Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

Form Status: Approved	

Overall Rating:	Needs Improvement
Decision:	
Portfolio/Project Number:	00113740
Portfolio/Project Title:	Youth Empowerment for Sustainable Development
Portfolio/Project Date:	2019-01-01 / 2020-12-31

Strategic	**Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

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:

Covid 19 showed up with the project in the middle of its implementation stage. The Project's board and implementing partners reacted to this outside stimuli by making necessary and relevant changes o the project direction

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On

No documents available.

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 is closely aligned with the United Nations Development Assistance Framework and Country Programme Document 2019-2023 and specifically Contribute to Outcome 3.1: By 2023, government and private sector increase opportunities for inclusive and sustainable economic growth, improved food security, and decent work, especially for women, youth and persons with disabilities

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:

> Given the limited capacity of government to create jobs and employment opportunities and the small and undiversified private sector, more than 30% of youth remain unemployed or trapped in low paying jobs. The Government of Lesotho has adopted the National Youth Development Policy (2018), which provides a national blue print on youth development and aims at facilitating comprehensive engagement of the youth for the country's socio-economic development and political participation.
> Contributing Outcome (UNDAF/CPD):
> Outcome 3.1: By 2023, government and private sector increase opportunities for inclusive and sustainable economic growth, improved food security, and decent work, especially for women, youth and persons with disabilities

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:

- Multi-professionalism is key to success; youths should not be trapped in their academic professions even when they cannot access job opportunities.
- Regardless of dropping school, innovation can still happen, and people can make a living out of it o nly if they get exposure and perfect support. Basoth o are innovative and just need support through motiv ation, materials or funding so that they can curb the i ssue of unemployment.
- For one to produce a tangible thing, they need t o start with the little they have in hand. Lack of need ed materials can affect the innovator negatively such that they can give up on their dream.
- Issue of inclusivity related to differently abled p eople is still an issue as Tsa Mahlale is the only prog ram that fully includes the hearing-impaired people a part from the news bulletin.
- Most of the Participants have been in business for at least two years with no experience and exposu re to opportunities and new techniques. With design thinking trainings, they were able to collaborate, net work and connect with others through WHATSAPP g roup as a platform to connect, share challenges and opportunities. An example, in Berea, one of the entr epreneurs who specialized in crafts using waste got support from his peers promised to disaggregate wa ste before for this production the availability of his re sources he always needs. The same entrepreneur w as featured on Tsa Mahlale LTV programme.
- Technology/ICT fully needed as part of the desi gn thinking training for youth
- There is a need for demand creation to increas e young women and girl's participation in business a nd entrepreneurship
- Need for Incubation hubs and financial support for youth businesses growth
- The high number of submissions is indicative of the high interest amongst the youth in agriculture as a sustainable employment activity, specifically due t o the COVID19 effects which threatened food securi ty

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:

> There is lots of potential for scale up, just need consi
> derable funding to accompany the many brilliant ide
> as generated from the project

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Principled   **Quality Rating: Needs Improvement**

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:

> 3: The project team has systematically gathered dat
> a and evidence through project monitoring on the rel
> evance of the measures to address gender inequaliti

es and empower women. Analysis of data and evide
nce were used to inform adjustments and changes,
as appropriate. (both must be true)
 2: The project team had some data and evidence o
n the relevance of the measures to address gender i
nequalities and empower women. There is evidence
that at least some adjustments were made, as appro
priate. (both must be true)
 1: The project team had limited or no evidence on t
he relevance of measures to address gender inequa
lities and empowering women. No evidence of adjus
tments and/or changes made. This option should als
o be selected if the project has no measures to addr
ess gender inequalities and empower women releva
nt to the project results and activities.
*Note: Management Action must be taken for score
of 1.
V. Gender Mainstreaming (how did project serve me
n and women, identify # of men/women served)
A total number 663 young people were reached with
EYES project support (462 males and 201 females)
through different activities;

- Covid 19 awareness
- SDGs
- leadership skills
- Design thinking
- Youth diaries
- Business pitches

However, in other activities women were not many, s
uch as Tsa Mahlale programme, one woman was ca
ptured.

It was very difficult to use equity or strategies that w
ould see more women participating because in other
districts like Berea more men applied than women.
But for those who committed to finish the training mo
re women appear to have completed without droppin
g out of the training.

For Thursday Hook up dinner activity, Women were
exclusivity a focus for this August month, however m
en were eventually permitted due to initial low turnou
t. Further action was taken; a communication strateg
y for intensifying women involvement was implement
ed and ultimately 75% of pitchers were female.

For bootcamp application form; although the proces
s was not specific regarding female preference amo
ng applicant, the vetting process prioritised female a
pplicants, ultimately, 55% of applicants were female.

Although exclusivity was given to women for August
month to participate in pitching, not enough female p
itchers submitted initially, thus a decision was made

to open it to all genders. Ultimately women pitchers did dominate but only at the later stages of the subm ission period

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:

These were done through the M& E framework of th e UNDP in ATLAS

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:

> There is not much evidence that this was the case at some point

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On

No documents available.

Management & Monitoring   **Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

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

○ 3: The project had a comprehensive and costed M&E plan. Baselines, targets and milestones were fully populated. Progress data against indicators in the project's RRF was reported regularly using credible data sources and collected according to the frequency stated in the Plan, including sex disaggregated data as relevant. Any evaluations conducted, if relevant, fully meet decentralized evaluation standards, including gender UNEG standards. Lessons learned, included during evaluations and/or After-Action Reviews, were used to take corrective actions when necessary. (all must be true)

◉ *2: The project costed M&E Plan, and most baselines and targets were populated. Progress data against indicators in the project's RRF was collected on a regular basis, although there was may be some slippage in following the frequency stated in the Plan and data sources was not always reliable. Any evaluations conducted, if relevant, met most decentralized evaluation standards. Lessons learned were captured but were used to take corrective actions. (all must be true)*

○ 1: The project had M&E Plan, but costs were not clearly planned and budgeted for, or were unrealistic. Progress data was not regularly collected against the indicators in the project's RRF. Evaluations did not meet decentralized evaluation standards. Lessons learned were rarely captured and used. Select this option also if the project did not have an M&E plan.

Evidence:

> Yes the M&E plan was followed through the UNDP A
> TLAs system

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:

> Project Technical Committee Meeting
> Review Meetings
> Project Closure Meetings
> All these reports are available and show that thecopr
> orate governance was followed on a regular basis

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On

No documents available.

---

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

○ 3: The project monitored risks every quarter and consulted with the key stakeholders, security advisors, to identify continuing and emerging risks to assess if the main assumptions remained valid. There is clear evidence that relevant management plans and mitigating measures were fully implemented to address each key project risk and were updated to reflect the latest risk assessment. (all must be true)

◉ *2: The project monitored risks every year, as evidenced by an updated risk log. Some updates were made to management plans and mitigation measures.*

○ 1: The risk log was not updated as required. There was may be some evidence that the project monitored risks that may affected the project's achievement of results, but there is no explicit evidence that management actions were taken to mitigate risks.

Evidence:

Project Risks and Assumptions Update: Please stat
e any risks and assumptions likely to impact project i
mplementation
•   There are two major risks that the project could
face, namely, the dependence of the program on the
political will of the Ministry of Communications to allo
w the program to continue flighting as well as the fun
ding dependence on UNDP.
•   The fact of having one presenter if he encounte
rs any challenges then the whole program will be ne
gatively impacted.
•   Introduction of the free slots becomes a risk wh
en LTV decides to withdraw those slots as Tsa Mahl
ale has no control
•   Delays to approve concept notes and planned
activities put more pressure on procurement process
es and implementation itself.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.

Efficient   **Quality Rating: Needs Improvement**

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:

Apart from the Project's core resources, there were
no additional resources mobilized

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:

Mostly, yes. At times, delivery was hampered by national lockdowns as a result of covid 19 impact country wide. However, projects teams were flexible to enough to accommodate some of the unexpected changes. The final evaluation reports including periodic steering committee reports bear testimony to this

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:

This was done through steering committee meetings

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Effective   Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory

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

◉ *Yes*
○ No

Evidence:

The reports submitted by several implementing part ners show success in delivering expected outputs

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:

Yes, this was done through periodic steering commit tee meetings on the board

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:

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

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:

> They were pat of the project Governance mechanism sitting in the steering committee and taking decisions

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:

> They were pat of the project Governance mechanis
> m sitting in the steering committee and taking decisi
> ons

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:

> In one of the Board meetings, there was a reference
> to the sustainability of the Project beyond UNDP's in
> volvement

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments