

Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

Form Status: Approved	
Overall Rating:	Satisfactory
Decision:	
Portfolio/Project Number:	00103026
Portfolio/Project Title:	Support to the Civil Service Academy
Portfolio/Project Date:	2017-01-01 / 2020-12-31

Strategic

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. There is 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. (both must be true)
- 1: The project team considered relevant changes in the external environment since implementation began, but there is no evidence of integration.

Evidence: During the implementation of the Project, the Project board discussed the external environment in the area of policy changes related to public administration and civil service, and relevant changes were integrated into the project. For example, the launch of the Concept of development of the digital economy for 2019-2025 created new opportunities for the project, which resulted in the development and launch of the master course on Digital Management at the Academy of Civil Service.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name
---	-----------

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 of the development settings as specified in the Strategic Plan. The project's RRF in
- 2: The project responded to at least one of the developments settings1 as specified in the Strategic Plan. The project's RRF in
- 1: While the project may have responded to a partner's identified need, this need falls outside of the UNDP Strategic Plan. All

Evidence: The project responded to developments settings of the SP and is inline with Signature Solution to accelerate structural transformations for sustainable development.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name
---	-----------

1	Prodoc_CSA_2017-2019_eng_6355_302
---	---

Relevant

3. Were the project's targeted groups systematically identified and engaged, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginali

- 3: Systematic and structured feedback was collected over the project duration from a representative sample of beneficiaries, w groups were active members of the project's governance mechanism (i.e., the project board or equivalent) and there is credible evi
- 2: Targeted groups were engaged in implementation and monitoring, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginali 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 opt
- Not Applicable

Evidence: The targeted groups, namely the staff of the Civil Service Academy as well as the students of the Academy were enga to receive feedback on the project interventions, which was used to inform and influence project decision making.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name
---	-----------

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 of risk?

- 3: Knowledge and lessons learned from internal or external sources (gained, for example, from Peer Assists, After Action Reviews) were discussed in project board meetings and reflected in the minutes. There is clear evidence that changes were made to the project based on this knowledge (i.e., what must be true)
 - 2: Knowledge and lessons learned backed by relatively limited evidence, drawn mainly from within the project, were considered to be true (i.e., what 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 knowledge was used to inform management of risk.
-

Evidence: Risks and lessons learned were collected regularly and shared with the project team. The final lessons learned of the Project were developed and shared with the National partners as well.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name
1	Lessons-LearnedReportCSA_6355_304

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 activities or indirectly through policy 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 expanding to other regions or countries).
 - 1: The project was not at scale, and there are no plans to scale up the project in the future.
-

Evidence: The project was mainly focused on the policy change and institutional change of the Civil Service Academy. The new phase of the project was approved by the Government to continue with scaling up of initiatives in the first phase.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name
1	FinalBoardMeetingMinutes_30.06.2020_ENG_6355_305
2	PRODOC_CSA_ENG_6355_305

Principled

6. Were the project's measures (through outputs, activities, indicators) to address gender inequalities and empower women relevant

- 3: The project team gathered data and evidence through project monitoring on the relevance of the measures to address gender inequalities and empower women (all 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
- 1: The project team had limited or no evidence on the relevance of measures to address gender inequalities and empowering women relevant to the project results and activities.

Evidence: While piloting the developed master course on Digital Management, the Project strongly advocated the Government to nominate women to attend the pilot course. As a result, three women out of 18 male middle-level managers in IT background successfully completed a two-month pilot course. Taking into account that women in the IT sector are underrepresented in Turkmenistan this was a break-through.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name
---	-----------

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 for High risk projects as identified through SESP). Relevant management plan(s) developed for identified risks through consultation with stakeholders. For projects categorized as High or Moderate Risk, 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 for Moderate risk projects as identified through SESP). Relevant management plan(s) developed, implemented and monitored for identified risks.
- 1: Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. For projects categorized as High or Moderate Risk, there was no assessment conducted. There are substantive changes to the project or changes in the context but SESP was not updated. (any may be true)

Evidence: SESP for the project was prepared on regular basis as part of the risk log. The project was categorized as Low risk through the SESP.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name
---	-----------

No documents available.

8. Were grievance mechanisms available to project-affected people and were grievances (if any) addressed to ensure any perceived

- 3: Project-affected people actively informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism (SRM/SECU) and how to access it. If grievances were received, they were effectively addressed in accordance with SRM Guidance.
- 2: Project-affected people informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism and how to access it. If the project was not, or 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

Evidence: The national partners from the CSA were the main beneficiaries of the project and were informed on UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism and how to access it. Since the project was categorized as Low Risk the no project-level grievance mechanism in place was not in place.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name
---	-----------

No documents available.

Management & Monitoring

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 was reported as stated in the Plan, including sex disaggregated data as relevant. Any evaluations conducted, if relevant, fully meet decentralized evaluation standards. Lessons learned 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 was not always reliable. Any evaluations conducted, if relevant, met most decentralized evaluation standards. Lessons learned were rarely captured and used. Select this option also if the project did not have an M&E plan.
- 1: The project had M&E Plan, but costs were not clearly planned and budgeted for, or were unrealistic. Progress data was not reported as stated in the Plan, including sex disaggregated data as relevant. Any evaluations conducted, if relevant, 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: M&E Plan for the project was in place. Most of the baselines and targets were reported on a regular basis. Lessons learned were recorded and attached in the library.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name
---	-----------

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 board or equivalent on results, risks and opportunities. It is clear that the project board explicitly reviewed and used evidence to inform its 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 prepared and reviewed 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

Evidence: The project governance mechanism operated well, the Project Boards were held twice a year. Minutes of the Board Meeting was collected on a duly basis and are attached in the library.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name
---	-----------

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 risks. Mitigating measures were fully implemented to address each key project risk and were updated to reflect the latest risk assessment.
- 2: The project monitored risks every year, as evidenced by an updated risk log. Some updates were made to management plan.
- 1: The risk log was not updated as required. There was may be some evidence that the project monitored risks that may affect

Evidence: The project monitored risks twice a year, emerging risks were assessed. Mitigation measures were fully implemented to address the key project risks. The risks for the project are available in the system.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name
---	-----------

No documents available.

Efficient

12. Adequate resources were mobilized to achieve intended results. If not, management decisions were taken to adjust expected re

- Yes
 No

Evidence: Adequate resources were mobilized from the Government as well as UNDP to implement the project.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name
---	-----------

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.
- 2: The project had updated procurement plan. The project annually reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner.
- 1: The project did not have an updated procurement plan. The project team may or may not have reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner.

Evidence: The Project had a procurement plan, which was part of the entire office procurement plan in online platform. The plan was monitored and reviewed annually.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name
---	-----------

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 office activities) and other relevant ongoing projects and initiatives (UNDP or other) to ensure complementarity and sought efficiencies wherever possible.
- 2: The project monitored its own costs and gave anecdotal examples of cost efficiencies (e.g., spending less to get the same results) or 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 the budget.

Evidence: The project regularly reviewed costs within the country office. While procurement of the IT equipment within the project UNDP corporate LTAs with IT companies was used to ensure complementarity and efficiency;

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name
---	-----------

No documents available.

Effective

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

- Yes
 No

Evidence: The project was on track, however, due to internal political reasons the project was extended on mutual agreement for additional 6 months with no cost.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name
---	-----------

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

- 3: Quarterly progress data informed regular reviews of the project work plan to ensure that the activities implemented were m
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 achie
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
management took place.

Evidence: The project had one review of the Work Plans addressing the needs of the project and emerging risks. The annual Work
Plans were reviewed and approved by the Project Governance mechanism. All necessary budget revisions were made accordingl
The budget revisions are uploaded in the system.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name
---	-----------

No documents available.

17. Were the targeted groups systematically identified and engaged, prioritizing the marginalized and excluded, to ensure results w

- 3: The project targeted specific groups and/or geographic areas, identified by using credible data sources on their capacity ne
targeted groups were reached as intended. The project engaged regularly with targeted groups over the past year to assess whether
- 2: The project targeted specific groups and/or geographic areas, based on some evidence of their capacity needs, deprivation a
beneficiaries are members of the targeted groups. There was some engagement with beneficiaries in the past year to assess whethe
- 1: The project did not report on specific targeted groups. There is no evidence to confirm that project beneficiaries are popula
some engagement with beneficiaries to assess whether they benefited as expected, but it was limited or did not occurred in the past
- Not Applicable

Evidence: Not applicable.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name
---	-----------

No documents available.

Sustainability & National Ownership

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 proje
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
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, implementa
- Not Applicable

Evidence: Though the project was implemented through the National Implementation Mechanism the national partners played an
active role in the project decision-making and implementation.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name
---	-----------

No documents available.

19. Were there regular monitoring of changes in capacities and performance of institutions and systems relevant to the project, as follows?

- 3: Changes in capacities and performance of national institutions and systems were assessed/monitored using clear indicators and implementation arrangements were formally reviewed and adjusted, if needed, in agreement with partners according to changes in partner capacities.
- 2: Aspects of changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems were monitored by the project and 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 but 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
---	-----------

No documents available.

20. Were the transition and phase-out arrangements were reviewed and adjusted according to progress (including financial commitments) as follows?

- 3: The project's governance mechanism regularly reviewed the project's sustainability plan, including arrangements for transition and phase-out, 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's sustainability plan was updated and adjusted according to progress.
- 1: The project may have had a sustainability plan but there was no review of this strategy after it was developed. Also select the option 'Not Applicable' if the project did not have a sustainability plan.

Evidence: The project had a sustainability plan and two project outputs were targeted at the sustainability of project interventions and these were being regularly reviewed by the project board.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name
---	-----------

No documents available.

QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments

The conclusions of the Project Board were as following: The joint project for the period 2017-2020 was successfully implemented, all results were achieved. It was recommended to continue cooperation between UNDP and Civil Service Academy within the framework of a new project for 2021-2023.