

# Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

Overall Project Rating: **Satisfactory**

Project Number : 00074116

Project Title : Strengthened institutional capacity and organisational management of State/Division, District and Township administrations for area-related development planning, responsive and effective public service delivery, and conflict prevention.

Project Date : 01-Jan-2013

## Strategic

Quality Rating: **Satisfactory**

**1. Did the project pro-actively take advantage of new opportunities and adapt its theory of change to respond to changes in the development context, including changing national priorities? (select the option from 1-3 which best reflects this project)**

- 3: The project team regularly completed and documented a comprehensive horizon scanning exercise to identify new opportunities and changes in the development context that required adjustments in the theory of change. There is clear evidence that the project board considered the scanning and its implications, and documented changes to the project's RRF, partnerships, etc. made in response, as appropriate. (both must be true to select this option)
- 2: *The project team has undertaken some horizon scanning over the life of the project to identify new opportunities and changes in the development context. The project board discussed the scanning and its implications for the project, as reflected in the board minutes. There is some evidence that the project took action as a result, but changes may not have been fully integrated in the project's theory of change, RRF, partnerships, etc. (all must be true to select this option)*
- 1: The project team may have considered new opportunities and changes in the development context since implementation began, but this has not been discussed in the project board. There is limited to no evidence that the project team has considered changes to the project as a result. This option should also be selected if no horizon scanning took place during project implementation.

### Evidence

The project team identified new opportunities to feed into the design of a new project, Township Democratic Local Governance Project, under the new Country Programme and signed project document attached.

**2. Was the project aligned with the thematic focus of the Strategic Plan? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)**

- 3: The project responded to one of the three areas of development [work](#) as specified in the Strategic Plan. It addressed at least one of the proposed new and emerging [areas](#) and implementation was consistent with the issues-based analysis incorporated into the project. The project's RRF included all the relevant SP output indicators. (all must be true to select this option)
- 2: *The project responded to one of the three areas of development [work](#) as specified in the Strategic Plan. The project's RRF included at least one SP output indicator, if relevant. (both must be true to select this option)*
- 1: While the project may have responded to one of the three areas of development [work](#) as specified in the Strategic Plan, it was based on a sectoral approach without addressing the complexity of the development issue. None of the relevant SP indicators were included in the project's RRF. This option is also selected if the project did not respond to any of the three SP areas of development work.

### Evidence

The project contributes to the SP Outcome 2: Governance and Output 1.2.1 indicator 'Number of countries where national and sub-national governments have improved capacities to plan, budget, manage and monitor basic services' with a corresponding indicator: 'A participatory methodology for area-based township planning developed and demonstrated jointly with national partners ready for replication'

**3. Evidence generated through the project was explicitly used to confirm or adjust the programme/CPD's theory of change during implementation.**

- Yes
- No

### Evidence

The project's support to women in local governance institutions and piloting of township planning model have been absorbed by the next CPD (2018-2022 ) and RRF indicators 1.1.1 and 1.1.2

## Relevant

Quality Rating: **Satisfactory**

**4. Were the project's targeted groups systematically identified and engaged, with a priority focus on the excluded and marginalized, to ensure the project remained relevant for them? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)**

- 3: Systematic and structured feedback was collected regularly from a representative sample of beneficiaries, with a priority focus on the excluded and marginalized, as part of the project's monitoring system. Representatives from the targeted group were active members of the project's governance mechanism (i.e., project board or equivalent) and there is credible evidence that their feedback informed decision making. (all must be true to select this option)
- 2: *Targeted groups were engaged in implementation and monitoring, with a priority focus on the excluded 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

Target groups such as township administrations (various sector departments) civil society organizations, village tract and ward administrators, members of parliament are engaged in planning and implementing as well as execution of funds and financial monitoring back to UNDP. Based on 2016/17 experience in 2 townships ,the Grant Manual/Standard Operating Procedure for the planning model was updated in 2017.

