

# Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

**Form Status: Approved**

<b>Overall Rating:</b>	Satisfactory
<b>Decision:</b>	
<b>Portfolio/Project Number:</b>	00093806
<b>Portfolio/Project Title:</b>	Mainstreaming, Acceleration and Policy Support (MAPS)
<b>Portfolio/Project Date:</b>	2016-01-01 / 2021-03-31

**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:**

The project conducted several consultations (list of publications attached in Annex 3, MTR 2018), one mid term evaluation and an audit. Recommendations emerging from both audit and MTE were incorporated in 2019 and the creation of 3 new outputs.

Key finding from MTR points out "The Project contributed considerably to the UNDP support to the implementation of the 2030 Agenda, as well as to developing partnerships around the 2030 Agenda within UN and beyond. This was at the core of the Project because this Project represents the main pillar of UNDP on supporting the 2030 Agenda. It helped UNDP act quickly and provide support to countries when no other UN agency was able to do so. It then improved the involvement of other UN agencies, and partners beyond the UN, and further improved the comprehensive assistance to countries on MAPS, including through SDG data and reporting." p.18  
A new global project document is being formulated building on identified opportunities and assumptions tested in MAPS project.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MAPSAuditReport_4664_301.pdf">MAPSAuditReport_4664_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MAPSAuditReport_4664_301.pdf)</a>	nermine.wally@undp.org	3/6/2020 7:52:00 PM
2	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MTEofMAPSProject-INTEGRATEDReportfinalversion1_4664_301.pdf">MTEofMAPSProject-INTEGRATEDReportfinalversion1_4664_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MTEofMAPSProject-INTEGRATEDReportfinalversion1_4664_301.pdf)</a>	nermine.wally@undp.org	3/6/2020 7:50:00 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 settings<sup>1</sup> 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:**

Evidence

- The project's overarching purpose and focus are identical to those proposed in the draft SP 2018-2021, i.e. 1.1 support Member States in the implementation of the 2030 Agenda.
- The project therefore responds to the 6 signature solutions through its integrated approach to country support.
- The project supports the global policy and advisory platform as proposed by UNDP's SP 2018-2021
- Supporting countries with preparation of VNR and SDGRs will enhance accountability to achieve the SDGs, supporting transformational sustainable development and achievement of the 2030 Agenda as specified in the SP
- The Project's RRF includes outcome indicator 7 from IRRF 2014-2017; with the adoption of new IRRF, the Project's RRF needs to be reviewed again.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

**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 MAPS Project was designed to directly engage with countries and regions as a Global Project. Because of the demand driven nature of the project, it frames interventions within the 20203 Agenda and the SDGs (LNOB). The following can be recognized as efforts to engage with populations that are likely to be excluded and marginalized:

- Support provided toward VNRs to countries and support for LNOB reporting
- The PovRisk tool that analyses the risks of people falling back into poverty was applied in 6 countries to help develop improved anti-poverty policies and programs;
- Through the SDG Action Campaign’s work, the voices of individuals are collected to monitor the SDG progress; also the private sector actors have been engaged in seeking solutions for the SDGs.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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:

MTE 2018 pointed out "On the other side, the Project produced more deliverables than what might have been expected. Most importantly, the Project learned from past lessons and continuously introduced adequate and timely corrective measures - and continued to evolve in line with the changing context and country demands."p.15. Confer Annex 3 for key knowledge tools and outputs produced with MAPS support.

Taking stock and lessons learned are an integral part of the MAPS projects:

- A global MAPS workshop was organized in Jan 2017 to share lessons learned from the implementation of the Project with a particular focus on MAPS missions;
- A MAPS analysis report was published on the best practices and lessons learnt from the 22 MAPS mission that has been conducted;
- The first RC Dialogue was convened in NY during the 2017 HLPF to discuss lessons learned from the VNR process;
- A series of webinar is being conducted during 2017, 2018, 2019 and 2020 to disseminate lessons learned from the Project and receive feedback from regional- and country-level colleagues;
- COntribution to the SDG Country Reporting Guidelines to generate additional knowledge in partnership with other UNDG members;
- Helped produce guidance note on VNR and SDGR with DESA to inform Cos
- The "SDGs are Coming to Life" publication issued 2016 collected feedback on the opportunities and challenges of mainstreaming the 2030 Agenda, informing subsequent advisory support (e.g. in context of MAPS missions);

In addition, additional information and exchanges through:

- MAPS Technical Support Team intranet page on SDG implementation, Yammer, etc.).

- SDG Integration Community of Practice

List of publications:

2016 Africa Data Revolution Report May 2016  
 The SDGs are Coming to Life: Stories of Country Implementation and UN Support July 2016  
 UNDP Offer on SDG Implementation in Fragile States Oct 2016  
 International Futures in Moldova Sept 2017  
 International Futures in Brazil Dec 2017  
 International Futures in Turkmenistan Nov 2017  
 International Futures in Uzbekistan July 2018  
 MAPS Mission Engagement and SDG Implementation Support (synthesis report) April 2018

#### 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:

The project was designed to respond to country needs for technical and integrated support, through a MAPS approach. The project's scale was considered sufficient in concept, since it is demand driven. For example, the majority of the MAPS mission requested and deemed feasible were implemented (Confer MTR assessment)

**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:**

One of the recommendations emerging from the audit and MTR was to revise and refine the Result Framework and adjust some outputs to reflect some of the emerging trends (confer question #1). Consequently, in 2018 the team revised the outputs, updated ATLAS accordingly and prepared an offline M&E framework to track progress.

**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:

When the Project was endorsed, it was recognized that there are no potential social and environmental risks generated by the Project. (see p.28 of ProDoc)

The MAPS project was recorded as a development project, it is indeed a global project that interacts directly with country office, regional bureaus and government.

- All guidance, advisory support, screening of outputs focus on ensuring that project-funded activities uphold the fundamental principles laid out in the 2030 Agenda: integrated nature of sustainable development (economic, social, environmental), leave no one behind & reaching the furthest behind first, and universal application.
- MAPS missions strongly emphasized gender, social and environmental dimensions, along with economic priorities.
- Several tools, such as the CLEWS (climate, land, energy, water systems) and microsimulations for poverty is focused around the environment and social objectives.
- The LNOB study being conducted in 8 countries examines the social and environmental risks and impacts for the populations that are likely to be left behind.



**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:**

When the Project was endorsed, it was recognized that there are no potential social and environmental risks generated by the Project. (see p.28 of ProDoc)  
Confer answer in Q#7

**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 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 has the M&E framework (p.22, Pro Doc). the mid-term evaluation is scheduled and budgeted during Year 3 of the Project (p.20, ProDoc).
- As indicated above, feedback from relevant stakeholders and lessons learned adjusted project activities, particularly for MAPS missions and VNR/SDG R support.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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

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

**Evidence:**

- The Project Board convened for the first time in 2017 and another one in Nov. 2018

While it is supposed to convene annually, the Project Board did not meet in 2016 partly because the major donor contribution to the Project became available at the end of 2016. While there was no formal Board Meeting in 2016, the Project was informed by consultations with BPPS colleagues through MAPS Technical Support Team, Regional Bureaus, Regional Hubs as well as other UNDG members. Confer Board composition, minutes and presentation

The MTR and Audit suggested a flexible modality of work for the future of the MAPS project, since it is not a traditional development project. A recommendation suggested having it as an Engagement Facility, hence

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Draft_MAPSProjectBoardMinutes_Nov92018_4664_310 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Draft_MAPSProjectBoardMinutes_Nov92018_4664_310.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Draft_MAPSProjectBoardMinutes_Nov92018_4664_310.docx</a> )	nermine.wally@undp.org	3/6/2020 7:32:00 PM
2	MAPSBoardMeeting_Nov9_4664_310 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MAPSBoardMeeting_Nov9_4664_310.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MAPSBoardMeeting_Nov9_4664_310.pdf</a> )	nermine.wally@undp.org	3/6/2020 7:32:00 PM
3	MTEofMAPSProject-INTEGRATEDReportfinalversion_4664_310 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MTEofMAPSProject-INTEGRATEDReportfinalversion_4664_310.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MTEofMAPSProject-INTEGRATEDReportfinalversion_4664_310.pdf</a> )	nermine.wally@undp.org	3/6/2020 7:33:00 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 risks have been constantly monitored throughout the delivery of the Project. Risks have been managed and entered in ATALS. The pipeline approach was utilized to register country demands for integrated policy support and tools-related support so that the Project can have flexibility in responding to country needs in case of changes in the original implementation plan.

<b>List of Uploaded Documents</b>			
#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

**Efficient**

**Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory**

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

- Yes
- No

**Evidence:**

The Project initially had a very ambitious budget plan; a revised multi-year budget plan was conducted for the 2017 Board Meeting. Also, stronger efforts will be made to mobilize resources to achieve intended results. The overall delivery stands at \$20,111,382 with the biggest contribution coming from the Korean Government.

<b>List of Uploaded Documents</b>			
#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

13. Were project inputs procured and delivered on time to efficiently contribute to results?

- 3: The project had a procurement plan and kept it updated. The project quarterly reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addressed them through appropriate management actions. (all must be true)*
- 2: The project had updated procurement plan. The project annually reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addressed them through appropriate management actions. (all must be true)
- 1: The project did not have an updated procurement plan. The project team may or may not have reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs regularly, however management actions were not taken to address them.

**Evidence:**

The Project has a centralized procurement plan that is consolidated, managed, and supported by the program analyst. This is being updated as new demands emerge for procurement services. The project procurement plan was set at the beginning of the year to the corporate procurement system, and updated on the go,

### 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 2018 annual report highlights the project good capacity for review and outputs versus costs.

The Project took into account cost-effective strategies that can minimize the overall costs of implementation, while maximising value-creation. Often partnerships are mobilised for cost-efficient and effective interventions. Particularly, the arrangement of a technical workshop for government officials on the application of modelling tools, UNDP partnered with UNDESA, KTH Royal Institute of Technology, International Center for Theoretical Physics (ICTP), and Cambridge University who made financial and in-kind contributions to the workshop.

Also, the project looked into regional and country office co-financing modalities, notably for the analytical work conducted by the International Futures and think tanks.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	MAPSProject2018Report_Final_07_03_2019_4664_314 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MAPSProject2018Report_Final_07_03_2019_4664_314.pdf)	nermine.wally@undp.org	3/6/2020 7:45:00 PM

**Effective**

**Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

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

- Yes
- No

**Evidence:**

Yes

The expected outputs have been delivered (confer section of MTR p.15 onward). MTR points out" it seems remarkable that the Project achieved such high volume of deliverables and provided quality services to beneficiaries in very diverse context - while also producing a multiplicatory effect for overall MAPS approach at global, regional and country levels. Some of the main factors for the success, as validated by stakeholders, had to do with: enthusiasm and inner drive of the Project team; commitment and support by the leadership; UNDP allowing for flexible implementation of the Project; and partnerships at global, regional and country levels, within UNDP and with other UN Agencies.: p. 13.

Original results framework had very ambitious targets and budget plan, so the revised results framework and budget plan incorporated recommendations emerging from MTR and audit of 2018. Annual reports were regularly prepared for 2017 and 2018. A final report is expected to be completed in mid 2020 for the closure of this project.

**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:**

Quarterly budget reviews have taken place under the guidance of the Team Lead on the 2030 Agenda. At these reviews, not only the budget but also the work plan has been closely reviewed to track progress and to assess the need for adjustment. A PIP was initiated in 2020, paving for the new project expected to kick off in Q2 2020.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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

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

**Evidence:**

This criterion is not applicable for the Project. please confer q.3

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

**Sustainability & National Ownership****Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory**

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

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

**Evidence:**

The MTE 2018 points out that "MAPS missions and engagements were also at the forefront of promoting the integrated approach to the SDGs emphasizing their indivisibility, multi-stakeholder involvement, and critical inter-linkages that are necessary for producing catalytic, systemic change"

Yes

(3)

The expected outputs are being delivered through the Project; the quality of outputs is improving based on the team's self-assessment and feedback from stakeholders. The original results framework had very ambitious targets and budget plan, so the revised results framework and budget plan is being submitted at the upcoming Board Meeting.

**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](#)<sup>8</sup> 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:**

HACT not applicable

**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:**

Board recommendations, MTR an audit suggest the following:

- The first issue for sustainability is funding. Capitalizing on core and other resources to continue building on good results.
- The second most important sustainability issue is the future role and place of the MAPS approach, both within UNDP and in relation to UNDG.
- With regard to the operational capacity, the turnover of staff might continue to represent a problem. Business Model improvements, including implementation arrangements.

A project document is now under review, managed under BPPS by SDG Integration Team, and implementation under engagement facility is agreed. The operational model and staff retention remain a key priority.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

**QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments**

This QA marks the closure of the MAPS project. A new global project entitled SDG Integration Service offer is now being developed and will include a dedicated component in MAPS engagement, in addition to other components that contribute to UNDP integrator role/ agenda. Key recommendations emerging from the 2018 MTR and 2018 audit are incorporated and reflected in the new project. A PIP is now initiated on ATLAS, a project manager has been appointed in late 2019 to manage the global project, and a resource mobilisation and a partnership strategy are underway.