Implementation Stage Quality Assurance Report

Form Status: Approved

Overall Rating:	Highly Satisfactory
Decision:	Continue as planned: The project is of sufficient quality to continue as planned. All management actions must be addressed in a timely manner.
Portfolio/Project Number:	00093522
Portfolio/Project Title:	Dev.Support Services-Disaster Risk Reduction
Portfolio/Project Date:	2016-01-01 / 2023-03-31

Strategic **Quality Rating: Exemplary**

1. Is the project pro-actively identifying changes to the external environment and incorporating them into the project strategy?

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

Evidence:

The consultants hired at the district and state level c ontinuously incorporate the suggested changes in th e task assigned.

The updated activities are being monitored at the dis trict collector level in the district and by UNDP CO. T he department management plans have assessed th e COVID situation and have incorporated pandemic management as a part of the planning

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	16.PANDEMICINTEGRATEDUDDRevisedDMPMaharashtra_10221_201 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/16.PANDEMICINTEGRATEDUDDRevisedDMPMaharashtra_10221_201.pdf)	mohsin.anwar@undp.org	11/1/2021 6:24:00 AM

2. Is the project aligned with the UNDP Strategic Plan?

- (●) *3: The project responds at least one of the development settings[3] as specified in the Strategic Plan (SP) and adopts at least one Signature Solution[4] and the project's RRF includes at all the relevant SP output indicators. (all must be true)*
- ( ) 2: The project responds to one of the three areas of development work[1] as specified in the Strategic Plan. The project's RRF includes at least one SP output indicator, if relevant. (both must be true)
- ( ) 1: While the project may respond to a partner's identified need, this need falls outside the UNDP Strategic Plan. Also select this option if none of the relevant SP indicators are included in the RRF.

Evidence:

The project through activities like the development o
f department plans in Maharashtra and capacity buil
ding of officials on disaster management have been
able to respond to one major development setting us
ing an integrated approach in the implementation [c]
and adopts three
of the Signature Solution.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Relevant **Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

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

- 3: Systematic and structured feedback has been collected over the past two years 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 are 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 have been engaged in implementation and monitoring, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized. Beneficiary feedback, which may be anecdotal, has been collected over the past year to ensure the project is addressing local priorities. This information has been used to inform project decision making. (all must be true)*
- 1: Some beneficiary feedback may have been collected over the past year, but this information has not been used to inform project decision making. This option is also selected if no beneficiary feedback has been collected.
- Not Applicable

Evidence:

The developed department plans have incorporated cross-cutting issues like the role of women during di sasters, marginalization during the last mile connecti vity and caste-based discrimination during the respo nse phase of disaster management.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	6.EnvironmentDept.MaharashtraDMP_10221_203 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/6.EnvironmentDept.MaharashtraDMP_10221_203.pdf)	mohsin.anwar@undp.org	11/1/2021 6:25:00 AM

4. Is the project generating 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 have been 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, have been 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 have been collected by the project team. There is little or no evidence that this has informed project decision making.

Evidence:

The project has been developing knowledge products to disseminate the lessons learnt. Be it the trainings organized at the district and state levels on first aid, search and rescue or the DM plans developed. The learnings are shared with the government officials and other stakeholder quarterly.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

5. Is the project sufficiently at scale, or is there potential to scale up in the future, to meaningfully contribute to development change?

- ○ 3: There is credible evidence that the project is reaching a 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 is currently not 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 is not at scale, and there are no plans currently to scale up the project in the future.

Evidence:

The project is working with both the state government on building the resilience but there
is a chance of scaling up the project activity and work towards mainstreaming DRM, urban resilience and conducting hazard, risk, vulnerability assessment for which the discussions have been initiated with the state government.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Principled **Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory**

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

- ◉ *3: The project team has systematically 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 has 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 has 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 plans developed talks about the role of women during disasters in the cross-cutting chapter. Also, th e consultants talk about gender equality as a part of the training curriculum in HP.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

7. Are social and environmental impacts and risks being successfully managed and monitored?

- ○ 3: Social and environmental risks are tracked in the risk log. Appropriate assessments conducted where required (i.e., Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) for Substantial and 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 has been a substantive change to the project or change in context that affects risk levels, the SESP is updated to reflect these changes. (all must be true)
- ◉ *2: Social and environmental risks are tracked in the risk log. Appropriate assessments conducted where required (i.e., Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) for Substantial and 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 is categorized as Low risk through the SESP.*
- ○ 1: Social and environmental risks have not been tracked in the risk log. For projects categorized as High, Substantial, and Moderate Risk there is no evidence that social and environmental assessments have been completed and/or management plans or measures development, implemented or monitored. There have been substantive changes to the project or changes in the context but SESP has not been updated. (any may be true)

Evidence:

The trainings in HP specifically reaches out to the co mmunity and makes sure that the social risks are bei ng addressed. At the same time, the plans develope d in Maharashtra have assessed the environmental r isks through climate modeling in the finalized plans.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	24.WaterResourcesDept.MaharashtraDMP_10221_207 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/24.WaterResourcesDept.MaharashtraDMP_10221_207.pdf)	mohsin.anwar@undp.org	11/1/2021 6:31:00 AM

8. Are grievance mechanisms available to project-affected people and are grievances (if any) addressed to ensure any perceived harm is effectively mitigated?

- ○ 3: Project-affected people have been actively informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism (SRM/SECU) and how to access it. If the project is categorized as High, Substantial, or Moderate Risk through the SESP, a project-level grievance mechanism is in place and project affected people informed. If grievances have been received, they are effectively addressed in accordance with SRM Guidance. (all must be true)
- ◉ *2: Project-affected people have been informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism and how to access it. If the project is categorized as Substantial or High Risk through the SESP, a project-level grievance mechanism is in place and project affected people informed. If grievances have been received they are responded to but face challenges in arriving at a resolution.*
- ○ 1: Project-affected people not informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism. If grievances have been received they are not responded to. (any may be true)

Evidence:

The DC of the districts forms the immediate points of contact for grievance in HP. Additionally, the project associate in UNDP CO have been asked to be in tou ch with all consultants for any such issue.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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

9. Is the project's M&E Plan sufficient and adequately implemented?

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

Evidence:

Submission of Quarterly & Monthly Reports to DC a nd UNDP

Planned budget for PSC Meeting and other M&E act ivities.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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

- ○ 3: The project's governance mechanism is operating well, and is a model for other projects. It has met in the agreed frequency stated in the project document and the minutes of the meetings are on file. There is 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 reviews and uses 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 has met in the agreed frequency and the minutes of the meeting are on file. A project progress report has been submitted to the project board or equivalent at least once in the past year, covering results, risks and opportunities. (both must be true to select this option)*
- ○ 1: The project's governance mechanism has not met in the frequency stated in the project document over the past year and/or the project board or equivalent is not functioning as a decision-making body for the project as intended.

Evidence:

The project's governance mechanism including the special secretary Department of Revenue has met in the agreed frequency and the minutes of the meeting are on file. An annual project report is also submitted to the government partner.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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

- *3: The project has actively monitored risks every quarter including consulting with key stakeholders, including security advisors, to identify continuing and emerging risks and to assess if the main assumptions remain valid. There is clear evidence that relevant management plans and mitigating measures are being fully implemented to address each key project risk, and have been updated to reflect the latest risk assessment. (all must be true)*
- 2: The project has monitored risks every year, as evidenced by an updated risk log. Some updates have been made to management plans and mitigation measures.
- 1: The risk log has not been updated as required. There may be some evidence that the project has monitored risks (including security risks or incidents) that may affect the project's achievement of results, but there is no explicit evidence that management actions have been taken to mitigate risks. In the case of a deteriorating security environment, no consultation has occurred with the UNDP Security Office on appropriate measures.

Evidence:

Based on the experience and risk assessment over the last five years, all possible risks have been adequately mitigated either through a democratic approach of community involvement, discussion with District Administration and the state department.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Efficient **Quality Rating: Exemplary**

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

- (●) *Yes*
- ( ) No

Evidence:

Yes, both the government of HP and Maharashtra h ave provided adequate funds to achieve the desired outputs. The funds in the case of HP were sufficient to build the capacity of the SDMA and the DDMA wh ile in Maharashtra they were enough to develop all t he required plans.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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

- (●) *3: The project has an updated procurement plan. Implementation of the plan is on or ahead of schedule. The project quarterly reviews operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addresses them through appropriate management actions. (all must be true)*
- ( ) 2: The project has an updated procurement plan. The project annually reviews operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addresses them through appropriate management actions. (all must be true)
- ( ) 1: The project does not have an updated procurement plan. The project may or may not have reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner, however management actions have not been taken to address them.

Evidence:

Despite the continuous change in leadership at the s tate level, and now COVID, the project is in a comfor table position to complete all its deliverables within t he planned timeline.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

14. Is there regular monitoring and recording of cost efficiencies taking into account the expected quality of results?

- *3: There is evidence that the project regularly reviews costs against relevant comparators (e.g., other projects or country offices) or industry benchmarks to ensure the project maximizes results that can be delivered with given resources. The project actively coordinates with other relevant ongoing projects and initiatives (UNDP or other) to ensure complementarity and seek efficiencies wherever possible (e.g. joint activities.) (both must be true)*
- 2: The project monitors its own costs and gives anecdotal examples of cost efficiencies (e.g., spending less to get the same result,) but there is no systematic analysis of costs and no link to the expected quality of results delivered. The project coordinates activities with other projects to achieve cost efficiency gains.
- 1: There is little or no evidence that the project monitors its own costs and is considering ways to save money beyond following standard procurement rules.

Evidence:

Adapting the best practices from other similar comm unity resilience projects of the unit. It also coordinate s with other relevant ongoing projects of the state go vernment.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Effective **Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory**

15. Is the project is on track to deliver its expected outputs?

- *Yes*
- No

Evidence:

Yes the project is on track to deliver the expected ou tputs. Most of the activities have already been achie ved and the last years of the HP component will deli ver the remaining outputs.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

16. Have there been regular reviews of the work plan to ensure that the project is on track to achieve the desired results, and to inform course corrections if needed?

- *3: Quarterly progress data has informed regular reviews of the project work plan to ensure that the activities implemented are most likely to achieve the desired results. There is evidence that data and lessons learned (including from evaluations and/or After Action Reviews) have been used to inform course corrections, as needed. Any necessary budget revisions have been made. (both must be true)*
- 2: There has been at least one review of the work plan per year to assess if project activities are on track to achieving the desired development results (i.e., outputs.) There may or may not be evidence that data or lessons learned has been 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 are delivered on time, no link has been made to the delivery of desired development results. Select this option also if no review of the work plan by management has taken place over the past year.

Evidence:

Submission of the monthly report by the consultants to the state administration gives a clear picture of th e activities being implemented on the ground.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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

- 3: The project is targeting 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 are being reached as intended. The project has engaged regularly with targeted groups over the past year to assess whether they are benefiting as expected and adjustments were made if necessary to refine targeting. (all must be true)
- *2: The project is targeting 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 has been some engagement with beneficiaries in the past year to assess whether they are benefiting as expected. (all must be true)*
- 1: The project does not report on specific targeted groups. There is no evidence to confirm that project beneficiaries are deprived and/or excluded from development opportunities relevant to the project area of work. There may have been some engagement with beneficiaries to assess whether they are benefiting as expected, but it has been limited or has not occurred in the past year.
- Not Applicable

Evidence:

The DM plans have talked about the marginalized gr oups under the cross cutting part of the plans. The tr ainings and capacity building exercises in HP to hav e worked with the targeted groups on various DRR mechanisms.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Sustainability & National Ownership **Quality Rating: Exemplary**

18. Are 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.) are used to fully implement and monitor the project. All relevant stakeholders and partners are 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.) are used to implement and monitor the project, but other support (such as country office support or project systems) may also be used if necessary. All relevant stakeholders and partners are fully and actively engaged in the process, playing an active role in project decision-making, implementation and monitoring. (both must be true)
- 1: There is relatively limited or no engagement with national stakeholders and partners in the decision-making, implementation and/or monitoring of the project.
- Not Applicable

Evidence:

In relation to the project, team members across units within UNDP and other partner organizations, including state governments are equally active and contributing in the project. Also, only the national systems are utilized to implement the projects.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

19. There is regular monitoring of changes in capacities and performance of institutions and systems relevant to the project, as needed. The implementation arrangements[5] have been adjusted according to changes in partner capacities.

- *3: In the past two years, changes in capacities and performance of institutions and systems have been comprehensively assessed/monitored using clear indicators, rigorous methods of data collection and credible data sources including relevant HACT assurance activities. Implementation arrangements have been formally reviewed and adjusted, if needed, in agreement with partners according to changes in partner capacities. (both must be true)*
- 2: In the past two years, aspects of changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems have been monitored by the project using indicators and reasonably credible data sources including relevant HACT assurance activities. Some adjustment has been made to implementation arrangements if needed to reflect changes in partner capacities. (both 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:

The project has witnessed the change in leadership at both the state and district level. The new suggestions made by the community and stakeholders have been formally monitored against the set indicators. Also, any change in the project activities have also been approved by the state administration and the department of DM.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

20. The transition and phase-out arrangements are reviewed regularly and adjusted according to progress (including financial commitments and capacity).

- ◉ *3: The project's governance mechanism has reviewed the project's sustainability plan, including arrangements for transition and phase-out, to ensure the project is on track in meeting the requirements set out by the plan. The plan has been adjusted according to progress as needed. (both must be true)*
- ○ 2: There has been a review of the project's sustainability plan, including arrangements for transition and phase-out, to ensure the project is on track in meeting the requirements set out by the plan.
- ○ 1: The project may have a sustainability plan, but there has not been a review of this strategy since it was developed. Also select this option if the project does not have a sustainability strategy.

Evidence:

The project transition and phase out plan will be adj
usted according to the set indicators. To make sure t
he project remains sustainable all the implemented
project activities are implemented in partnership with
the community and the local administration so that t
hey are well aware of the
nitty-gritties of the project

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

QA Summary/Project Board Comments