### 5. Did the project generate knowledge, particularly lessons learned (i.e., what has worked and what has not) – and has this knowledge informed management decisions and changes/course corrections to ensure the continued relevance of the project towards its stated objectives, the quality of its outputs and the management of risk? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

- 3: *Knowledge and lessons learned (gained, for example, from Peer Assists, After Action Reviews or Lessons Learned Workshops) backed by credible evidence from evaluation, analysis and monitoring were regularly discussed in project board meetings and reflected in the minutes. There is clear evidence that the project's theory of change was adjusted, as needed, and changes were made to the project to ensure its continued relevance. (both must be true to select this option)*
- 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 to select this option)
- 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

Local Governance Pillar evaluation and lesson learned from the project completion provided further evidence for the design of the New Township Development Local Governance Project ( TDLG). The review of the One Stop Shop and Assessment of IDA also feed into new strategy and this strategy has been discussed and endorsed by the project board

### 6. Were the project's special measures (through outputs, activities, indicators) to address gender inequalities and empower women relevant and produce the intended effect? If not, were evidence-based adjustments and changes made? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

- 3: The project team systematically gathered data and evidence on the relevance of the special measures in addressing gender inequalities and empowering women. Analysis of data and evidence were used to inform adjustments and changes, as appropriate. (both must be true to select this option)
- 2: *The project team had some data and evidence on the relevance of the special measures in addressing gender inequalities and empowering women. There is evidence that at least some adjustments made, as appropriate. (both must be true to select this option)*
- 1: The project team had limited or no evidence on the relevance of the special measures in addressing gender inequalities and empowering women. No evidence that adjustments and/or changes were made, as appropriate. This option should also be selected if the project had no special measures in addressing gender inequalities and empowering women relevant to project results and activities.

#### Evidence

National workshop for female ward/village tract administrators has been conducted and collect evidence to enable project plan new target activities such as a study tour and leadership training for female 10 household leaders.

### 7. Was the project sufficiently at scale, or is there potential to scale up in the future, to meaningfully contribute to development change? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

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

#### Evidence

The newly designed TDLG project will be a scale up of current township planning works. ( TDLG Prodoc Signed is attached in Q1)

## Social & Environmental Standards

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

**8. Did the project seek to further the realization of human rights using a human rights-based approach? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)**

- 3: There is credible evidence that the project aimed to further the realization of human rights, on the basis of applying a human rights based approach. Any potential adverse impacts on enjoyment of human rights were actively identified, managed and mitigated through the project's management of risks. (all must be true to select this option)
- 2: *There is some evidence that the project aimed to further the realization of human rights. Potential adverse impacts on the enjoyment of human rights were identified and adequately mitigated through the project's management of risks. (both must be true to select this option)*
- 1: There is no evidence that the project aimed to further the realization of human rights. There is limited to no evidence that potential adverse impacts on the enjoyment of human rights were managed.

### Evidence

The project applies human rights based approach to programming, as per Pillar strategy and TDLG ProDoc.

**9. Were social and environmental impacts and risks (including those related to human rights, gender and environment) successfully managed and monitored in accordance with the project document and relevant action plans? (for projects that have no social and environmental risks the answer is "Yes")**

- Yes
- No

### Evidence

Project Grant Manual prohibits investments into projects increasing local environmental risks. The project specifically addressed inclusion of women into local governance processes by supporting female VTAs in strengthening the skills and ensures balanced participation of women in township planning processes by taking affirmative actions to include additional women representatives into planning sessions.

**10. Were any unanticipated social and environmental issues or grievances that arose during implementation assessed and adequately managed, with relevant management plans updated? (for projects that did not experience unanticipated social and environmental risks or grievances the answer is "Yes")**

- Yes
- No

### Evidence

Close partnership with the Bago Region Government, UNDP facilitated the Bago Minister of Natural Resources, Forest and Environmental Conservation participating at the 'Asia Forum on the Role of Local and Urban Governments in Building Sustainable and Resilient Cities and Rural Area' held in People's Republic of China on 19-21 June 2017. The forum helped the region government learn about best practices and lessons learned on disaster risk management, climate resilience, and to develop a set of recommendations for building more resilient local and urban areas in Bago.

## Management & Monitoring

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

**11. Was the project's M&E Plan adequately implemented? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)**

- 3: Progress data against indicators in the project's RRF was reported regularly using highly credible data sources and collected according to the frequency stated in the project's M&E plan, including sex disaggregated data as relevant. Evaluations, if conducted, fully met decentralized evaluation standards, including gender UNEG standards, and management responses were fully implemented. Lessons learned, including during evaluations, were used to take corrective actions when necessary. (all must be true to select this option)
- 2: *Progress data against indicators in the project's RRF was collected on a regular basis, although there may have been some slippage in following the frequency stated in the project's M&E plan and data sources were not always reliable. Any evaluations conducted meet most decentralized evaluation standards; management responses were fully implemented to the extent possible. Lessons learned have been captured but not used to take collective actions. (all must be true to select this option)*
- 1: Progress data either was not collected against the indicators in the project's RRF, or limited data was collected but not regularly; evaluations did not meet decentralized evaluation standards; and/or lessons learned were rarely captured and used.

### Evidence

The project has an M&E plan with baselines based on the RRF. Progress and lessons learned are regularly captured in Project Board reports. Evaluation of the Local Governance Programme was conducted based on decentralized evaluation standards.

#### 12. Did the project's governance mechanism (i.e., the project board or equivalent) function as intended? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

- The project's governance mechanism operated very well, and is a model for other projects. It met in the agreed frequency stated in the project document and the minutes of the meetings are 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)
- 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)*
- The project's governance mechanism did not meet in the frequency stated in the project document, and/or the project board or equivalent did not function as a decision making body for the project as intended.

### Evidence

The project board meets twice a year to review implementation and discuss results, risks, opportunities and strategies for future work. Minutes from the meetings are kept to ensure that discussion points and decisions are agreed by all parties.

#### 13. Were risks to the project adequately monitored and managed? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

- 3: The project actively monitored risks every quarter including consulting with key stakeholders at least annually to identify continuing and emerging risks to project implementation and to assess if the main assumptions remain valid. There is clear evidence that relevant management plans and mitigating measures were fully implemented to address each key project risk, and some evidence that risk mitigation has benefitted performance. (all must be true to select this option)
- 2: The project monitored risks every quarter, as evidenced by a regularly updated risk log. Some updates were made to management plans and mitigation measures. (both must be true to select this option)*
- 1: The risk log was not updated every quarter as required. There may be some evidence that the project monitored risks that could have affected the project's achievement of results, but there is no explicit evidence that management actions were taken to mitigate risks. The project's performance was disrupted by factors that could have been anticipated or managed.

### Evidence

Significant project risks are updated on a quarterly basis in the quarterly reports.

**Efficient** **Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory**

#### 14. 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

AWP fully funded and new agreement signed for continuation of work 2017-2020

#### 15. Were project inputs procured and delivered on time to efficiently contribute to results? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

- 3: The project had a procurement plan and kept it updated. Implementation of the plan was generally on or ahead of schedule. On a quarterly basis, the project reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addressed them through appropriate management actions. (all must be true to select this option)*
- 2: The project had a procurement plan and kept it updated. The project annually reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addressed them through appropriate management actions. (all must be true to select this option)
- 1: The project did not have an updated procurement plan. The project team may have reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs regularly, however management actions were not taken to address them. This option is also selected if operational bottlenecks were not reviewed during the project in a timely manner.

### Evidence

The implementation status has been reviewed at monthly Program Management Team meeting and also in the One Stop shop meeting for each project quarterly

**16. Was there regular monitoring and recording of cost efficiencies, taking into account the expected quality of results? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)**

- 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 to select this option)
- 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 communicated with a few other projects to coordinate activities. (both must be true to select this option)*
- 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. It is not clear that the link between cost savings and quality of results was made.

**Evidence**

Project uses open competitive processes to ensure cost-effective partnerships. Project includes a negotiation strategy with vendors, where budgets are perceived as exceeding market rates. Other cost efficiencies are achieved by Country Office cost efficiency measures

Effective

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

**17. Is there evidence that project outputs contributed to the achievement of programme outcomes?**

- Yes
- No

**Evidence**

The project outputs contributed to the achievement of programme outcomes is explicitly mentioned in the project completion report

**18. The project delivered its expected outputs.**

- Yes
- No

**Evidence**

The project is on the track to deliver the expected outputs. Please see in the project completion report.

**19. 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? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)**

- 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) were used to inform course corrections, as needed. (both must be true to select this option)
- 2: *There was at least one review of the work plan each year with a view to assessing if project activities were on track to achieving the desired development results (i.e., outputs.) There is no evidence that data or lessons learned were used to inform the review(s).*
- 1: While the project team may have reviewed the work plan at least once per 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 regular review of the work plan by management took place.

**Evidence**

In the monthly Programme Management Team (PMT) meeting, review of the project progress to ensure to implement in line with the workplan and to take follow up action as required.

**20. Were the intended targeted groups systematically identified and engaged, prioritizing the marginalized and excluded, to ensure results were achieved as expected? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)**

3: Targeted groups were systematically identified 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 to confirm that targeted groups were reached as intended. The project engaged regularly with targeted groups to assess whether they benefitted as expected and adjustments were made if necessary to refine targeting. (all must be true to select this option)

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 were members of the targeted groups. There was some engagement with beneficiaries to assess whether they benefitted as expected. (all must be true to select this option)*

1: The project did not report on specific targeted groups, or there is no evidence to confirm that project beneficiaries have capacity needs or are populations deprived and/or excluded from development opportunities relevant to the project's area of work. There may have been some engagement with beneficiaries to assess whether they benefitted as expected, but not regularly.

Not Applicable

#### Evidence

The project has women as a target group and has engaged the target group in identifying measures to improve results. The project also provided numerous trainings, TOT courses, and lessons/knowledge sharing workshops to elected Ward/ Village Tract Administrator ( W/VTA), as well as to civil servants working for OSS, in partnership with the IDA and the General Administration Department, thus gradually upgrading the IDA curriculum to include more soft components on aspects related to democratic local governance, gender, W/VTAs' roles in local development planning, communication and leadership skills, while building the capacity of the target groups to participate effectively in participatory planning exercises and to ultimately improve service delivery in the OSS.

#### 21. Were at least 40 per cent of the personnel hired by the project, regardless of contract type, female?

Yes

No

#### Evidence

### Sustainability & National Ownership

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

#### 22. Were stakeholders and partners fully engaged in the decision-making, implementation and monitoring of the project? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

3: Only national systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) were 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. (all must be true to select this option)

2: National systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) were used in combination with other support (such as country office support or project systems) to implement and monitor the project, as needed. 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 to select this option)

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 UNDP country Programme is implemented under the DIM modality. The project approach is tailored and contextualized to Myanmar utilizing existing institutions and structures and anchored in the sector departments and the elected W/VTAs. By engaging EAOs in government-led planning processes in conflict areas, the project seeks to contribute to an enabling environment for dialogue and collaboration at the local level.

#### 23. Were there regular monitoring of changes in capacities and performance of institutions and systems, and were the implementation arrangements adjusted according to changes in partner capacities? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

3: Changes in capacities and performance of national institutions and systems were regularly and comprehensively assessed/monitored using clear indicators, rigorous methods of data collection and credible data sources. There is clear evidence that capacities and performance of national institutions and systems improved by the end of the project, if applicable. Implementation arrangements were formally reviewed and adjusted, if needed, in agreement with partners according to changes in partner capacities. (all must be true to select this option)

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. There is limited evidence that capacities and performance of national institutions and systems improved by the end of the project, if applicable. Some adjustment was made to implementation arrangements if needed to reflect changes in partner capacities. (all must be true to select this option)*

- 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 were not considered. Also select this option if changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems were not monitored by the project.
- Not Applicable

#### Evidence

The project conducted HACT assessments of Responsible Parties (RPs) and prepared assurance plans to improve capacities.

#### 24. Were the transition and phase-out arrangements implemented as planned by the end of the project, taking into account any adjustments made to the plan during implementation? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

- 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 to select this option)
- 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. The plan was implemented by the end of the project, taking into account any adjustments made during implementation. (both must be true to select this option)*
- 1: The project may have had a sustainability plan that specified arrangements for transition and phase-out, 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 reviewed transition arrangement into the new TDLG project and endorse the new strategy. In the Country Program Document (CPD) effective from 2018-2022, UNDPs management structure will be changed and its programs organized under a different structure with two main areas of work, Governance and Sustainable Peace and Sustainable and Inclusive Growth respectively. Under the new CPD there will tentatively be 6 larger and integrated projects, out of which one is 'Support to Effective and Responsive Institutions Project' (SERIP). The TDLG will be one of the four outputs under SERIP.

#### 25. Please upload the final lessons learned report that was produced for this project.

### Summary/Final Project Board Comments: