

Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

Form Status: Approved

Overall Rating:	Highly Satisfactory
Decision:	
Portfolio/Project Number:	00079191
Portfolio/Project Title:	INTERDEV 1
Portfolio/Project Date:	2014-01-15 / 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:

The project timely and proactively identified the changes, and opportunities and incorporated them in the project strategy. The strategy was assessed against the developments and circumstances. The project board met regularly and considered all the implications and when changes are needed they were well elaborated and approved when needed. (see the attachment on minutes from the PB meetings in section 10)

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	INTERDEV2FinalNarrativeReportFeb201731Jan.2020_5617_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/INTERDEV2FinalNarrativeReportFeb201731Jan.2020_5617_301.docx)	anton.selitaj@undp.org	8/26/2020 5:30:00 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 project responded to development setting a) Eradicate poverty in all its forms and dimensions and applies signature solutions a) Keeping people out of poverty; b) Strengthen effective, inclusive and accountable governance. The project RRF did not have indicators of the UNDP SP as the project started prior to the SP, however, the project is linked to relevant SP indicators in the corporate IT systems (1.1.2.3 Country has an improved enabling environment for expansion of decent work and livelihoods; 1.2.1.1 National and sub-national governments have improved capacities to plan, budget, manage and monitor basic services).

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Relevant**Quality Rating: Exemplary**

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

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

Evidence:

The project groups were well identified and engaged during the project implementation. The project itself was implemented in three multi ethnic municipalities. The marginalized groups, women and long term unemployed were major beneficiaries in the project schemes. Only in the local micro and small enterprises and farmers grants scheme throughout the project cycle 236 new jobs were created, whereof 102 (43%) were for women and 85 (36%) were for non-majority community members.

The representatives of the three targeted municipalities were participating in the boards and all forms of governance mechanisms.

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:

The project has generated a lot of valuable knowledge in all the three components as this is a specific project and approach on local development. The project underwent the scheduled external mid-term evaluation that assessed progress of the project against its plan, its results and impact, as well as provided recommendations and lessons learned for the second part of the INTERDEV 2 project. The full report was shared with the donor, and findings were discussed among the Project Board members. Furthermore, the project conducted also the scheduled external final evaluation starting from October – December 2019 that assessed progress of the project against its plan, its results and impact, the implementation of recommendations from the mid-term evaluation, as well as provided recommendations and lessons learned in a dedicated workshop with Project Board and stakeholders. The finalized version of the report is received with recommendations for UNDP, ADA and municipalities capturing the way forward for potential INTERDEV stage 3 and in the future scale up initiatives.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	LessonsLearned_5617_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/LessonsLearned_5617_304.docx)	anton.selitaj@undp.org	8/26/2020 5:05:00 PM

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

- 3: There was credible evidence that the project reached sufficient number of beneficiaries (either directly through significant coverage of target groups, or indirectly, through policy change) to meaningfully contribute to development change.**
- 2: While the project was not considered at scale, there are explicit plans in place to scale up the project in the future (e.g. by extending its coverage or using project results to advocate for policy change).**
- 1: The project was not at scale, and there are no plans to scale up the project in the future.**

Evidence:

The project was sufficiently at scale and the targets fully achieved and were even exceeded in some components.

The grant scheme exceeded the targets, completed calls, resulted with 58 projects receiving financial support to improve productivity, created jobs and strengthened income generation, well beyond the project's original target of 45.

In component related to TEPs, 595 additional job opportunities created in the three municipalities by the end of the TEPs implementation

The project contributed significantly in the change for lives of many beneficiaries directly and also had in direct impact in the targeted municipalities.

The project has a great potential for scale up in the future and this was recommended in the final evaluation.

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 measures addressed and even exceeded the targets regarding the gender and women empowerment.

In a gender-sensitive manner, design Territorial Employment Pact in Viti/Vitina used a participatory approach and expanded the current TEPs in Dragash/Dragaš and Shtërpçë/Štrpce.

In the local micro and small enterprises and farmers grants scheme throughout the project cycle 236 new jobs were created, whereof 102 (43%) were for women.

In the TEPs 40% of additional job opportunities created are for women

The data and evidences were gathered in a gender segregated manner and were used to inform adjustments and decision making.

The final evaluation has assessed that gender has been very much present in the project activities and that the project has made considerable efforts to mainstream gender in all its strategies with considerable results. Most significantly, the women beneficiaries of the project have taken new roles as entrepreneurs mostly in the agricultural sector, but also in other productive areas such as trade.

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 project was categorized as Low Risk by SESP. The social and environmental impacts and risks were successfully managed and monitored in general. The risks were identified and addressed.

In addition to the ADA standards, UNDP applied the SESP and Accountability Mechanism as a key element of quality assurance, a demonstration of commitment to the highest standards of transparency, and accountability and sustainability in response to growing demand from external stakeholders. The project in general has enhanced positive social and environmental opportunities and benefits as well as ensure that adverse social and environmental risks and impacts are avoided, minimized, and mitigated.

The small grants applications for micro-enterprises contain environmental criteria, including all advisory services to local producers/farmers, which have an environmental protection as a strong element included to address it.

The final evaluation emphasizes that the project has implemented capacity building measures related to agricultural best practices on the safe use of pesticides, environmentally friendly harvesting methods, water saving and waste management. Moreover, the Value Chain analysis emphasized the protection of natural resources as a factor of growth. Regarding the livestock sector was more focused on waste management and animal welfare, while the fruit and vegetable producers paid more attention on controlled use of pesticides. Less use of pesticides and water saving, especially among raspberry producers, was the most prevalent environmental protection measure applied. A positive experience in this regard was the cooperation with one company which started exporting to European countries and Canada, prompting farmers to comply with the required standards.

Harvesting methods were also an important environment protection measure through environmentally friendly harvesting techniques to protect the flora of the national park.”

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	INTERDEV2-06_Annex_5_Environmental_Integration_ChecklistFINAL_5617_307 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/INTERDEV2-06_Annex_5_Environmental_Integration_ChecklistFINAL_5617_307.doc)	anton.selitaj@undp.org	3/4/2022 11:26:00 AM
2	INTERDEV2-08_Annex_7_Social_Standards_AssessmentFINAL_5617_307 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/INTERDEV2-08_Annex_7_Social_Standards_AssessmentFINAL_5617_307.docx)	anton.selitaj@undp.org	3/4/2022 11:27:00 AM

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:

The beneficiaries were informed about the UNDP approach and standards of performance, their rights and opportunities.

The project had fielded constant personnel presence in the partner municipalities identified, managed and responds to any grievances that arose throughout the project implementation. All the grievances were addressed in the project, programme and board levels.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Management & Monitoring**Quality Rating: Exemplary**

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 M&E plan was fully and successfully implemented.

The project had a clear RRF with well defined baselines, targets and milestones etc. The project measured the progress against well defined indicators. The periodic progress reports were prepared regularly using credible data sources, evidences were collected in a segregated manner including, ethnicity, sex data as relevant etc. Other monitoring mechanisms such as field visits, meetings, inspections etc were conducted.

The project had a well costed and funded M&E plan and has conducted the Midterm Evaluation and also the Final Evaluation (see the uploaded documents) Both overvaluations were conducted according to highest standards of UNEG. The findings,, recommendations and lessons learned were captured, used and corrective actions were undertaken accordingly.

The management responses and key actions to the recommendations are followed and conducted in ER C

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	INTERDEV2MidTermEvaluationReport_5617_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/INTERDEV2MidTermEvaluationReport_5617_309.pdf)	anton.selitaj@undp.org	8/25/2020 11:28:00 PM
2	FInalEvaluationReportINTERDEV2__5617_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FInalEvaluationReportINTERDEV2__5617_309.pdf)	anton.selitaj@undp.org	8/25/2020 11:28:00 PM

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

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

Evidence:

The project governance structure operated well. The project had a board and a good representation of the UNDP, the donor and the beneficiary institutions and municipalities. The board meet on a regular, 6-month basis. The progress reporting was done semi-annually, including results, risks, opportunities lessons learned. The project board utilized the reporting and any evaluation outcomes as evidence for decision-making, and event minutes were filed. The project board also analysed findings of the mid-term external evaluation in late 2018, both through a dedicated debriefing workshop in 2018, as well as the regular project board meeting in early 2019. The final evaluation findings and recommendations and potential scale up were discussed in the board meeting at the end of 2020.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	InTerDev2FirstPBMMinutes05July2017ENG_5617_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/InTerDev2FirstPBMMinutes05July2017ENG_5617_310.doc)	anton.selitaj@undp.org	8/25/2020 11:59:00 PM
2	InTerDev2SecondPBMMinutes13Feb2018_ENG_5617_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/InTerDev2SecondPBMMinutes13Feb2018_ENG_5617_310.doc)	anton.selitaj@undp.org	8/25/2020 11:59:00 PM
3	InTerDev2ThirdPBMMinutes05Sep2018_ENG_452_210_5617_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/InTerDev2ThirdPBMMinutes05Sep2018_ENG_452_210_5617_310.doc)	anton.selitaj@undp.org	8/26/2020 12:00:00 AM
4	INTERDEV2FourthPBMMinutes28Feb2019_ENG_452_210_5617_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/INTERDEV2FourthPBMMinutes28Feb2019_ENG_452_210_5617_310.doc)	anton.selitaj@undp.org	8/26/2020 12:00:00 AM

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 monitored and managed risks timely and adequately, Risks throughout the project were well identified, assessed, monitored, addressed and managed. They were reported and escalated when needed and actions were undertaken accordingly. In the atlas risk management log modules they were clearly evidenced and management responses were recorded.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Efficient**Quality Rating: Exemplary**

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 managed to mobilize the necessary resources to achieve its objectives and targets. Beside the major donor which was ADA, the local beneficiary municipalities contributed more funds than originally envisaged, while contribution of Ministry of Labour was provided through direct implementation of ALM Ps. UNDP also contributed with a small contribution to the project.

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:

In general the project had the inputs procured and all so delivered on time. The project prepared the annual procurement plans and updated procurement plan, along with utilization of PROMPT system, and has assessed risks and mechanisms of procurement regularly. Lessons learned from the first phase of the project were key in identifying proper procurement methods as well as cost estimates. Some challenges were faced in finalizing procurement processes given limited responsive bids received. In this regard, the project has responded re-advertising the procurement processes several times along with modification of TORs / specifications accordingly to identify appropriate suppliers / service providers.

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:

There was a continuous monitoring and also recording of the cost efficiency against the targeted results and also vs relevant compactors in the market. This was done in project level but also close monitoring was done by the office programme and operations. The regular spot checks were conducted to the implementing partner in Component 2. (see attachment on section 19)

The project actively coordinated and used the synergies with other relevant ongoing projects within UNDP, ALMP2 project and also project funded by other donor like ADA, EU, ASB etc.

The project not only was cost efficient to achieve the targeted results but planning and rational approach resulted in exceeding the results expected. (see the attached Final Progress Report). The final evaluation shows that there was a significant return on investment through this project; from 1.4 mill investment, the income generated through the production was over 3.4 mill over 3 years.

List of Uploaded Documents

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

No documents available.

Effective

Quality Rating: Exemplary

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

- Yes
- No

Evidence:

The project throughout the cycle was on track, was implemented on a timely manner. All the expected outputs were delivered on time and successfully. In some components there were noted also exceeds.

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:

There were good monitoring mechanisms throughout the project cycle. The project team jointly with representatives of the LAGs monitored project's progress in the stages of full implementation, measuring results and assessing any challenges that feed into the progress against qualitative and quantitative indicators outlined in the logical framework. The project has active logs in Atlas (the project management software used by UNDP) that is regularly updated by the Project Manager.

The UNDP Programme staff in charge with quality assurance of the INTERDEV 2 project also conducted periodical visits to the project sites, quality assurance of all written materials, and oversight of financial and administrative aspects of project.

There were regular monthly meetings between the project team and the programme team to have regular reviews of the project annual plans, achievements, risks, obstacles, lessons learned etc.

All the evidence was shared with project board who since the beginning of the project in 2014 and also in the second stage from 2017, other members of the Project Board were also invited to participate in site visits periodically including the donor representatives from ADA in Vienna and Prishtinë/Priština.

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 occurred in the past year.
- Not Applicable

Evidence:

The project was implemented in specific targeted geographic areas which are mixed and mutli ethnic character is noted.

Through the mechanisms of the TEP, capacity development & improvements in public service delivery, as well as the Local Development Fund reached vulnerable beneficiaries. The TEP design was to promote adequate socioeconomic inclusion through its profiling table, specifics of each public call for support packages, as well as subsequent field assessments and monitoring. External evaluations assessed the project's reach and exceed of non majority community beneficiaries, in overall, 45.4% of job opportunities were created for non-majority communities through TEPs, The necessary corrections were made during the implementation.

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 project was implemented under DIM modality and used mainly CO procurement, and M&E systems. In the second component which was implemented by the partner Local Development Fund (LDF) their procurement system was used but closely observed process by the project staff.

The project collaborated very well with partner municipal staff and structures in monitoring and the partner municipalities, as key national counterparts, they were fully engaged in decision making and strategic direction of the project.

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:

Through component 1 of the project which dealt with capacity development and inter-municipal cooperation needed the assessment of the capacities and performance of the national institutions involved in this project. LAGs (Local Action Groups) in Dragash/Dragaš, Shtërpçë/Štrpce and Viti/Vitina were made functional and leading the project's implementation. Municipal public services in economic, agriculture and rural development are improved through enhanced capacities of 18 municipal officials as the result of mentoring and coaching services in sustainable agriculture with topics on organic production.

The capacity and performance of the partner in Component 2 which dealt with Support to Micro and Small Enterprises was spot checked and assessed directly by UNDP staff

Through the external midterm and final evaluations there were also assessed the performance of relevant municipal institutions and partners.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	SPOTCHECKREPORT-July-September2018LDF_5617_319 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SPOTCHECKREPORT-July-September2018LDF_5617_319.doc)	anton.selitaj@undp.org	8/26/2020 1:34:00 PM
2	SPOTCHECKREPORT-July-September2019LDF_5617_319 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SPOTCHECKREPORT-July-September2019LDF_5617_319.doc)	anton.selitaj@undp.org	8/26/2020 1:36:00 PM

20. Were the transition and phase-out arrangements were reviewed and adjusted according to progress (including financial commitment and capacity).

- 3: *The project's governance mechanism regularly reviewed the project's sustainability plan, including arrangements for transition and phase-out, to ensure the project remained on track in meeting the requirements set out by the plan. The plan was implemented as planned by the end of the project, taking into account any adjustments made during implementation. (both must be true)*
- 2: There was a review of the project's sustainability plan, including arrangements for transition and phase-out, to ensure the project remained on track in meeting the requirements set out by the plan.
- 1: The project may have had a sustainability plan but there was no review of this strategy after it was developed. Also select this option if the project did not have a sustainability strategy.

Evidence:

The project board and also the project and program team discussed and analyzed all the phase out arrangements and transition process.

The project was implemented in close cooperation with municipalities and they agreed to follow up the activities.

The handover process to the municipalities was ensured during the end phase of project.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments

The project is considered as one the most successful in the filed local economic development and can serve as exemplary model.

It was implemented timely as planned, all the targets and objectives were achieved and even exceeded. A serious and fruitful cooperation was ensured with all the stakeholders involved and a general satisfaction with the results achieved is noted among all involved.

The project built a good example and basis for replication in other parts of the country and for the scale up.