Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

Form Status: Approved

Overall Rating:	Satisfactory
Decision:	
Portfolio/Project Number:	00106109
Portfolio/Project Title:	Country Coordinating Mechanism
Portfolio/Project Date:	2018-01-01 / 2019-12-31

Strategic **Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

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

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

Evidence:

The Project constantly re-consider new possible cha nges and opportunities in the context of developmen t, undertaking relevant adjustment if needed and tak es appropriate actions. The Project provides admini strative, communication and logistic support to CCM through organization of several high-level dialogue p latforms to make voices of the key affected populatio ns be heard by the decision-makers.

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:

The project fully responded to SP Output Indicator: 1.2.1 Capacities at national and sub-national levels strengthened to promote inclusive local economic de velopment and deliver basic services including HIV and related services

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	CCMDecree_eng_1220_302 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CCMDecree_eng_1220_302.pdf)	ryssaldy.demeuova@undp.org	9/30/2019 6:48:00 AM
2	Project_Document_2018-2019_CCM_5_with Annexes_ENG_1220_302 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Project_Document_2018-2019_CCM_5_withAnnexes_ENG_1220_302.pdf)	ainur.abusseitova@undp.org	1/20/2020 1:37:00 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:

Project objectives and results are consistent with nat ional needs and requirements. Targeted groups are i nvolved at the stage of proposal development and i mplementation of Country Dialogue Plan, when prov iding specific offers and recommendations to the pro posal or identify the most appropriate needs and req uirements of the services to be provided by PRs und er the GF grants and National Health Programmes. The project also collects feedback on goods quality f rom end-users as soon as in-country services are pr ovided.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	FinalProjectProgressReport_2018-2019_signed_1220_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FinalProjectProgressReport_2018-2019_signed_1220_303.pdf)	ainur.abusseitova@undp.org	1/20/2020 1:38:00 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:

The Project updates Lessons Learned Report on a c onstant basis, reviews knowledge to adapt and chan ge plans, undertakes appropriate actions when nece ssary. Lessons learned report for 2019 is attached. F inal Project Lessons-learned report attached

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	MinutesPB_CCM_2018-2019_December052019_ENG_1220_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MinutesPB_CCM_2018-2019_December052019_ENG_1220_304.pdf)	ainur.abusseitova@undp.org	1/20/2020 1:40:00 PM

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

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

Evidence:

The Project is sufficiently at scale, considering that CCM includes representatives from different regions of Kazakhstan, including national and regional levels.

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:

The CCM has balanced representation of men and women (the Global Fund Gender Equality Strategy c larifies how women and girls are key affected groups in the context of the 3 diseases). According to the re sults of the CCM Election that was held in October – November 2018, the female representation in the C CM Kazakhstan is 61%. CCM membership list is att ached. The final Decree of the Prime Minister will be endorsed in the end of 2019

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	MinutesCCMworkingmeeting_Gender_14May2019_1220_306 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MinutesCCMworkingmeeting_Gender_14May2019_1220_306.docx)	ainur.abusseitova@undp.org	1/20/2020 1:43:00 PM
2	MinutesGenderworkinggroupmeeting20Dec2019_1220_306 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MinutesGenderworkinggroupmeeting20Dec2019_1220_306.docx)	ainur.abusseitova@undp.org	1/20/2020 1:44:00 PM

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 Substantial and 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 Substantial and 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, Substantial, or Moderate Risk, there was no evidence that social and environmental assessments completed and/or management plans or measures development, implemented or monitored. There are substantive changes to the project or changes in the context but SESP was not updated. (any may be true)

Evidence:

The CCM Project's social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. Relevant management plan developed, implemented and monitored for identified risks. Taking into account the needs of vulnerable population that demonstrated during the CCM meeting the Vice-Minister of Labor and Social Protection is invited to a CCM Member and to participate in solving the Social issues. Reporting is ensured on a regular basis. Confirmation from Min Labor and Social Protection is attached

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, Substantial, 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 Substantial or High Risk through the SESP, a project -level grievance mechanism was in place and project affected people informed. If grievances were received, they were responded to but faced challenges in arriving at a resolution.*
- 1: Project-affected people was not informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism. If grievances were received, they were not responded to. (any may be true)

Evidence:

The CCM project was not categorized as High Risk t hrough the SESP, in case of any risks the project aff ected people will be informed.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
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 project had a comprehensive and costed M&E p lan. Baselines, targets and milestones were fully pop ulated because of the CCM activities were presente d during the CCM Meetings for 26 organiozations re presentatives, moreover all project results were publ ished in the CCM web-site www.ccmkz.kz. In additio n, the results of Oversight visits were circulated on q uarterly basis among al partners and donor.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	MECCMPlan2019_1220_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MECCMPlan2019_1220_309.doc)	ainur.abusseitova@undp.org	1/20/2020 1:48:00 PM

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's governance mechanism operated well, and was a model for other Global Fund projects. It m et in the agreed frequency stated in the project docu ment and the minutes of the meetings were all on fil e. There was regular reporting (weekly basis) to the Governance Unit and CCM Vice-Chairs on results, ri sks and opportunities.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	MinutesPB_CCM_2018-2019_December052019_ENG_1220_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MinutesPB_CCM_2018-2019_December052019_ENG_1220_310.pdf)	ainur.abusseitova@undp.org	1/20/2020 1:50:00 PM

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

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

Evidence:

The project monitored risks every year, as evidenced by an updated risk log. It was not applicable to make updates to management plans and mitigation measures.

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 adequate resources were mobilized to implement the project in line with GF Funding Agreement

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 project procurement plan developed and kept it updated accordingly

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	ProcurementPlanCCM2019_1220_313 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ProcurementPlanCCM2019_1220_313.xlsx)	ainur.abusseitova@undp.org	1/21/2020 4:24:00 AM

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

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

Evidence:

The project was implemented with 100% delivery rat e. The project were reviewed to ensure maximized r esults delivered with given resources.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Effective **Quality Rating: Exemplary**

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

- *Yes*
- No

Evidence:

All planned results are achieved and CCM has been informed on the results.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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

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

Evidence:

The regular reviews of the work plan were conducte d on regular basis to ensure that the project was on t rack to achieve the desired results, and there were n o reason for any corrections

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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

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

Evidence:

The CCM project has a clear evidence that the targe ted groups were reached as intended. The project e ngaged regularly with targeted groups over the past year to assess whether they benefited as expected and adjustments were made if necessary, to refine t argeting.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	FinalProjectProgressReport_2018-2019_signed_1220_317 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FinalProjectProgressReport_2018-2019_signed_1220_317.pdf)	ainur.abusseitova@undp.org	1/20/2020 1:52:00 PM

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:

Taking into account that the project's implementing p artner is Country Coordinating mechanism that was established by Government of the Republic Kazakhs tan all stakeholders and national partners fully enga ged in the decision-making, implementation of the pr oject.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

19. Were there regular monitoring of changes in capacities and performance of institutions and systems relevant to the project, as needed, and were the implementation arrangements[8] 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:

The CCM project is multi stakeholders body that represented by 26 organizations, therefore Implementation arrangements were formally reviewed and adjusted, if needed, in agreement with partners

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:

There was a review of the project's sustainability plan, but all other activities including arrangements for transition and phase-out, to ensure the project remained on track in meeting the requirements will be set out by next cycle plan

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	MinutesPB_CCM_2018-2019_December052019_ENG_1220_320 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MinutesPB_CCM_2018-2019_December052019_ENG_1220_320.pdf)	ainur.abusseitova@undp.org	1/20/2020 1:52:00 PM

QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments

The final project board accepted the results of the project "Support to Country Coordinating Mechanism for 2018-2019" and approved the successful closure of the project due to the achievement of all the targets stated in the Project Document.