

# Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

**Form Status: Approved**

<b>Overall Rating:</b>	Satisfactory
<b>Decision:</b>	
<b>Portfolio/Project Number:</b>	00116671
<b>Portfolio/Project Title:</b>	Cohésion sociale, Diffa
<b>Portfolio/Project Date:</b>	2019-01-01 / 2021-12-31

**Strategic**

**Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

1. Did the project pro-actively identified changes to the external environment and incorporated them into the project strategy?

- 3: The project team identified relevant changes in the external environment that may present new opportunities or threats to the project's ability to achieve its objectives, assumptions were tested to determine if the project's strategy was valid. There is some evidence that the project board considered the implications, and documented the changes needed to the project in response. (all must be true)
- 2: *The project team identified relevant changes in the external environment that may present new opportunities or threats to the project's ability to achieve its objectives. There is some evidence that the project board discussed this, but relevant changes did not fully integrate in the project. (both must be true)*
- 1: The project team considered relevant changes in the external environment since implementation began, but there is no evidence that the project team considered these changes to the project as a result.

**Evidence:**

Le projet dispose d'une théorie de changement qui a été élaborée dans le document du projet. De même, les réunions de Comité de Pilotage et Comité Technique permettent de faire les ajustements nécessaires pour prendre en compte les changements de l'environnement externe.

L'équipe du projet a identifié des changements liés à l'environnement d'insécurité qui ont représenté des menaces pour la mise en œuvre du projet. Ce faisant, la stratégie du projet a été réajustée et la stratégie du Faire-Faire a été déployée à travers les ONGs nationales et les services techniques nationaux pour mettre en œuvre le projet.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

2. Was the project aligned with the thematic focus of the Strategic Plan?

- 3: The project responded to at least one of the development settings as specified in the Strategic Plan (SP) and adopted at least one Signature Solution. The project's RRF included all the relevant SP output indicators. (all must be true)
- 2: *The project responded to at least one of the developments settings<sup>1</sup> 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:**

Il faut aussi noter que le projet cadre avec les objectifs du PNUD et l'UNHCR dont :

- Plan stratégique du PNUD 2018 – 2021 dans son objectif de renforcer la résilience aux crises et aux chocs. En mettant en place une gouvernance plus efficace, plus inclusive et plus responsable et Renforce les capacités nationales de prévention et de relèvement pour édifier des sociétés résilientes.
- Effet 2 de l'UNDAF : D'ici à 2021 la sécurité intérieure, transfrontalière et communautaire ainsi que le système judiciaire sont améliorés pour garantir le respect des droits humains et l'accès des groupes vulnérables à la justice et l'organisation des processus démocratiques ouverts, transparents, crédibles avec des collectivités territoriales mieux gérées, viables et aptes à satisfaire les besoins spécifiques des couches les plus vulnérables notamment les femmes, les jeunes, les enfants et les personnes avec handicap.
- Le CPD dans son pilier 2 : Gouvernance Paix et Sécurité (v) renforcer la gouvernance nationale et transfrontalière de la sécurité et les systèmes opérationnels pour renforcer la cohésion sociale et la stabilité ; et vi) améliorer la participation des femmes et des jeunes aux processus de prise de décisions politiques et socioéconomiques.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

**Relevant****Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

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

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

**Evidence:**

Le Comité Technique mis en place par le Gouverneur de la Région de Diffa est impliqué dans la mise en œuvre et le suivi. Il faut ajouter à cela, les comités communaux dans lesquels siègent les représentants des bénéficiaires.

Le projet a mis l'accent sur l'inclusion des femmes, des jeunes et les populations-hôtes. Ils ont été clairement identifiés et ont participé activement à la mise en œuvre du projet, en particulier les populations hôtes qui ont fait l'objet d'un soutien particulier.

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

Le projet a généré des connaissances par rapport aux mécanismes d'enrôlement des jeunes. Un partenariat a été mis en place avec des centres de formation (CFN) ont permis d'identifier des filières porteuses (formation par les services techniques). Le projet a également permis d'asseoir une bonne collaboration entre les populations hôtes et les populations déplacées et d'organiser un partage des ressources sans tensions.

<b>List of Uploaded Documents</b>			
#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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

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

**Evidence:**

Le projet a intervenu dans 5 communes de la Région de Diffa, sur un total de 12 communes appartenant à la Région. La stratégie de mobilisation en cours facilite la recherche de fonds afin de pouvoir couvrir les communes restantes.

<b>List of Uploaded Documents</b>			
#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

**Principled**

**Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

6. Were the project’s measures (through outputs, activities, indicators) to address gender inequalities and empower women relevant and produced the intended effect? If not, evidence-based adjustments and changes were made.

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

**Evidence:**

Le projet a pour principales cibles, les femmes et les jeunes (filles et garçons) dans la mise en œuvre des activités. Le marqueur Genre du projet est : 2  
Le projet peut être mis à l'échelle dans le cadre des interventions du Programme Stabilisation du bassin du Lac Tchad.

**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:**

Le projet a aménagé des points d'eau afin de réduire les effets des inondations sur les habitations et aussi de canaliser les eaux vers les espaces cultivables.

**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:**

Un Comité Technique régional a été mis en place, avec pour mandat de s'informer des contraintes et besoins des populations, identifier les contraintes de mise en œuvre et proposer des solutions.

**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:**

Un plan de suivi/évaluation du projet a été établi et budgétisé à hauteur de 5% minimum du budget global du projet. Il a été exécuté en même temps que le plan de suivi/évaluation global de l'Unité Paix et Sécurité.



**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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

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

**Evidence:**

La réunion du Comité de Pilotage de tous les projets PBF se tient 2 fois par an. C'est dans ce cadre que se projet est examiné. Les Comités de Pilotage, Comités Techniques et Comité régional de suivi se sont réunis comme prévu.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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

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

**Evidence:**

Les procédures internes des agences déjà très lourdes, ont été aggravées par les mesures restrictives mises en place dans la pandémie du COVID-19, mais l'équipe du projet a su les surmonter et a mené à bien les activités prévues.

Les risques sécuritaires, environnementaux ont été pris en charge correctement à travers des activités de délocalisation, reprogrammation, ou mise en place d'un mécanisme de réponse, en particulier dans le cas des inondations.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

**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:**

Les ressources mises à disposition ont permis de mener les activités programmées au niveau des 5 communes cibles.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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

- 3: The project had a procurement plan and kept it updated. The project quarterly reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addressed them through appropriate management actions. (all must be true)
- 2: *The project had updated procurement plan. The project annually reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addressed them through appropriate management actions. (all must be true)*
- 1: The project did not have an updated procurement plan. The project team may or may not have reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs regularly, however management actions were not taken to address them.

**Evidence:**

Le plan de réquisition du projet a été exécuté en même temps que le plan d'achat global du bureau. Toutes les acquisitions ont été livrées à temps et ont permis d'atteindre les résultats attendus.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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

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

**Evidence:**

Les achats groupés faits à travers l'Unité des achats du PNUD a permis d'obtenir des prix très compétitifs pour les acquisitions du projet.

**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:**

Les rapports trimestriels et annuels, les PV des Comités de Pilotage sont produits régulièrement et ont toujours fait état de l'atteinte des résultats attendus. Le projet a donné les résultats attendus et une mise à l'échelle serait même souhaitable car il a facilité l'intégration des populations déplacées et réfugiées auprès des communautés hôtes, contribuant grandement à la cohésion sociale dans la région.

List of Uploaded Documents			
#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

16. Were there regular reviews of the work plan to ensure that the project was on track to achieve the desired results, and to inform course corrections if needed?

- 3: Quarterly progress data informed regular reviews of the project work plan to ensure that the activities implemented were most likely to achieve the desired results. There is evidence that data and lessons learned (including from evaluations /or After-Action Reviews) were used to inform course corrections, as needed. Any necessary budget revisions were made. (both must be true)
- 2: *There was at least one review of the work plan per year with a view to assessing if project activities were on track to achieving the desired development results (i.e., outputs.) There may or may not be evidence that data or lessons learned were used to inform the review(s). Any necessary budget revisions have been made.*
- 1: While the project team may have reviewed the work plan at least once over the past year to ensure outputs were delivered on time, no link was made to the delivery of desired development results. Select this option also if no review of the work plan by management took place.

**Evidence:**

Les plans de travail annuels sont revus trimestrielle ment afin de procéder à des réajustements dans le but d'atteindre les objectifs fixés. Ce qui a permis de faire les révisions budgétaires à temps, ainsi que les demandes de no-cost extension du projet.

Un dispositif de gestion de proximité a été mis en place à travers le Comité régional de suivi, qui a assuré le suivi de la mise en œuvre et a apporté les réajustements nécessaires.

List of Uploaded Documents			
#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

17. Were the targeted groups systematically identified and engaged, prioritizing the marginalized and excluded, to ensure results were achieved as expected?

- 3: The project targeted specific groups and/or geographic areas, identified by using credible data sources on their capacity needs, deprivation and/or exclusion from development opportunities relevant to the project’s area of work. There is clear evidence that the targeted groups were reached as intended. The project engaged regularly with targeted groups over the past year to assess whether they benefited as expected and adjustments were made if necessary, to refine targeting. (all must be true)
- 2: *The project targeted specific groups and/or geographic areas, based on some evidence of their capacity needs, deprivation and/or exclusion from development opportunities relevant to the project’s area of work. Some evidence is provided to confirm that project beneficiaries are members of the targeted groups. There was some engagement with beneficiaries in the past year to assess whether they were benefiting as expected. (all must be true)*
- 1: The project did not report on specific targeted groups. There is no evidence to confirm that project beneficiaries are populations have capacity needs or are deprived and/or excluded from development opportunities relevant to the project area of work. There is some engagement with beneficiaries to assess whether they benefited as expected, but it was limited or did not occurred in the past year.
- Not Applicable

**Evidence:**

Le projet vise les femmes et les jeunes des populations des 5 communes cibles du projet et plus spécifiquement parmi les populations hôtes, de ces communes accueillant les réfugiés et déplacés du conflit de Boko haram.

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

Le projet a été exécuté sous la modalité DIM, mais le Comité Technique mis en place par le Gouverneur de la Région de Diffa a été partie prenante active de l'exécution de toutes les activités.  
 Un dispositif de suivi a été mis en place au niveau national et au niveau régional, engageant les autorités nationales, régionales et locales concernées par la mise en œuvre du projet (Gouverneurs, Maires, cadres des ministères - services techniques).

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

Des activités régulières de micro évaluation et de spotcheck ont été organisées à l'endroit de l'ensemble des acteurs engagés dans le projet, ainsi que des activités de renforcement de leurs capacités.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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

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

**Evidence:**

Une stratégie de sortie a été développée, notamment reposant sur la mise en place d'un Comité régional, et l'implication des services techniques nationaux et locaux, afin d'assurer l'appropriation nationale. Des réajustements ont été apportés, en particulier dans le cadre de la formation des jeunes. Ainsi, initialement prévue dans les localités, elle a finalement eu lieu dans les centres régionaux des métiers, afin d'harmoniser les formations et gérer le défi sécuritaire.



**List of Uploaded Documents**

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

No documents available.

**QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments**