Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

Form Status: Approved	
Overall Rating:	Satisfactory
Decision:	
Portfolio/Project Number:	00074036
Portfolio/Project Title:	Development Effectiveness
Portfolio/Project Date:	2013-01-01 / 2019-09-30

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:

The project team completed and documented a horizon scanning exercise, based on which the project team's annual work plan was adjusted to respond to the emerging needs. Key examples are:
- Statistics Law was revised with more emphasis on positioning the Central Statistical Organization as the statistical authority of the Government and on evidence-based planning. Accordingly, the project team implemented not only the design of the training curricular (which was the original AWP), but also the design of the institutional setup for a statistical training center.
- The Ministry of Planing and Finance(MoPF) showed increased commitment for SDG integration and asked for UNDP's technical support. In response to this, UNDP and MoPF established a joint SGD team to develop a SDG discussion paper, with an aim to provide options for adopting the principles of the 2030 Agenda and SDGs into planning/budgeting/monitoring frameworks. In addition, UNDP could deliver technical support to assess development finance in Myanmar to help MoPF strategize financing for SDG implementation.
- State Counsellor established the Development Assistance Coordination Unit(DACU). In response to this, the project team, through the Secretariat for Cooperation Partners Group(CPG) advocated for inclusive membership in the Operating Guideline for the Sectoral Coordination Groups(SCGs) as well as an emphasis on SDG implementation. Both are achieved.

The project board discussed the implications of the above adjustments and strategized way forward. Myanmar's case of joint MoPF-UNDP work on SDG discussion paper was showcased at 2017 UNDP Regional Knowledge Exchange on SDGs (Oct 2017, Manila).

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	1-Output_Board_Meeting_Minutes_DE_20170921_final_version_3594_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/1-Output_Board_Meeting_Minutes_DE_20170921_final_version_3594_301.docx)	khin.thuzar.win@undp.org	2/11/2020 6:20:00 AM
2	1-Project_team_review_-_Theory_of_Change__21.10.2016__3594_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/1-Project_team_review_-_Theory_of_Change__21.10.2016__3594_301.docx)	khin.thuzar.win@undp.org	2/11/2020 6:21:00 AM

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 output(s) - [National and state/regional development planning informed by robust data and broad consultations;
capacities of stakeholders strengthened to manage development cooperation in line with GPEDC principles] responds to the following development outcome and output of the UNDP Strategic Plan:

Outcome 1: ADVANCE POVERTY ERADICATION IN ALL ITS FORMS AND DIMENSIONS.
Output 1.1.1 Capacities developed across the whole of government to integrate the 2030 Agenda, the Paris Agreement and other international agreements in development plans and budgets, and to analyse progress towards the SDGs, using innovative and data-driven solutions.

The project's RRF includes the following SP output indicator:
1.9. Number of countries reporting progress in multi-stakeholder development effectiveness monitoring frameworks that support the achievement of the sustainable development goals

The project RRF has a similar indicator to the below SP indicator:
1.10. Proportion of sustainable development indicators produced at the national level with full disaggregation when relevant to the target, in accordance with the Fundamental Principles of Official Statistics.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	2-DE_Annual_Workplan_2017_Revised_3594_302 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2-DE_Annual_Workplan_2017_Revised_3594_302.docx)	khin.thuzar.win@undp.org	2/11/2020 6:21:00 AM

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:

Key examples are 1) the Myanmar Living Conditions Survey and 2) the Cooperation Partners Group secretariat work.

1. The Myanmar Living Conditions Survey(MLCS) has significantly increased representedness and quality standards of the previous rounds of living conditions surveys in Myanmar. The MLCS included those households in conflict-affected areas as part of the sample and the enumeration team has been successfully reaching to the conflict-affected areas. Direct beneficiaries in this case is the government enumeration team who has been trained by the project team to apply conflict-sensitive approaches. Anecdotal feedback has been collected through enumeration journal series posted at UNDP Myanmar social media channels. Based on the feedback, the government and project team decided to produce a fact sheet about the survey, in order to help sample households in post-conflict areas understand the survey better.
2. Civil society and private sector have been largely excluded from development cooperation discussions. The project team supported Myanmar government implement a monitoring round of the development effectiveness monitoring indicators (Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation Monitoring Framework) and collected feedback from civil society and private sector to measure the inclusiveness of development cooperation mechanisms. Feedbacks collected were published and informed project's AWP. Feedbacks collected were also used by the government and led to the government approval of the official inclusion of civil society and private sector to sector working groups.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Results_Monitoring_Round_GPEDC_3594_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Results_Monitoring_Round_GPEDC_3594_303.pdf)	khin.thuzar.win@undp.org	2/11/2020 6:27:00 AM
2	Annex_2._DE_Output_Board_Mid-Year_Report_2017_3594_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Annex_2._DE_Output_Board_Mid-Year_Report_2017_3594_303.pdf)	khin.thuzar.win@undp.org	2/11/2020 6:27:00 AM
3	Meeting_minutes_MLCS_local_stakeholder_buy-in_3594_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Meeting_minutes_MLCS_local_stakeholder_buy-in_3594_303.pdf)	khin.thuzar.win@undp.org	2/11/2020 6:27:00 AM

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:

Since 2015, the project team has adopted a standard practice of collecting the lessons learned through evaluation forms and/or experts (consultants)' lessons learned report. The project team has presented to the Board the findings from the evaluation forms and the lessons learned and discussed the way forward. Key examples include:
-SDG trainings at the sub-national level for planning departments, civil society and private sector: the evaluation form, completed by over 500 participants, informed next steps for the SDG training. Two project staff have received SDG training certificates from UNITAR and provided SDG trainings through government's training institute for civil servants (Union Civil Service Board).
-Experts' (consultants') lessons learned reports: all consultants' deliverables include brief lessons learned reports and these are used to validate/inform the directions of the project activities. Lessons learned report from the SDG data availability assessment assignment, for example, has informed the design of the approaches for the SDG indicator baseline report work.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	SDG_Baseline_report_-_Lessons_Learned_Report_3594_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SDG_Baseline_report_-_Lessons_Learned_Report_3594_304.doc)	khin.thuzar.win@undp.org	2/11/2020 6:29:00 AM
2	SDG_data_assessment_-_Lessons_Learned_Report_3594_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SDG_data_assessment_-_Lessons_Learned_Report_3594_304.doc)	khin.thuzar.win@undp.org	2/11/2020 6:30:00 AM

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's is an upstream policy-level engagement, and the project team primarily works with the Ministry of Planning and Finance (MoPF) and its three key departments that lead statistical, planning, and development cooperation activities. The project team's capacity strengthening work includes almost all relevant government officials at the national level and some pilots at the sub-national level.
> In addition, the project started implementing two joint projects in 2017: 1) sub-national support for SDG implementation with the Parliament Support project and Public Administration Reform project; and 2) Township planning and Region/State planning with the Local Governance Output.
>
> Through the above joint projects, results of the projects are expected to inform policy change in national and sub-national planning process and fiscal decentralization.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	DevelopmentEffectivenessAWP2017_3594_305 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/DevelopmentEffectivenessAWP2017_3594_305.pdf)	khin.thuzar.win@undp.org	2/11/2020 6:34:00 AM
2	Signed_ToR_International_Planning_Advicor_3594_305 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Signed_ToR_International_Planning_Advicor_3594_305.pdf)	khin.thuzar.win@undp.org	2/11/2020 6:33:00 AM
3	Output9_Pillar3_DevelopmentEffectiveness-2017APR_3594_305 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Output9_Pillar3_DevelopmentEffectiveness-2017APR_3594_305.docx)	khin.thuzar.win@undp.org	2/11/2020 6:35:00 AM

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 team is primarily engaging with the Central Statistical Organization to ensure that gender disaggregated data are available for the country for key socio economic and environmental indicators (i.e. the Sustainable Development Goals indicators), which will inform the policy makers the areas needing the gender equality and empowerment the most. In addition to the gender disaggregated data, the project team has adjusted its survey training to include gender-sensitive approach of the survey enumeration.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	2-DE_Annual_Workplan_2017_Revised_3594_306 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2-DE_Annual_Workplan_2017_Revised_3594_306.docx)	khin.thuzar.win@undp.org	2/11/2020 6:37:00 AM
2	UNDP_MM_SDG_Indicator_Baseline_Report_ENG_QA_3594_306 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/UNDP_MM_SDG_Indicator_Baseline_Report_ENG_QA_3594_306.pdf)	khin.thuzar.win@undp.org	2/11/2020 6:37:00 AM
3	11-MLCS_Baseline_Capacity_Assessment_3594_306 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/11-MLCS_Baseline_Capacity_Assessment_3594_306.docx)	khin.thuzar.win@undp.org	2/11/2020 6:37:00 AM

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 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 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 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 was categorized as Low risk through the SESP.*

○ 1: Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. For projects categorized as High, Substantial, 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:

There are no social and environmental risks, according to the Socio-Economic Risk Assessment criteria. All risks are managed in line with UNDP procedures and reported quarterly.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Annual_Project_Progress_Review_Report-DE-2016_3594_307 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Annual_Project_Progress_Review_Report-DE-2016_3594_307.docx)	khin.thuzar.win@undp.org	2/11/2020 6:39:00 AM
2	17-2016_Quarterly_Project_Progress_Review_Report_Q1_QA1_3594_307 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/17-2016_Quarterly_Project_Progress_Review_Report_Q1_QA1_3594_307.docx)	khin.thuzar.win@undp.org	2/11/2020 6:39:00 AM
3	14-DE_Annual_Workplan_2017_Revised_QA_3594_307 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/14-DE_Annual_Workplan_2017_Revised_QA_3594_307.docx)	khin.thuzar.win@undp.org	2/11/2020 6:40:00 AM
4	Output9_Pillar3_DevelopmentEffectiveness-2017APR_3594_307 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Output9_Pillar3_DevelopmentEffectiveness-2017APR_3594_307.docx)	khin.thuzar.win@undp.org	2/11/2020 6:40:00 AM
5	Pillar3Report_DemocraticGovernanceProgram-2017APR_3594_307 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Pillar3Report_DemocraticGovernanceProgram-2017APR_3594_307.docx)	khin.thuzar.win@undp.org	2/11/2020 6:40:00 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, Substantial, 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 Substantial or High Risk through the SESP, a project -level grievance mechanism was in place and project affected people informed. If grievances were received, they were responded to but faced challenges in arriving at a resolution.*

○ 1: Project-affected people was not informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism. If grievances were received, they were not responded to. (any may be true)

Evidence:

No unanticipated social and environmental risks or g
rievances have so far emerged.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Annual_Project_Progress_Review_Report-DE-2016_3594_308 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Annual_Project_Progress_Review_Report-DE-2016_3594_308.docx)	khin.thuzar.win@undp.org	2/11/2020 6:41:00 AM
2	Pillar3Report_DemocraticGovernanceProgram-2017APR_3594_308 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Pillar3Report_DemocraticGovernanceProgram-2017APR_3594_308.docx)	khin.thuzar.win@undp.org	2/11/2020 6:42:00 AM

Management & Monitoring   **Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

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

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

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

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

Evidence:

The project team has the comprehensive and costed M&E plan and its associated M&E data with baselines, targets and milestones which are fully populated. The M&E report include progress data against indicators in the project's RRF is being reported regularly (see; RFF and Output board reports). Evaluations included data disaggregated by sex, lessons learned are used to take corrective actions when necessary (cf; question 5), and evaluations and/or After Action Reviews are taking place. Pre-evaluations and post-evaluations are frequently used and allowed UNDP to adapt its capacity development approaches (eg. capacity assessment of enumerators/Myanmar Living Conditions Survey).

The project has also produced SDG indicator baseline report, based on the metadata of the SDG indicators, available at the UN Stats Office.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	11-MLCS_Baseline_Capacity_Assessment_3594_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/11-MLCS_Baseline_Capacity_Assessment_3594_309.docx)	khin.thuzar.win@undp.org	2/11/2020 6:43:00 AM

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'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.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	19-DEOutputBoardReportFinal_3594_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/19-DEOutputBoardReportFinal_3594_310.pdf)	khin.thuzar.win@undp.org	2/11/2020 6:44:00 AM
2	19-Output_Board_Meeting_Minutes_DE_20170921_QA3_3594_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/19-Output_Board_Meeting_Minutes_DE_20170921_QA3_3594_310.docx)	khin.thuzar.win@undp.org	2/11/2020 6:43:00 AM
3	17-Annual_Project_Progress_Review_Report-DE-2016_QA1_3594_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/17-Annual_Project_Progress_Review_Report-DE-2016_QA1_3594_310.docx)	khin.thuzar.win@undp.org	2/11/2020 6:44:00 AM
4	Output9_Pillar3_DevelopmentEffectiveness-2017APR_3594_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Output9_Pillar3_DevelopmentEffectiveness-2017APR_3594_310.docx)	khin.thuzar.win@undp.org	2/11/2020 6:44:00 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:

> Meetings with counterparts are taking place at least once a year through output board meetings to identify continuing and emerging risks to project implementation and to assess if the main assumptions remain valid.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	13-2016_Quarterly_Project_Progress_Review_Report_Q1_QA_3594_311 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/13-2016_Quarterly_Project_Progress_Review_Report_Q1_QA_3594_311.docx)	khin.thuzar.win@undp.org	2/11/2020 6:46:00 AM
2	13-Annual_Project_Progress_Review_Report-DE-2016_QA1_3594_311 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/13-Annual_Project_Progress_Review_Report-DE-2016_QA1_3594_311.docx)	khin.thuzar.win@undp.org	2/11/2020 6:46:00 AM
3	13-Output_Board_Meeting_Minutes_DE_20170921_QA1_3594_311 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/13-Output_Board_Meeting_Minutes_DE_20170921_QA1_3594_311.docx)	khin.thuzar.win@undp.org	2/11/2020 6:46:00 AM
4	13-Quarterly_Project_Progress_Review_Report_2016_Q3_QA_3594_311 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/13-Quarterly_Project_Progress_Review_Report_2016_Q3_QA_3594_311.docx)	khin.thuzar.win@undp.org	2/11/2020 6:46:00 AM

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:

For this year, adequate and additional resources (i.e. RBAP pipeline fund and UNDG SDG Implementation Fund) were mobilized during the year to fund activities.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	14-DE_Annual_Workplan_2017_Revised_QA_3594_312 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/14-DE_Annual_Workplan_2017_Revised_QA_3594_312.docx)	khin.thuzar.win@undp.org	2/11/2020 6:48:00 AM
2	Annual_Project_Progress_Review_Report-DE-2016_3594_312 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Annual_Project_Progress_Review_Report-DE-2016_3594_312.docx)	khin.thuzar.win@undp.org	2/11/2020 6:48:00 AM
3	Pillar3Report_DemocraticGovernanceProgram-2017APR_3594_312 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Pillar3Report_DemocraticGovernanceProgram-2017APR_3594_312.docx)	khin.thuzar.win@undp.org	2/11/2020 6:48:00 AM

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

◉ *3: The project had a procurement plan and kept it updated. The project quarterly reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addressed them through appropriate management actions. (all must be true)*

○ 2: The project had updated procurement plan. The project annually reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addressed them through appropriate management actions. (all must be true)

○ 1: The project did not have an updated procurement plan. The project team may or may not have reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs regularly, however management actions were not taken to address them.

Evidence:

The project has an updated procurement plan. Implementation of the plan is on or ahead of schedule. The project reviews operational bottlenecks at every two weeks. For example, through the by-weekly operational analysis, the project identified that at least 3 days of staff time is spent on engaging a LTA translator/interpreter because the current SOP requires a ToR and performance evaluation at every each translation/interpretation work. The project has addressed this issue by establishing an umbrella ToR that can be used for any assignments of the translator/interpreter and does not require performance evaluation at each assignment. This initiative reduced time taken to less than one day.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Signed_ToR_Interpreter_Translater_Mya_Mya_Thet_20170130_3594_313 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Signed_ToR_Interpreter_Translater_Mya_Mya_Thet_20170130_3594_313.pdf)	khin.thuzar.win@undp.org	2/11/2020 6:50:00 AM

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

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

Evidence:

The project team has sought cost efficiencies by coll aborating with other outputs- spending less overall s o both outputs can generate information they need. For example, the project team is collaborating with t he public administration project team on a perceptio n survey; the parliament project team on providing ai d coordination and SDG trainings to Members of Par liament; and the local governance project team to joi ntly deploy experts for sub-national level planning/da ta support. The project team has also sought efficien cies by getting government to contribute in kind to c ompletion of activities. For example, the survey coor dination for the Myanmar Living Conditions Survey i s being carried out by the Central Statistical Organiz ation staff. In addition, the project has mobilized part nership with the World Bank to support the Myanmar Living Conditions Survey and saved the total survey costs by half.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	16-UNDP_WB_MLCS_work_and_costs_359 4_314 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/Project QA/QAFormDocuments/16-UNDP_WB_MLC S_work_and_costs_3594_314.docx)	khin.thuzar.win@undp.org	2/11/2020 6:52:00 AM

Effective   **Quality Rating: Exemplary**

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

◉ *Yes*
○ No

Evidence:

The project is on track

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	17-Annual_Project_Progress_Review_Report-DE-2016_QA1_3594_315 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/17-Annual_Project_Progress_Review_Report-DE-2016_QA1_3594_315.docx)	khin.thuzar.win@undp.org	2/11/2020 6:53:00 AM
2	17-2016_Quarterly_Project_Progress_Review_Report_Q1_QA1_3594_315 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/17-2016_Quarterly_Project_Progress_Review_Report_Q1_QA1_3594_315.docx)	khin.thuzar.win@undp.org	2/11/2020 6:53:00 AM
3	17-Project_team_review_-_Theory_of_Change__21.10.2016__3594_315 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/17-Project_team_review_-_Theory_of_Change__21.10.2016__3594_315.docx)	khin.thuzar.win@undp.org	2/11/2020 6:53:00 AM

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:

> The project's work plan and its progress was reviewed in June and subsequently in August/September 2017.
> Evidence of course correction: the lessons learned report from the SDG data availability assessment assignment has informed the design of approaches to SDG indicator baseline report work. Originally, this work did not include extensive workshops; however, informed by the lessons learned report, the project team learned some Myanmar data uses different definitions and incorporated a series of workshops during the SDG indicator baseline report work to discuss those differences in definitions.
> Budget revision has been made in September/October 2017.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	19-DEOutputBoardReportFinal_3594_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/19-DEOutputBoardReportFinal_3594_316.pdf)	khin.thuzar.win@undp.org	2/11/2020 6:55:00 AM
2	OutputBoardReport-MidTermReport2015DevelopmentEffectiveness22June2015_3594_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/OutputBoardReport-MidTermReport2015DevelopmentEffectiveness22June2015_3594_316.pdf)	khin.thuzar.win@undp.org	2/11/2020 6:55:00 AM
3	13-Output_Board_Meeting_Minutes_DE_20170921_QA1_3594_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/13-Output_Board_Meeting_Minutes_DE_20170921_QA1_3594_316.docx)	khin.thuzar.win@undp.org	2/11/2020 6:55:00 AM

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:

> This is an upstream policy-level engagement, Evidence that UNDP has targeted the relevant counterparts and is providing relevant policy advisory services is seen in the Output Board reports, and evidence of data gathering to inform future engagement with new counterparts is seen in the SDG discussion paper produced in 2017. The project team's capacity strengthening work includes almost all relevant government officials at the national level and some pilots at the sub-national level. The project is also proposing work in Rakhine State to reach marginalized and excluded groups.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Output9_Pillar3_DevelopmentEffectiveness-2017APR_3594_317 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Output9_Pillar3_DevelopmentEffectiveness-2017APR_3594_317.docx)	khin.thuzar.win@undp.org	2/11/2020 6:57:00 AM
2	Annex_2._DE_Output_Board_Mid-Year_Report_2017_QA_3594_317 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Annex_2._DE_Output_Board_Mid-Year_Report_2017_QA_3594_317.pdf)	khin.thuzar.win@undp.org	2/11/2020 6:58:00 AM

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

As the country programme is implemented under the DIM modality, UNDP policies are procedures for procurement, monitoring and evaluation are followed. The project is taking deliberate steps to build the capacity of stakeholder in monitoring and evaluating progress against project activities.

The outcome evaluation notes that notwithstanding the DIM modality 'government counterparts reported a sense of ownership of project activities' and that activities 'have generally been conducted in line with government priorities, and were found to be responsive to partner needs'.

Stakeholders and national partners are engaged in the decision-making and prioritization of project activities - in line with democratic and national priorities. The project does not engage in any activities without the approval of the national counterparts. Support is also given to activities based on advice and decisions from national counterparts.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Annual_Project_Progress_Review_Report-DE-2016_3594_318 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Annual_Project_Progress_Review_Report-DE-2016_3594_318.docx)	khin.thuzar.win@undp.org	2/11/2020 7:00:00 AM
2	Pillar3Report_DemocraticGovernanceProgram-2017APR_3594_318 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Pillar3Report_DemocraticGovernanceProgram-2017APR_3594_318.docx)	khin.thuzar.win@undp.org	2/11/2020 7:00:00 AM

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:

HACT assessment tools have not been used in the project's monitoring of capacity change. The Outcome Evaluation reviewed the evidence and stated that 'so much remains to be done in building up the institutional capacity of government partners, it will be advisable for UNDP to continue to implement programming through the DIM modality.'

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Annex_2._DE_Output_Board_Mid-Year_Report_2017_QA_3594_319 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Annex_2._DE_Output_Board_Mid-Year_Report_2017_QA_3594_319.pdf)	khin.thuzar.win@undp.org	2/11/2020 7:02:00 AM
2	Pillar3Report_DemocraticGovernanceProgram-2017APR_3594_319 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Pillar3Report_DemocraticGovernanceProgram-2017APR_3594_319.docx)	khin.thuzar.win@undp.org	2/11/2020 7:02:00 AM
3	17-Annual_Project_Progress_Review_Report-DE-2016_QA1_3594_319 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/17-Annual_Project_Progress_Review_Report-DE-2016_QA1_3594_319.docx)	khin.thuzar.win@undp.org	2/11/2020 7:03:00 AM

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 team's Board has reviewed the project's sustainability plan (in the form of the refined narrative for the project, which includes sustainability considerations). In addition, discussions about sustainability are documented in the output board minutes.

A key example of how UNDP has planned support to phase-out is the Myanmar Business Survey through:
- Set-up of the statistical business register for next year's survey to facilitate data collection by the government
- Government ownership - UNDP worked closely with various officials in the MoPF to ensure the business survey, from design to report production is now fully owned and conducted by the government.
- Facilitate partnership between Myanmar government and UNESCAP to establish the statistical business register; UNESCAP is the regional lead in this work.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Pillar3Report_DemocraticGovernanceProgram-2017APR_3594_320 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Pillar3Report_DemocraticGovernanceProgram-2017APR_3594_320.docx)	khin.thuzar.win@undp.org	2/11/2020 7:03:00 AM

QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments

- The objective of this Output is to strengthen the capacities of national stakeholders at both national and sub-national levels to ensure robust data is available, and to enhance the use of broad consultations for the formulation of development plans. Robust socio-economic data would be informed by an improved sampling framework, design and methodology, so that it can be as accurate and relevant as possible for decision makers. The related objective is work with government, development partners, civil society, private sector and the parliament to strengthen their capacities in managing development cooperation in line with the Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation (GPEDC) principles.

- The key achievements to date have been: 1) strengthening production and compilation of nationally representative and high-quality statistics; 2) enhancing capacities of government to strategize options to integrate the Sustainable Development Goals into planning, budgeting, and monitoring frameworks; and 3) ensuring inclusive and cohesive partnership towards achieving effective development cooperation. As evidence, UNDP used examples of: Myanmar Living Conditions Survey, SDG Indicator Baseline Report, SDG Discussion Paper, Development-Humanitarian-Peace Nexus Workshop, and Development Finance Assessment.

- On new developments, UNDP pointed out the development of the new Statistics Law, increased commitment for SDG integration, and activation of the State Counsellor-led Development Assistance Coordination Unit (DACU). To these new developments, UNDP responded with strategic actions such as providing UNDP's technical assistance to the Central Statistical Organization to increase access to statistical data and develop a harmonized training curricular for government statisticians; 2) working with a MoPF team to develop an SDG discussion paper; and 3) organizing a Development-Humanitarian-Peace Nexus Workshop.

- On challenges/lessons learned, UNDP sought Government advice on the approval process of the SDG Indicator Baseline Report. UNDP pointed out challenges in assessing enumeration areas with ongoing or post-conflict issues, but explained how technical rigor is being maintained in order to ensure that the results of the Myanmar Living Conditions Survey are nationally representative.

- Lastly, UNDP presented its delivery rate as of mid-September (74%) against the total funded budget.