

# Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

**Form Status: Approved**

<b>Overall Rating:</b>	Satisfactory
<b>Decision:</b>	
<b>Portfolio/Project Number:</b>	00087621
<b>Portfolio/Project Title:</b>	Civil Registry Reform in Tajikistan, Phase I
<b>Portfolio/Project Date:</b>	2015-07-01 / 2023-12-31

**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:**

1. Under the initial approved project plan, all 68 Civil Registration offices were considered as primary and 405 jamoats (autonomous local organs) as secondary beneficiaries of the project. However, during project implementation it was discovered that these targets are over ambitious and civil registration offices were in need of more time than expected to introduce and cement the transformational change employed under the project support. Hence, upon agreement with all stakeholders during the Project's Steering Committee Meeting, the jamoats' component was suspended in the project during Phase I. 2. As a part of the project plan to digitize civil registration archives, it was decided to start with the pilot approach to identify the approach and model for digitization. Hence upon consultations with all partners and stakeholders, only 168.000 of primary and 10.000 secondary copies of the archives were selected to be digitized.

Minutes of Steering Committee meetings enclosed to reference.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	SC_minutes_eng_ver_19.06.2018_3035_301 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SC_minutes_eng_ver_19.06.2018_3035_301.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SC_minutes_eng_ver_19.06.2018_3035_301.pdf</a> )	anvar.aminov@undp.org	1/10/2020 12:38:00 PM
2	SC_meeting_14.12.2018_engver_3035_301 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SC_meeting_14.12.2018_engver_3035_301.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SC_meeting_14.12.2018_engver_3035_301.pdf</a> )	anvar.aminov@undp.org	1/10/2020 12:39:00 PM
3	SC_Minutes_11July2019_ENG_signed_3035_301 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SC_Minutes_11July2019_ENG_signed_3035_301.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SC_Minutes_11July2019_ENG_signed_3035_301.pdf</a> )	anvar.aminov@undp.org	1/10/2020 1:08:00 PM

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 responded to development setting B. Accelerate structural transformations for sustainable development by leveraging technological advances such as digitalization of government service delivery, enhancement of infrastructure and capacity for service delivery, provision of high-quality policy and technical advice to the government, promoting innovation and knowledge-sharing. The project adopted Signature solution 2: Strengthen effective, inclusive and accountable governance and to some extent to Signature solution 6: Strengthen gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls since civil registration is a foundation for accessing basic services including for women and girls.

The project's RRF included indicators similar or contributing to SP output indicator 2.2.3.1. Country is using frameworks that leverage digital technologies and big data for civil registration and 2.2.3.1. Country has strengthened institutions and systems supporting fulfilment of nationally and internationally ratified human rights obligations.

Project Document, logical framework, results and impact summary table and Final Evaluation report enclosed for reference.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	ProDoc_87621_97519_Civil_Registry_phase1_eng_3035_302 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ProDoc_87621_97519_Civil_Registry_phase1_eng_3035_302.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ProDoc_87621_97519_Civil_Registry_phase1_eng_3035_302.pdf</a> )	anvar.aminov@undp.org	1/10/2020 1:10:00 PM
2	E.ProjectResultsandImpactSummary_Updated_FinalEvaluation_06.02.2019_3035_302 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/E.ProjectResultsandImpactSummary_Updated_FinalEvaluation_06.02.2019_3035_302.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/E.ProjectResultsandImpactSummary_Updated_FinalEvaluation_06.02.2019_3035_302.docx</a> )	anvar.aminov@undp.org	1/10/2020 1:26:00 PM
3	FinalevaluationreportCRRTJ_3035_302 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FinalevaluationreportCRRTJ_3035_302.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FinalevaluationreportCRRTJ_3035_302.pdf</a> )	anvar.aminov@undp.org	1/10/2020 1:27:00 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:**

The ultimate target groups were identified at the initial stage of the project which were children and women who are the most marginalized and deprived from the benefit of using civil registration to exercise and protect own rights. In the course of the project implementation, they were engaged through the feasibility studies and surveys to identify the reasons of delayed registration of vital events and what measures need to be taken to create a conducive environment for timely registration. In addition, all of them were covered through the public awareness campaigns.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	UNFPA_FinalProgressReport_CRVS_PHASE1_3035_303 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/UNFPA_FinalProgressReport_CRVS_PHASE1_3035_303.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/UNFPA_FinalProgressReport_CRVS_PHASE1_3035_303.pdf</a> )	anvar.aminov@undp.org	1/10/2020 2:03:00 PM
2	BaselineStudyundertheUNDPPProject_Clean_24112016_3035_303 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/BaselineStudyundertheUNDPPProject_Clean_24112016_3035_303.doc">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/BaselineStudyundertheUNDPPProject_Clean_24112016_3035_303.doc</a> )	anvar.aminov@undp.org	1/10/2020 1:40:00 PM
3	UNWomen_FinalNarrativeReportonCRRproject2016-2019_3035_303 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/UNWomen_FinalNarrativeReportonCRRproject2016-2019_3035_303.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/UNWomen_FinalNarrativeReportonCRRproject2016-2019_3035_303.pdf</a> )	anvar.aminov@undp.org	1/10/2020 2:03:00 PM

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:**

There are 2 major lessons learnt in the project and a appropriate decision and actions were taken immediately to address all the challenges:

1. The engagement with the Executive Office of the President was vital for timely achieving policy and legal reforms of civil registration system. Once appropriate actions were taken to closely cooperate with the Office, it has proved the effectiveness and efficiency in decision making and support rendering to the project. The major legal amendments to reform the civil registration such as making the birth registration free and introducing electronic civil registration become effective mid of 2019.
2. In the course of the project implementation, it was learnt that the project has been over ambitious in many ways and targets and indicators were not likely to be achieved. It has mainly related to Jamoats, data discrepancy alignment between Ministry of Health and Civil Registration system, ensuring the entire system will be reformed by the end of Phase I. Once these were learnt, the project direction was adjusted.

Minutes of Steering Committee meetings, Final Evaluation report enclosed for reference

<b>List of Uploaded Documents</b>			
<b>#</b>	<b>File Name</b>	<b>Modified By</b>	<b>Modified On</b>
1	FinalevaluationreportCRRTJ_3035_304 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FinalevaluationreportCRRTJ_3035_304.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FinalevaluationreportCRRTJ_3035_304.pdf</a> )	anvar.aminov@undp.org	1/13/2020 6:02:00 AM
2	SC_minutes_eng_ver_19.06.2018_3035_304 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SC_minutes_eng_ver_19.06.2018_3035_304.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SC_minutes_eng_ver_19.06.2018_3035_304.pdf</a> )	anvar.aminov@undp.org	1/13/2020 6:28:00 AM
3	SC_meeting_14.12.2018_engver_3035_304 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SC_meeting_14.12.2018_engver_3035_304.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SC_meeting_14.12.2018_engver_3035_304.pdf</a> )	anvar.aminov@undp.org	1/13/2020 9:49:00 AM
4	SC_Minutes_11July2019_ENG_signed_3035_304 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SC_Minutes_11July2019_ENG_signed_3035_304.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SC_Minutes_11July2019_ENG_signed_3035_304.pdf</a> )	anvar.aminov@undp.org	1/13/2020 9:59:00 AM

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

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

**Evidence:**

The reform processed by the project will greatly contribute to development change as it contributes both on supply and demand sides:

On demand side the project covers very significant number of beneficiaries:

- 73 CR Offices in districts and cities of all regions provided by IT equipment, CROIS2 deployed and these offices started using the system.

almost 350 CR staff covered by capacity building on basic computer skills, using CROIS2 and gender orientation.

- Almost 350 CR staff covered by basic computer skills, using CROIS2 and gender orientation.

- Amendments to law on civil registration simplified processes and procedures for CR staff

- One-Stop-Shop service delivery model implemented in two CR Offices for better and innovative service provision. The changes include division of work to front offices for receiving citizens and issuing final certificates and services and back-office for registration in CROIS2, these 2 pilot CR Offices were equipped with Queue Management System, IT equipment, office space was renovated for front and back offices division and for introducing comfortable space for citizens.

While these results focused on demand side they have impact for citizens as well.

