Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

Form Status: Approved		
Overall Rating:	Highly Satisfactory	
Decision:		
Portfolio/Project Number:	00086689	
Portfolio/Project Title:	Regional Programme Africa - Sustainable Development	
Portfolio/Project Date:	2015-01-01 / 2022-12-31	

Strategic Quality Rating: Exemplary

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

Evidence:

The project adapted to the COVID-19 pandemic by s pecifically changing the 2nd African SSC/TrC report to focus more on the context of the pandemic. The p roject made use of online matchmaking meetings to avoid travels. Besides SSC/TrC solutions, the projec t also codified emerging innovative local developme nt solutions that have potential for scale-up and replication in other peer African countries.

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

- 2. Was the project aligned with the thematic focus of the Strategic Plan?
- 3: The project responded to at least one of the development settings as specified in the Strategic Plan (SP) and adopted at least one Signature Solution . The project's RRF included all the relevant SP output indicators. (all must be true)
- 2: The project responded to at least one of the developments settings1 as specified in the Strategic Plan. The project's RRF included at least one SP output indicator, if relevant. (both must be true)
- 1: While the project may have responded to a partner's identified need, this need falls outside of the UNDP Strategic Plan. Also select this option if none of the relevant SP indicators are included in the RRF.

Evidence:

Yes, the project responds to (B) "Accelerate structur al transformations for sustainable development" in the SP and SSC/TrC is a foundational enabler of the signature solutions anchored in the Global Development Service Platform. The RRF includes SP output indicators.

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

Relevant Quality Rating: Highly 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:

Feedback meetings were organized on the reporting process for SSC and viewpoints at regional meeting s were incorporate into project activities. During the codification of South-South and innovative solutions, feedbacks from member states through consultative reviews were incorporated into the final solutions.

Li	List of Uploaded Documents				
#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On		
No	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 were incorporated i nto all project discussions and relevant knowledge p roducts.

Lis	List of Uploaded Documents			
#	# File Name Modified By Modified On			
No	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:

The project has come to an end, but as detailed in the final evaluation of the project, it would benefit from being scaled up significantly to further facilitate SSC/TrC exchanges and strengthen partnerships with global partners through the solutions codified in SS Galaxy.

Lis	List of Uploaded Documents				
#	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:

Attention was paid to sharing SSC/TrC experience t hat are gender responsive and workshops ensured a reasonable ration of women-men. Gender-respons ive solutions were codified for sharing and promotion under the project.

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:

Social and environmental impacts analysis and solut ions were incorporated in our regional knowledge products (different reports) of the SSC project. The social and environmental risk were logged in the Regional Programme Quarterly Progress report, and risk a nalysis including social and environmental risks was performed with mitigation measures to RSCA.

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:

For each South-South and innovative solutions codified in the project, contact information of UNDP focal points for the solutions was made public for addressing disputes.

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

Management & Monitoring

Quality Rating: Highly 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 final evaluation of the project details the baselin es, targets and milestones based on credible data. B esides, progress was reported within the project tea m on weekly, monthly, and quarterly basis; the Project's quarterly reporting table and monthly inputs wer e provided for Africa Regional Programme of RSCA; and annual results were reflected in the ROAR and annual report of the Regional Programme for Africa.

Lis			
#	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:

The project was anchored in the Regional Program me for Africa governance mechanisms. Quarterly pr ogress reporting of the project was done through the reporting template of the Regional Programme for Africa.

	List of Uploaded Documents				
#	# File Name Modified By Modified On				
١	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:

Risks were identified, reported and mitigated throug hout the project, as seen in the quarterly progress re porting, risk assessment of RSCA and the project ev aluation report.

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

Efficient Quality Rating: Highly 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:

The project has sufficient resources to achieve intended results.

Li	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:

All the procurement ToRs necessary for the project i mplementation and delivery (such as services of con sultancy, event interpretation, editing, translation, de sign) were planned, prepared, adjusted as necessar y and executed successfully.

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:

Cost reviewing and monitoring was done through th e quarterly progress reporting, monitoring matrix of the RP for Africa, and project team's internal monitoring table. For cost efficiency and complementarity of expertise, collaboration was conducted with other initiatives, e.g., mapping and codification of southern solutions with UNDP Accelerator Labs and UNOSSC, and promotion of solutions at UN SS Galaxy platform.

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

Effective	Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory
15. Was the project on track and delivered its expected	outputs?
YesNo	
Evidence:	
The project has delivered the expected outputs, as s hown in the evaluation report of the project.	

Li	st 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:

Quarterly progress reporting against the workplan of the project was done through the reporting mechani sm of the RP for Africa to ensure on-track delivery. B esides, project progress monitoring on weekly, mont hly, and quarterly bases were in place within the proj ect team.

Lis	st 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:

The project prioritized in codifying South-South and i nnovative solutions that focus on addressing develo pment issues (including issues relevant to the margi nalized and excluded) in Africa, and organized SSC match-making events to promote regional and global collaborations between solution providers and seeke rs and expand the positive impacts of the solutions t o broader country and beneficiary coverages. For ex ample, through our codification and promotion, a Bra zil-DR Congo South-South solution is now planned t o be replicated for Sudan on agroecology training of Sudan family farmers in Brazil.

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

Sustainability & National Ownership

18. Were stakeholders and national partners fully engaged in the decision-making, implementation and monitoring of the project?

Quality Rating: Exemplary

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

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:

The project focused on developing national strategie s and institutional framework for SSC/TrC and codify ing South-South and innovative solutions, while ens uring a wide range of national stakeholders were consulted.

Lis	ist 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 arrangements⁸ 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:

Reports on South-South Cooperation (and report ch apters on South-South Cooperation trends in Develo pment Finance Assessments) were produced that in corporated analysis of the capacities and performan ce of national institutions on South-South Cooperati on.

Lis	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:

The project renewed the workplan annually based on the overall progress made as well as the financial commitments and capacity available, which was reviewed and approved by the Regional Programme for Africa governance mechanism. As the project aimed at supporting SSC/TrC ecosystem establishment and codifying and promoting good SSC/TrC solutions, national ownership and commitment will also be crucial to ensure the long-term sustainability of the project efforts beyond the project lifetime.

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

QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments