligned multiple funding sources to form a new service line.

Sustainability at the global level: the IF has had impact in terms of moving innovation from the fringes to the core of the organization. The Innovation Facility has also been the cornerstone in UNDP’s pivot towards system transformation over the past year. While the Facility has supported the development of a protocol supporting system transformation efforts in 7 countries, there has been a number of organizational spin-offs. The new 30 Accelerator Labs will be rolled out in part building on this methodology. Malawi and Mongolia are applying it for transforming governance systems and managing climate-driven development transitions.

Transition and phase-out arrangements have been planned and initiated at both operational and senior levels towards the end of the project. The project board discussed and agreed on preparations for a transition to IF 2.0 in a meeting on 17 Sep 2018. At the operational level, the transition and project closure activities are now underway with the preparation of a Project Initiation Plan for the IF 2.0.

Documentation:

- 2018 Fund Allocation for the Innovation Facility Call for Proposals (UNDP 2018)

- 2020 Innovation Facility Review (UNDP 2020)
- IF Board Meeting September 2019

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments

No other comments