On supply side

- Amendments to law on civil registration simplified processes and procedures for citizens and making birth registration free within the first three months after birth.

- Number of beneficiaries covered directly by awareness-raising campaigns conducted in 4 pilot locations (number). Awareness-raising activities using TV and radio has almost 90% of coverage of population.

- Communication strategy raising awareness of population endorsed. This institutionalized the outreach of target groups, ensured national ownership of the work and founded mechanism for coverage of target groups in the future.

Supporting documents such as law on civil registration, handover of IT equipment, progress reports, communication strategy enclosed for reference.

### List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	ЗаконРТОгосударственнойрегистрацииактовгражданскогосостояния_07.08.2019_3035_305 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ЗаконРТОгосударственнойрегистрацииактовгражданскогосостояния_07.08.2019_3035_305.docx)	anvar.aminov@undp.org	1/10/2020 2:06:00 PM
2	Planofactionsapproved_communication_SIG NED_3035_305 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Planofactionsapproved_communication_SIGNED_3035_305.docx)	anvar.aminov@undp.org	1/10/2020 2:13:00 PM
3	CRproject_Semi-annualreport_2019_3035_305 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CRproject_Semi-annualreport_2019_3035_305.pdf)	anvar.aminov@undp.org	1/13/2020 5:55:00 AM
4	CRProject_AnnualReport_submittedtoSDC2018_3035_305 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CRProject_AnnualReport_submittedtoSDC2018_3035_305.pdf)	anvar.aminov@undp.org	1/13/2020 5:54:00 AM
5	TransferofassetstotheMoJ_3035_305 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/TransferofassetstotheMoJ_3035_305.pdf)	anvar.aminov@undp.org	1/13/2020 5:33:00 AM
6	transferofassetsmoj2019_3035_305 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/transferofassetsmoj2019_3035_305.pdf)	anvar.aminov@undp.org	1/13/2020 5:38:00 AM

### Principled

Quality Rating: **Satisfactory**

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

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



**Evidence:**

The project team has systematically gathered data and evidence through project monitoring on the relevance of the measures to address gender inequalities and empowering women. Analysis of data and evidence were used to inform adjustments and changes in programming.

Gender analysis conducted by the project (see attached document) specifically focused on the following areas: 1) capacity of the CR system to provide sex-disaggregated vital statistics; 2) coverage of gender-specific problems in civil service registration by the national policies; 3) cultural and social factors that deepen gender inequality in access to civil registration services; 4) capacity of the CR system to establish demand for registration and addressing existing gender inequalities in coverage.

The Project's gender marker has moved to level 2.

**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 and risks especially those related to human rights under SDG5 gender and environment are being successfully managed and monitored (see monitoring document attached describing how project are promoting SDG 16 peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development, the provision of access to justice for all, and building effective, accountable institutions. This is in accordance with the ProDoc and in direct reference to wider national action plans and NDS.

The project was categorized as Low risk through the SESP in 2016. There were no substantive changes to the project or changes in the context until the end of the project thus SESP and risk category remaining unchanged.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/AnnexXIV-SESPCRProject_3035_307">AnnexXIV-SESPCRProject_3035_307 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/AnnexXIV-SESPCRProject_3035_307.pdf)</a>	anvar.aminov@undp.org	1/9/2020 11:42:00 AM
2	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Inclusive_Process_and_Governance_TC_Daler_comments_RUS_version_3035_307">Inclusive_Process_and_Governance_TC_Daler_comments_RUS_version_3035_307 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Inclusive_Process_and_Governance_TC_Daler_comments_RUS_version_3035_307.docx)</a>	anvar.aminov@undp.org	1/10/2020 2:16:00 PM

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:**

Project-affected people were always informally informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism during each events. The project manager has always been in front of all events sharing his own contacts and other relevant UNDP colleagues where people always could receive information or discuss any of her issues.

**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 civil registration project has a comprehensive M & E plan and relevant budget allocation for this exercise. Baselines, targets and milestones were fully populated and periodically reviewed. Progress data against indicators in the project's RRF is being reported regularly. This is according to the Project Annual Work Plan, which also tracks sex disaggregated data where possible. Evaluations are conducted and meet evaluation standards, including gender UNEG standards.

In 2019 Final Evaluation of the project was conducted by independent evaluator. In 2018 the project passed the Final Evaluation by an independent evaluator. UNDP considered recommendations from the Evaluation Report in designing Phase II of the project. Particularly lessons learnt from Phase I, recommendations from Evaluation considered in formulating outcome level indicators, baselines and targets in the logical framework. (check lessons learnt from Evaluation report).

Project Document, Final evaluation report enclosed for reference.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	FinalevaluationreportCRRTJ_3035_309 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FinalevaluationreportCRRTJ_3035_309.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FinalevaluationreportCRRTJ_3035_309.pdf</a> )	anvar.aminov@undp.org	1/13/2020 6:30:00 AM
2	ProDoc_87621_97519_Civil_Registry_phase1_eng_3035_309 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ProDoc_87621_97519_Civil_Registry_phase1_eng_3035_309.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ProDoc_87621_97519_Civil_Registry_phase1_eng_3035_309.pdf</a> )	anvar.aminov@undp.org	1/13/2020 6:32:00 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 Civil registration project's governance mechanism is functioning well. The Steering Committee meets periodically every 6 months according to the Project Document and the minutes are shared, accepted and filed (see attached). Regular progress reports are produced biannually in the form of semi annual and annual reports, reporting to the steering committee and donor which highlight results, risks and steering opportunities. The Steering Committee actively reviews the evidence produced in the semi/annual reports and uses the project's knowledge base to inform project steering decisions, lessons learned and evaluations for change management strategy.

Minutes of Steering Committee meetings enclosed for reference.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	SC_minutes_eng_ver_19.06.2018_3035_310 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QA/FormDocuments/SC_minutes_eng_ver_19.06.2018_3035_310.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QA/FormDocuments/SC_minutes_eng_ver_19.06.2018_3035_310.pdf</a> )	anvar.aminov@undp.org	1/13/2020 6:35:00 AM
2	SC_meeting_14.12.2018_engver_3035_310 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QA/FormDocuments/SC_meeting_14.12.2018_engver_3035_310.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QA/FormDocuments/SC_meeting_14.12.2018_engver_3035_310.pdf</a> )	anvar.aminov@undp.org	1/13/2020 6:36:00 AM
3	SC_Minutes_11July2019_ENG_signed_3035_310 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QA/FormDocuments/SC_Minutes_11July2019_ENG_signed_3035_310.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QA/FormDocuments/SC_Minutes_11July2019_ENG_signed_3035_310.pdf</a> )	anvar.aminov@undp.org	1/13/2020 7:01:00 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 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 has actively monitored risks every quarter including consulting with key government and UN implementing agency stakeholders twice in the past year identifying risks to project implementation and assumptions are still valid. Evidence that relevant management plans and remedial actions are being addressed can be found in inter-agency coordination meeting minutes. These coordination meetings are held monthly and deal with any common risks to the project and addressed as one-UN.

Minutes of Steering Committee meetings, annual progress reports enclosed for reference.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	CRproject_Semi-annualreport_2019_3035_311 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CRproject_Semi-annualreport_2019_3035_311.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CRproject_Semi-annualreport_2019_3035_311.docx</a> )	anvar.aminov@undp.org	1/10/2020 2:19:00 PM
2	SC_minutes_eng_ver_19.06.2018_3035_311 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SC_minutes_eng_ver_19.06.2018_3035_311.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SC_minutes_eng_ver_19.06.2018_3035_311.pdf</a> )	anvar.aminov@undp.org	1/13/2020 7:14:00 AM
3	SC_meeting_14.12.2018_engver_3035_311 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SC_meeting_14.12.2018_engver_3035_311.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SC_meeting_14.12.2018_engver_3035_311.pdf</a> )	anvar.aminov@undp.org	1/13/2020 7:15:00 AM
4	SC_Minutes_11July2019_ENG_signed_3035_311 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SC_Minutes_11July2019_ENG_signed_3035_311.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SC_Minutes_11July2019_ENG_signed_3035_311.pdf</a> )	anvar.aminov@undp.org	1/13/2020 7:17:00 AM
5	CRProject_AnnualReport2017FINAL_3035_311 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CRProject_AnnualReport2017FINAL_3035_311.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CRProject_AnnualReport2017FINAL_3035_311.pdf</a> )	anvar.aminov@undp.org	1/13/2020 7:21:00 AM
6	CRProject_AnnualReport_submittedtoSDC2018_3035_311 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CRProject_AnnualReport_submittedtoSDC2018_3035_311.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CRProject_AnnualReport_submittedtoSDC2018_3035_311.pdf</a> )	anvar.aminov@undp.org	1/13/2020 7:23:00 AM
7	CRproject_Semi-annualreport_2019_3035_311 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CRproject_Semi-annualreport_2019_3035_311.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CRproject_Semi-annualreport_2019_3035_311.pdf</a> )	anvar.aminov@undp.org	1/13/2020 7:25:00 AM

**Efficient****Quality Rating: Exemplary**

12. Adequate resources were mobilized to achieve intended results. If not, management decisions were taken to adjust expected results in the project's results framework.

- Yes  
 No

**Evidence:**

The project for both phases (2006-2019 and 2020-2023) are funded by the donor along with UNDP core funds allocation which is in breakdown is as follow \$4million USD are donor's allocation and \$2million USD are UNDP funds. These resources are sufficient to achieve outcome articulated in the Project Document. Additional resources for for full-scale digitization of CR archives and b) scaling up One-Stop-Shops service delivery model in CR Offices are being presented to other donors and it is expected that in 2020 new donors will contribute.

**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:**

The civil registration project has an updated procurement plan (see attached). Implementation of the plan goes as planned. The project conducts periodic quarterly reviews to assess operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and find solutions through appropriate management actions.

Procurement plan and delivery table enclosed for reference.



### List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	ProjectProcurementPlanDetailedReport_3035_313 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ProjectProcurementPlanDetailedReport_3035_313.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ProjectProcurementPlanDetailedReport_3035_313.pdf</a> )	anvar.aminov@undp.org	1/10/2020 2:23:00 PM

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:

Evidence that the project regularly reviews costs against relevant comparators can be found for example in the cost benefit analysis for alternative office space. Part 6 of the attached evaluation report shows a value for money analysis taken from other projects who are also moving to alternative office space in the city.

The analysis indicates industry benchmarks on office rental costs to ensure the project maximizes project funding from given finite resources. The project actively coordinates with other relevant ongoing projects by joining DCC working groups and contributing to common reporting goals. This ensures complementarity even outside the UN Common system for programmes with similar goals to gain efficiencies wherever possible.

The project in implementing activities and delivering results actively consulted Country Office for cost-benefit analysis and achieving value for money.

### List 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?

- Yes
- No

**Evidence:**

Project has developed Annual and detailed Work Plans to track the intended outputs, and flag any possible delays in delivery which require remedial action.

The project delivered expected outputs. Final Evaluation Report enclosed for reference.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	FinalevaluationreportCRRTJ_3035_315 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FinalevaluationreportCRRTJ_3035_315.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FinalevaluationreportCRRTJ_3035_315.pdf</a> )	anvar.aminov@undp.org	1/13/2020 7:28:00 AM

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

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

**Evidence:**

The project board along with the project team regularly monitored the work plan, identified issues and made course corrections where required.

Minutes of Steering Committee meetings enclosed for reference.

### List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	SC_Minutes_11July2019_ENG_signed_3035_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SC_Minutes_11July2019_ENG_signed_3035_316.pdf)	anvar.aminov@undp.org	1/13/2020 9:31:00 AM
2	SC_minutes_eng_ver_19.06.2018_3035_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SC_minutes_eng_ver_19.06.2018_3035_316.pdf)	anvar.aminov@undp.org	1/13/2020 8:40:00 AM
3	SC_meeting_14.12.2018_engver_3035_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SC_meeting_14.12.2018_engver_3035_316.pdf)	anvar.aminov@undp.org	1/13/2020 8:41:00 AM

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

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

#### Evidence:

The target groups were identified at the initial stage of the project which are women and girls. They are most deprived in benefiting from Civil Registration system in terms conducting timely registration of birth and marriage. The project conducted several awareness-raising campaigns reaching 9000 people out of which 60% were women and girls.

Please refer to the uploaded progress reports, Final Evaluation report.

### List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	FinalevaluationreportCRRTJ_3035_317 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FinalevaluationreportCRRTJ_3035_317.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FinalevaluationreportCRRTJ_3035_317.pdf</a> )	anvar.aminov@undp.org	1/13/2020 7:40:00 AM
2	UNWomen_FinalNarrativeReportonCRRproject2016-2019_3035_317 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/UNWomen_FinalNarrativeReportonCRRproject2016-2019_3035_317.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/UNWomen_FinalNarrativeReportonCRRproject2016-2019_3035_317.pdf</a> )	anvar.aminov@undp.org	1/13/2020 7:43:00 AM
3	UNFPA_FinalProgressReport_CRVS_PHASE1_3035_317 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/UNFPA_FinalProgressReport_CRVS_PHASE1_3035_317.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/UNFPA_FinalProgressReport_CRVS_PHASE1_3035_317.pdf</a> )	anvar.aminov@undp.org	1/13/2020 7:44:00 AM

### Sustainability & National Ownership

Quality Rating: **Satisfactory**

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

- 3: Only national systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) were used to fully implement and monitor the project. All relevant stakeholders and partners were fully and actively engaged in the process, playing a lead role in project decision-making, implementation and monitoring. (both must be true)
- 2: *National systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) were used to implement and monitor the project (such as country office support or project systems) were also used, if necessary. All relevant stakeholders and partners were actively engaged in the process, playing an active role in project decision-making, implementation and monitoring. (both must be true)*
- 1: There was relatively limited or no engagement with national stakeholders and partners in the decision-making, implementation and/or monitoring of the project.
- Not Applicable

#### Evidence:

The project board meetings conducted twice a year to discuss the project progress, to agree on key strategic decisions. Stakeholders and national partners are fully engaged in monitoring and implementation of most of the activities and interventions.

Minutes of Steering Committee meetings enclosed for reference.

List of Uploaded Documents			
#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	SC_meeting_14.12.2018_engver_3035_318 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SC_meeting_14.12.2018_engver_3035_318.pdf)	anvar.aminov@undp.org	1/13/2020 9:35:00 AM
2	SC_Minutes_11July2019_ENG_signed_3035_318 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SC_Minutes_11July2019_ENG_signed_3035_318.pdf)	anvar.aminov@undp.org	1/13/2020 9:37:00 AM
3	SC_minutes_eng_ver_19.06.2018_3035_318 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SC_minutes_eng_ver_19.06.2018_3035_318.pdf)	anvar.aminov@undp.org	1/13/2020 9:34:00 AM

19. Were there regular monitoring of changes in capacities and performance of institutions and systems relevant to the project, as needed, and were the implementation [arrangements](#)<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:**

Not applicable

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:**

Throughout the project implementation, the project board ensured the smooth and gradual phase out of project components. To ensure full sustainability is reached, the donor has committed suffice resources to be utilized within 2 project phases. The phase I during 2016-2019 has implemented all key components and already started implementing the sustainability plan whereas the phase II (2020-2023) will fully focus on transition and phase - out to ensure the reforms envisaged are fully taken over by the Government.

Minutes of Steering Committee meetings enclosed for reference.

<b>List of Uploaded Documents</b>			
#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	SC_minutes_eng_ver_19.06.2018_3035_320 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SC_minutes_eng_ver_19.06.2018_3035_320.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SC_minutes_eng_ver_19.06.2018_3035_320.pdf</a> )	anvar.aminov@undp.org	1/13/2020 9:39:00 AM
2	SC_meeting_14.12.2018_engver_3035_320 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SC_meeting_14.12.2018_engver_3035_320.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SC_meeting_14.12.2018_engver_3035_320.pdf</a> )	anvar.aminov@undp.org	1/13/2020 9:40:00 AM
3	SC_Minutes_11July2019_ENG_signed_3035_320 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SC_Minutes_11July2019_ENG_signed_3035_320.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SC_Minutes_11July2019_ENG_signed_3035_320.pdf</a> )	anvar.aminov@undp.org	1/13/2020 9:45:00 AM

**QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments**