

# Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

**Form Status: Approved**

<b>Overall Rating:</b>	Satisfactory
<b>Decision:</b>	
<b>Portfolio/Project Number:</b>	00098147
<b>Portfolio/Project Title:</b>	Support to Bottom 40% Income Group Action Plan
<b>Portfolio/Project Date:</b>	2016-09-01 / 2022-03-31

**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:**

- 1) The finding on B40 Action Plan 2016 was unanimously not accepted by the NSC as some NSC members raised their concerns on the sampling size and were less confident about the qualitative methodology used to obtain the results. Therefore, the final report did not receive a unanimous endorsement from the members of NSC. Although the B40 Action Plan was not presented to the Cabinet, the project team agreed to pilot a citizen-centric intervention based on the recommendation of the B40 Action Plan Report
- 2) Poor buy-in from key government partners in the initial stage of the Citizen's Journey Approach (CJA) pilot project design due to the mismatch of expectations on how this pilot should be operationalised and reality on the ground has resulted in some resistance given the tight timeline of this pilot. Therefore, the scope of the pilot was revised to focus mainly on how the beneficiary access government services (demand side) rather than addressing all components in the service delivery (ie the touchpoints and back-end mechanism)
- 3) Unresponsive local community leaders due to inexperience, fear of doing it alone, competing commitments etc, To motivate community leaders, experienced leaders were mobilised to mentor other team members and move as a team.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	B40FinalReport4June2018rev_10298_301 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAF/ormDocuments/B40FinalReport4June2018rev_10298_301.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAF/ormDocuments/B40FinalReport4June2018rev_10298_301.pdf</a> )	asfaazam.kasbani@undp.org	2/25/2022 7:45:00 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 contributes directly to UNDP SP 2022-2025 Development Outcome 2 No-one left behind, centering on equitable access to opportunities and a rights-based approach to human agency and human development. The project included at least one of the previous UNDP SP's output which is the growth and development are inclusive and sustainable, incorporating productive capacities that create employment and livelihoods for the poor and excluded.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	B40ActionPlan_ProDoc_Final_10298_302 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/B40ActionPlan_ProDoc_Final_10298_302.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/B40ActionPlan_ProDoc_Final_10298_302.pdf</a> )	herlianna.naning@undp.org	11/5/2021 3:14:00 PM

**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:**

Beneficiary feedback is collected through regular engagement with stakeholders, participatory workshops, interviews and mid-point checks. The information obtained was used to inform the project decision making. As an example, in the preparation of the training, the core team learnt that the Unit Pemimpin Pembangunan Masyarakat (UPPM), a politically appointed body responsible to monitor the Sabah MPKK (local community leaders). Assessing the complexities of the local governance structure and processes which may pose a risk to the CJA implementation, the core team decided to include UPPM as well to the training, mainly to sensitise and get buy-in for this pilot. This “surprise” element resulted in necessary adjustments ie change of engagement strategy and implication on cost as the number of people attending the CRs training increases.

**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:**

Knowledge and lessons learned from this project have been presented at the TWC and NSC meetings (both minutes as attached). Changes made such as the scope of the CJA pilot was changed based on engagement and consultations with the key stakeholders.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	LAMPIRAN2MINITPEMANDUCJA_10298_304 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/LAMPIRAN2MINITPEMANDUCJA_10298_304.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/LAMPIRAN2MINITPEMANDUCJA_10298_304.pdf</a> )	herlianna.naning@undp.org	11/5/2021 3:27:00 PM
2	2.0MinitMesyuaratJawatankuasaTeknikalProjekRintisB40CJA_10298_304 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2.0MinitMesyuaratJawatankuasaTeknikalProjekRintisB40CJA_10298_304.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2.0MinitMesyuaratJawatankuasaTeknikalProjekRintisB40CJA_10298_304.pdf</a> )	herlianna.naning@undp.org	11/5/2021 3:30:00 PM

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

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

**Evidence:**

The B40 Action Plan study was bottom-up engagement to obtain feedback from the community while the CJA was proof-of-concept project to demonstrate if the intervention can be replicated at scale. The CJA pilot has demonstrated that local community leaders can facilitate services for the furthest behind with adequate training and tools. Building on knowledge gained from the CJA pilot, a guideline was developed and submitted to EPU aimed at replicating CJA principles to any government agencies.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CJAinGovernmentServiceDelivery-FinalGuideline_10298_305.pdf">CJAinGovernmentServiceDelivery-FinalGuideline_10298_305 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CJAinGovernmentServiceDelivery-FinalGuideline_10298_305.pdf)</a>	herlianna.naning@undp.org	11/5/2021 3:37:00 PM

**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:**

## 1) B40 Action Plan Study

## Output 1.1 Open space forum conducted:

In planning the consultation sessions, the project team ensured that the invitations targeted equally to male and female B40 individuals based on the eKasih database as well as through NGO networks. The invitations also took into consideration participation of people with disabilities and of different age groups.

## Output 1.2 B40 Action Plan developed:

In analysing the results of the consultations and of the existing government programmes for the B40 households, a gender perspective was used. For example, the study analysed poverty and B40 programmes based on their opportunities for women's participation. The study also highlighted the plight of single mothers from the consultations.

## 2) CJA Pilot

## Output 2.1 Convene consultation and citizen journey mapping:

The households identified by the CRs were based on these vulnerabilities criteria (details provided in the final report):

- Single parent
- Elderly
- Breadwinner with many dependants
- Unstable job
- Unpaid care-giver

## Output 2.2 capacity development training:

The project was unable to ensure gender equality representation of the local leaders as the selection was done by the state and local level. However, the reality unveiled the need for gender-sensitised at the state and local government to promote gender equality among local leaders. This observation would be added to the policy brief which is currently being developed

## Output 2.3 Develop policy paper on citizen journey approach in government service delivery:

The report considered gender lens analysis. It highlighted the unpaid care burden of single or elderly women who fell through the crack of the government's social protection due to inability to seek help as the current mechanism in place is not addressing their situation.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

7. Were social and environmental impacts and risks successfully managed and monitored?

- 3: Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. Appropriate assessments conducted where required (i.e., Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) for High risk projects and some level of social and environmental assessment for Moderate risk projects as identified through SESP). Relevant management plan(s) developed for identified risks through consultative process and implemented, resourced, and monitored. Risks effectively managed or mitigated. If there is a substantive change to the project or change in context that affects risk levels, the SESP was updated to reflect these changes. (all must be true)
- 2: *Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. Appropriate assessments conducted where required (i.e., Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) for High risk projects and some level of social and environmental assessment for Moderate risk projects as identified through SESP). Relevant management plan(s) developed, implemented and monitored for identified risks. OR project was categorized as Low risk through the SESP.*
- 1: Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. For projects categorized as High or Moderate Risk, there was no evidence that social and environmental assessments completed and/or management plans or measures development, implemented or monitored. There are substantive changes to the project or changes in the context but SESP was not updated. (any may be true)

**Evidence:**

The project risks including the identified social risks were tracked and reported in the Atlas risk log. The project had low social risks since the project's main objective will lead to improved participation and access of people living in poverty and marginalised groups to social assistance services. The project will not exacerbate gender inequality but rather empowering women within households with the knowledge to seek support to social assistances. The project also had low environmental risk given none of the communities we worked with lived near natural forest or depended on natural resources.

**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:**

The project-affected people were informed of the measures and grievance mechanism throughout the project especially during the check ins. Subsequently, a WhatsApp (WA) group was set set-up at the district level for Sabah and state level for Kelantan and Klang Valley, as a way of communication with the project-affected people where the WA group consist of the District Officer, the local community leaders (MPKK), the KEMAS Officers, a representative from the Welfare Department, Implementation Coordination Unit and UNDP. The WA group was primarily for coordination, progress check-in and a platform where any of the WA group members can ask for clarification or provide feedback related to the project. Additionally, beneficiary feedback is collected through regular engagement with stakeholders, participatory workshops, interviews and mid-point checks.

**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:**

The project has a costed M&E plan with baselines and targets mostly populated. The progress data indicators were collected and reported in mid-year progress (MYPR) and annual progress report (APR) as attached. However, evaluation was not conducted as it was not needed. Lessons learned were captured was not only for corrective actions but to inform the government on improving social service delivery and social protection work.

<b>List of Uploaded Documents</b>			
#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	APR2020Signed_10298_309 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/APR2020Signed_10298_309.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/APR2020Signed_10298_309.pdf</a> )	herlianna.naning@undp.org	11/5/2021 4:08:00 PM
2	APR2019-B40-Signed_10298_309 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/APR2019-B40-Signed_10298_309.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/APR2019-B40-Signed_10298_309.pdf</a> )	herlianna.naning@undp.org	11/8/2021 5:56:00 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 NSC was conducted in Feb 2019 and Nov 2020. Interim progress reports were submitted to the project board ie Scoping Document and Final Report.

<b>List of Uploaded Documents</b>			
#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	NSC_04Nov2020_Rev5_10298_310 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/NSC_04Nov2020_Rev5_10298_310.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/NSC_04Nov2020_Rev5_10298_310.pdf</a> )	herlianna.naning@undp.org	11/5/2021 4:11:00 PM
2	LAMPIRAN2MINITPEMANDUCJA_10298_310 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/LAMPIRAN2MINITPEMANDUCJA_10298_310.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/LAMPIRAN2MINITPEMANDUCJA_10298_310.pdf</a> )	herlianna.naning@undp.org	11/5/2021 4:10:00 PM
3	NSCKick-off_18Feb2019_combined_10298_310 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/NSCKick-off_18Feb2019_combined_10298_310.pptx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/NSCKick-off_18Feb2019_combined_10298_310.pptx</a> )	herlianna.naning@undp.org	11/8/2021 5:47:00 AM
4	CJAScopingDocument_editDL02012020_clean_10298_310 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CJAScopingDocument_editDL02012020_clean_10298_310.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CJAScopingDocument_editDL02012020_clean_10298_310.docx</a> )	herlianna.naning@undp.org	11/8/2021 5:47:00 AM

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

- 3: The project monitored risks every quarter and consulted with the key stakeholders, security advisors, to identify continuing and emerging risks to assess if the main assumptions remained valid. There is clear evidence that relevant management plans and mitigating measures were fully implemented to address each key project risk and were updated to reflect the latest risk assessment. (all must be true)
- 2: *The project monitored risks every year, as evidenced by an updated risk log. Some updates were made to management plans and mitigation measures.*
- 1: The risk log was not updated as required. There was may be some evidence that the project monitored risks that may affected the project’s achievement of results, but there is no explicit evidence that management actions were taken to mitigate risks.

**Evidence:**

The project monitored risks regularly updated at the Atlas Risk Log with mitigation measures and reported in the APR.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	APR2020Signed_10298_311 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/APR2020Signed_10298_311.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/APR2020Signed_10298_311.pdf</a> )	herlianna.naning@undp.org	11/5/2021 4:13:00 PM
2	APR2019-B40-Signed_10298_311 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/APR2019-B40-Signed_10298_311.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/APR2019-B40-Signed_10298_311.pdf</a> )	herlianna.naning@undp.org	11/8/2021 5:57:00 AM

**Efficient**

**Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

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:**

Yes, attached is the approved AWP by the EPU and IP which indicate resources mobilised for the project.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	B40-AWP2020-SignedbyEPUandIP_10298_312 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/B40-AWP2020-SignedbyEPUandIP_10298_312.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/B40-AWP2020-SignedbyEPUandIP_10298_312.pdf</a> )	herlianna.naning@undp.org	11/5/2021 4:15:00 PM
2	B40Pilot_ProposedBudget_Appendix_10298_312 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/B40Pilot_ProposedBudget_Appendix_10298_312.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/B40Pilot_ProposedBudget_Appendix_10298_312.pdf</a> )	herlianna.naning@undp.org	11/8/2021 6:04:00 AM
3	B40ActionPlanprojectextension_10298_312 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/B40ActionPlanprojectextension_10298_312.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/B40ActionPlanprojectextension_10298_312.pdf</a> )	herlianna.naning@undp.org	11/8/2021 6:04:00 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:**

With support from the PSU team, the project updated its procurement plan regularly and annually reviewed the procurement plan and addressed operational bottlenecks by ensuring adequate resources available as indicated in the AWP, to procure necessary services (ie technical and logistic) for timely and efficient delivery of outputs.

### List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	B40-AWP2020-SignedbyEPUandIP_10298_313 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/B40-AWP2020-SignedbyEPUandIP_10298_313.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/B40-AWP2020-SignedbyEPUandIP_10298_313.pdf</a> )	herlianna.naning@undp.org	11/8/2021 6:11:00 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 monitored its own costs and conduct some cost analysis and projection to ensure the project has adequate funding to implement the core activities that contribute directly to the project such as the closure workshop to obtain final feedback from the local community leaders. The project also considered cost efficiency such that any workshops will be held in a venue that provides the lowest price and strategic location for all participants to attend, and progress meetings were held at the government's premises to minimize cost.

### List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

**Effective****Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

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

- Yes  
 No

**Evidence:**

The B40 Action Plan Study produced a study report while the CJA Pilot produced a final report and a Guideline for the government to adopt and replicate the CJA principle in any government's setting.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	B40FinalReport4June2018rev_10298_315 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/B40FinalReport4June2018rev_10298_315.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/B40FinalReport4June2018rev_10298_315.pdf</a> )	herlianna.naning@undp.org	11/5/2021 4:35:00 PM
2	CJAinGovernmentServiceDelivery-FinalGuideline_10298_315 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CJAinGovernmentServiceDelivery-FinalGuideline_10298_315.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CJAinGovernmentServiceDelivery-FinalGuideline_10298_315.pdf</a> )	herlianna.naning@undp.org	11/5/2021 4:35:00 PM
3	FinalReportCJAinGovernmentServiceDeliveryAsofMarch05_10298_315 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FinalReportCJAinGovernmentServiceDeliveryAsofMarch05_10298_315.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FinalReportCJAinGovernmentServiceDeliveryAsofMarch05_10298_315.pdf</a> )	herlianna.naning@undp.org	11/5/2021 4:36:00 PM

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:**

Attached is the AWP 2020 with necessary budget revision made, reviewed by the EPU and IP

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	B40-AWP2020-SignedbyEPUandIP_10298_316 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/B40-AWP2020-SignedbyEPUandIP_10298_316.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/B40-AWP2020-SignedbyEPUandIP_10298_316.pdf</a> )	herlianna.naning@undp.org	11/5/2021 4:38:00 PM

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:**

1) B40 Action Plan Study  
The study on B40 Action Plan aimed at supporting t



he Government in crafting effective policies and initiatives that promote socioeconomic inclusion for the B40 communities. Hence, the findings and recommendations from this study benefit both the Government and the B40 communities. The study employed a series of open space technology (OST) which provides a platform for B40 communities to be engaged in a meaningful way. UNDP identified B40 communities to be involved in this OST based on an extracted but confidential pool of eKasih data provided by the ICU, who among others is the key stakeholder in this study. eKasih database is a national registry of poor and hardcore poor in Malaysia, defined as households with income below the poverty line. As a result, the OST discussions were held in six geographical zones, namely Northern, Eastern, Central, Southern, Sabah and Sarawak covering all states and two custom-designed participatory workshops with the indigenous people. The participatory discussion saw a total of 619 people from B40 communities participate in which women comprised 55% of the overall participants.

## 2) CJA Pilot

The CJA Pilot is an extension of the B40 Study to test the recommended intervention crafted in consultation with the B40 communities. Similarly, it aimed at supporting the Government to implement an effective programme for the B40 communities to alleviate the poverty of this group. Therefore, both the Government and the B40 communities are the ultimate beneficiaries and target group of this project. The intervention was piloted in three states: Sabah, Kelantan and Kuala Lumpur and overall involved 272 poor and vulnerable households from 33 villages and 22 Projek Perumahan Rakyat Termiskin (PPRTs). However, the household interviewed were not necessarily the head of households as many of them were out for work during the interview. These households were identified by the local community leaders based on vulnerability traits i.e. single parent, elderly, sole breadwinner, unpaid care etc. 38% of the 272 households reached out to are women respondents. Under this project, a total of 90 local community leaders across three states trained as the Community Referral (CRs) for this pilot and only 20% of the local community leaders are women. The CRs were selected through a layered of consultation process at federal and state level. As an instance, in consultation with UNDP, MRD at Federal level proposed the MPKK entity to play the CR's role while the selection of MPKK leaders at the grassroots level was picked by the MPKK state administration in line with the district proposed by the project. With the facilitation of the CRs, a total of 127 households were registered in eKasih. For househ

olds with unsuccessful registers were mainly because the household income is above the poverty line (therefore ineligible which reflect the gap in social protection as poverty line measure unidimensionally while in reality poverty is multidimensional), existing record (repeat entry) or incomplete documentation. However, the pilot did not track nor observe if the households received the social assistance due to the short timeframe of the pilot.

#### List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

#### 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:**

This is a National Implementation Modality (NIM) project with Equity Division of the EPU as the implementing partner. The project is governed by a National Steering Committee (NSC) chaired by the Deputy Director General (Policy) of EPU. The committee members of NSC are representatives from key relevant ministries to B40 issues such as the Implementing Coordination Unit (ICU) under the Prime Minister's Office, Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Women, Family and Community Development and Ministry of Rural Development. As the governing body of the project, the committee of NSC provide guidance and direction to the project implementation process according to the established detailed work plan monitoring tool.

In reinforcing ownership of this project, the project's NPD is the Director of EPU Equity Division whose responsibility is coordinating project activities, ensuring the project document and project revisions requiring Government's approval are verified by EPU Equity Division and processed through the Government coordinating authority in accordance with established procedures and providing direction and guidance on project-related issues. The NPD also has the authority to disburse funds upon the advice from the National Steering Committee or the Project Manager based on the required project milestones.

To ensure sustainability, the project works with existing institutions and processes, where the EPU Equity Division was the main driver behind this initiative and was supported strongly by key partners such as the MRD, MFT, MWFC and ICU.

**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](#)<sup>8</sup> 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:**

There is no audit for the project since the overall expenses for IP processes is below USD 200K.  
 HACT spot check for the B40 project was not conducted because the annual IP processes expenses is below USD50K.

<b>List of Uploaded Documents</b>			
#	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:**

After the last NSC meeting, it was suggested that a CJA Guideline potentially to be adopted by the Government. The Guideline is aimed to provide a generic guideline for the government as well as non-government entities to roll out CJA relevant to their context in improving service delivery to the last mile. The CJA Guideline has been submitted to the IP but there was no further feedback from IP on the next steps of whether the Guideline will be discussed, presented and formally adopted by the Government. Attached is the minutes of the last NSC meeting mentioning the Guideline. However, the knowledge and lesson learned gained from this project have been applied to inform another project on social protection.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	LAMPIRAN2MINITPEMANDUCJA_10298_320 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/LAMPIRAN2MINITPEMANDUCJA_10298_320.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/LAMPIRAN2MINITPEMANDUCJA_10298_320.pdf</a> )	herlianna.naning@undp.org	11/5/2021 4:58:00 PM

**QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments**

Reviewed and added other necessary information.