

Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

Form Status: Approved

Overall Rating:	Highly Satisfactory
Decision:	
Portfolio/Project Number:	00099159
Portfolio/Project Title:	Vanuatu Electoral Environment Project
Portfolio/Project Date:	2017-04-01 / 2021-12-31

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:

Changes in the external environment were continuously identified, challenges and opportunities analyzed, mitigated or adapted as necessary, and presented to the project board with discussions captured in minutes of meeting. Attached an example of Board presentation presenting achievements, risk log, challenges and opportunities, incorporating updates to the project strategy.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	UNDP_VEEP_BoardMeeting_8Oct2020__6035_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/UNDP_VEEP_BoardMeeting_8Oct2020__6035_301.pptx)	anne-sofie.gerhard@undp.org	10/16/2020 2:50:00 AM

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 was successfully aligned with the "Governance for peaceful, just, and inclusive societies" Signature Solution.

VEEP has supported a nationwide inclusive joint civil and voter registration of citizens to ensure participation of all communities in the VEEP supported general elections with participation of all islands from all urban and rural communities. Election results were widely and peacefully accepted as credible and fair. This support ensured a representative and responsive government, representing the voice of the citizens.

The benefits of our work on civil and voter registration, and the issuing of the country's first ever national ID cards, to the benefit of all citizens, private sector, government ministries (especially in their strategic response to COVID-19 and TC Harold) are evident. VEEP has supported strong people's participation, strengthened national identity, and improved national electoral and civil registry institutions in transparently and credibly implementing their mandate, and managing political change through electoral processes for stronger governance. Attached the 2020 General Election Report with analysis of process, participation, results and impact.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	ECGeneralElectionReport2020_6035_302 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAF/ormDocuments/ECGeneralElectionReport2020_6035_302.pdf)	anne-sofie.gerhard@undp.org	10/16/2020 3:32:00 AM

Relevant**Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory**

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

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

Evidence:

VEEP supported establishment of a Voter Awareness Committee, functioning as a 'sounding board' on all public outreach initiatives, and as an additional 'distribution channel' for all communication and material. The participation of the Voter Awareness Committee included FBOs (incl church groups), CSOs (incl women and disabled groups), NGOs, media, youth council and ministry representatives.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	TORsCoordinationCommitteeV2_6035_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QA/FormDocuments/TORsCoordinationCommitteeV2_6035_303.docx)	anne-sofie.gerhard@undp.org	10/16/2020 3:41:00 AM
2	VEOMyElectionhandbook_EMAIL_6035_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QA/FormDocuments/VEOMyElectionhandbook_EMAIL_6035_303.pdf)	anne-sofie.gerhard@undp.org	10/16/2020 3:58:00 AM

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:

In addition to several lessons learned workshops focusing on joint registration activities and local elections, a comprehensive 2020 post-electoral review was organized aimed at producing an all-inclusive review of the electoral process to guide the EC, the VEO and other electoral stakeholders' planning for credible elections in the next cycle as well as to identify any electoral reform measures required for the future. The post-electoral review was organized through field workshops and HQ workshops to analyze what worked well during the preparations and conduct of the elections, what did not and why. It covered aspects of the electoral system, policies, processes, and management structures and capabilities, polling and vote-counting activities, voters' attitudes and stakeholders' responses to EMB actions. The results of the comprehensive review allowed for suitable recommendations for remedial action, and fed into discussions about electoral reform and the procedural development of the EMB throughout the electoral cycle. It also created the basis for the formulation of the 2021 strategic and operational workplan of electoral authorities, as well as VEEP phase II. Attached concept note, and Post-Electoral Review report

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	VEEP_GeneralElectionReview_conceptpaper_FINAL_6035_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/VEEP_GeneralElectionReview_conceptpaper_FINAL_6035_304.docx)	anne-sofie.gerhard@undp.org	10/16/2020 3:55:00 AM
2	VEEP_ThemesandIssuesforreview_FINAL_6035_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/VEEP_ThemesandIssuesforreview_FINAL_6035_304.docx)	anne-sofie.gerhard@undp.org	10/16/2020 3:55:00 AM
3	PostElectoralReview2020_finalreport_6035_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PostElectoralReview2020_finalreport_6035_304.docx)	anne-sofie.gerhard@undp.org	10/16/2020 3:56:00 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 project started at lower scale with lower ambitions but during 2019 the project up-scaled with additional activities and additional resource mobilization of 1 million USD for more meaningful registration including reach and impact, in full compliance with Board discussions, recommendations and adaption of project strategy. The project thus upscaled to be at sufficient and good scale with significant nationwide coverage and target groups, and contributing to the project's anticipated development challenge, establishing legal identity for approximately 70% of the anticipated voting population (citizens above 18) - national beneficiaries - and wide accreditation application by international and regional observers

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	AdditionalFundingmobilisedforVEEP_6035_305 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/AdditionalFundingmobilisedforVEEP_6035_305.docx)	anne-sofie.gerhard@undp.org	10/19/2020 12:21:00 AM
2	VEEObservationHandbook-email_6035_305 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/VEEObservationHandbook-email_6035_305.pdf)	anne-sofie.gerhard@undp.org	10/16/2020 4:02:00 AM

Principled

Quality Rating: **Highly 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:

Information was gathered annually on gender statistics, and this was continuously adapted into processes and activities of the project. Attached an example of information gathered.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	ANNEXCGenderChecklistUNWinput7July2020_6035_306 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ANNEXCGenderChecklistUNWinput7July2020_6035_306.docx)	anne-sofie.gerhard@undp.org	10/16/2020 4:04:00 AM

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 risks were continuously tracked in the risk log, regularly follow up with the Vanuatu Meteorology & Geo-Hazard Department, and adapted accordingly into activity planning and field work.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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

- 3: Project-affected people actively informed of UNDP’s Corporate Accountability Mechanism (SRM/SECU) and how to access it. If the project was categorized as High or Moderate Risk through the SESP, a project -level grievance mechanism was in place and project affected people informed. If grievances were received, they were effectively addressed in accordance with SRM Guidance. (all must be true)
- 2: Project-affected people informed of UNDP’s Corporate Accountability Mechanism and how to access it. If the project was categorized as High Risk through the SESP, a project -level grievance mechanism was in place and project affected people informed. If grievances were received, they were responded to but faced challenges in arriving at a resolution.
- 1: Project-affected people was not informed of UNDP’s Corporate Accountability Mechanism. If grievances were received, they were not responded to. (any may be true)

Evidence:

Staff were pro-actively informed of grievance mechanisms and COVID19 support mechanisms. No grievances received.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Management & Monitoring

Quality Rating: Exemplary

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:

Following UNDP guidance, an “After Action Review” (of which post-electoral assessment is a sub-set) was used as a simple knowledge management technique, conducted via dynamic, structured discussion among team members after each election, and following completion of registration completion in each province. Experiences and activities were analyzed based on expectations and outcomes achieved: What happened and why, what worked well, what needed improvement, and what were the lessons and recommendations? In addition to these reports, regular quarterly reports were established, including reporting against the annual workplan and budget, milestones and achievements against indicators, and challenges analysed and mitigated.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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

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

Evidence:

The project was governed by a committed Project Board which functioned very well. The board was supplied with comprehensive quarterly progress reports on results and expenditures, risk and challenges, as well as spot reports as necessary, or pre- during and post-election reports and analysis. The donor was also supplied with annual progress reports as per pro doc. The board convened for physical meetings every 6 months as outlined in the prodoc, and minutes were captured and documented of all meetings and discussions. Attached example of annual report and example of board minutes

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	ActivityProgressReportVEEPUNDP_6035_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ActivityProgressReportVEEPUNDP_6035_310.pdf)	anne-sofie.gerhard@undp.org	10/16/2020 1:41:00 PM
2	VEEPProjectboardmtg_Feb192020_Minutes_final_6035_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/VEEPProjectboardmtg_Feb192020_Minutes_final_6035_310.docx)	anne-sofie.gerhard@undp.org	10/16/2020 1:42:00 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 and updated risks on a quarterly basis, examined and consulted with relevant stakeholders, and updated the risk log in each quarterly report accordingly. Risks were assessed and mitigation measures put in place as also reported to the project board through quarterly reporting, and bi-annual board meetings, in addition to monthly informal catch-up sessions with the donor. Please see Risk Log in Atlas, as well as Risk Log tracking in all quarterly reports.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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:

Additional and therefore adequate resources were mobilized to achieve intended up-scaled results. The project has proven strong project implementation and delivery, in 2019 with 96% budget delivery and in 2020 by Q3 with 91% implementation and delivery. Planned activities and results of the team were effectively achieved as per annual workplan, as tracked in progress reports and as confirmed in end of year review. Please see quarterly progress reports for more details.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	AdditionalFundingmobilisedforVEEP_6035_312 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/AdditionalFundingmobilisedforVEEP_6035_312.docx)	anne-sofie.gerhard@undp.org	10/16/2020 1:58:00 PM

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:

Project procurement plan was established and updated on an ongoing basis, as well as added to PROMPT. Operational bottlenecks were timely identified, particularly in connection with COVID-19 and closure of borders, whereby procurement solutions were innovatively and creatively established in the local market to ensure continued and smooth delivery. Pls see PROMPT for further details.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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

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

Evidence:

Project costs were regularly reviewed and analyzed against the progress of results and deliverables. Financial reports with analysis and expenditure overview was reported to the project board on a quarterly basis. Furthermore, the project kept a daily excel log of all commitments and payments for systematic overview per activity per output. This was also captured in the 'Results resource framework' in the quarterly progress report, which provided an overview of progress, outputs achieved etc. over the lifespan of the project period.

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:

Yes the project has throughout been on track, or ahead on delivery.

By end of year 2019, VEEP was at 96% delivery, by Q3 2020 VEEP is at 91% delivery, despite the challenges posed by COVID-19, closed borders, no incoming consultants, no international procurement etc. This has also been captured and tracked through the results resource framework in quarterly reports providing an overview of progress, outputs achieved etc. over the lifespan of the project period.

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 annual work plan was developed each January, based on the prodoc and the multiyear workplan. The detailed annual workplan was presented and adopted through board meetings convened beginning of each year. Quarterly progress reporting informed regular review of the work plan and status of activities to achieve the intended results. Budget revisions were made as necessary. Attached annual work plans and quarterly reports

List of Uploaded Documents			
#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	VEEP_QuaterlyReport_Q4_2019_final_6035_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QA/FormDocuments/VEEP_QuaterlyReport_Q4_2019_final_6035_316.pdf)	anne-sofie.gerhard@undp.org	10/16/2020 4:20:00 AM
2	2019AWP_Dec2019version231219_6035_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QA/FormDocuments/2019AWP_Dec2019version231219_6035_316.docx)	anne-sofie.gerhard@undp.org	10/16/2020 2:18:00 PM
3	Annex2_UNDP-VEEPAWP2020_withBudget_6035_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QA/FormDocuments/Annex2_UNDP-VEEPAWP2020_withBudget_6035_316.xlsx)	anne-sofie.gerhard@undp.org	10/16/2020 2:19:00 PM
4	VEEP_QuaterlyReport_Q1_2020_6035_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QA/FormDocuments/VEEP_QuaterlyReport_Q1_2020_6035_316.zip)	anne-sofie.gerhard@undp.org	10/16/2020 4:16:00 AM
5	VEEP_QuaterlyReport_Q2_2020_final_6035_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QA/FormDocuments/VEEP_QuaterlyReport_Q2_2020_final_6035_316.pdf)	anne-sofie.gerhard@undp.org	10/16/2020 4:17:00 AM
6	VEEP_QuaterlyReport_Q12019_6035_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QA/FormDocuments/VEEP_QuaterlyReport_Q12019_6035_316.pdf)	anne-sofie.gerhard@undp.org	10/16/2020 4:18:00 AM
7	VEEP_QuaterlyReport_Q22019_6035_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QA/FormDocuments/VEEP_QuaterlyReport_Q22019_6035_316.pdf)	anne-sofie.gerhard@undp.org	10/16/2020 4:19:00 AM
8	VEEP_QuaterlyReport_Q32019_6035_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QA/FormDocuments/VEEP_QuaterlyReport_Q32019_6035_316.pdf)	anne-sofie.gerhard@undp.org	10/16/2020 4:19:00 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 project targeted specifically women, youth and people with disabilities from all communities, tribes - urban and rural, based on a civic education assessment of how citizens access data (chief, churches, radio, newspapers, nakamals etc.). The project also produced a Civic Education booklet, in collaboration with national curriculum taskforce of the Ministry of Education, which includes focus on all citizens being equal (which is a sensitive matter here). Attached the booklet, which is developed in both English, French and Bislama, and will be incorporated into secondary school curriculums from 2021.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	VEOCivicEducationBookletA5v8-00email_6035_317 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/VEOCivicEducationBookletA5v8-00email_6035_317.pdf)	anne-sofie.gerhard@undp.org	10/19/2020 12:41:00 AM
2	VEOCivicEducationBookletFRANCAISemail_6035_317 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/VEOCivicEducationBookletFRANCAISemail_6035_317.pdf)	anne-sofie.gerhard@undp.org	10/19/2020 12:41:00 AM

Sustainability & National Ownership

Quality Rating: **Highly 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:

National stakeholders and partners were fully and actively engaged in all decision making process and board meetings.
Please see minutes of board meetings, including the participation log.

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:

Capacities and performance of national institutions and systems were assessed through HACT assessment (piggy-backing on UNICEF HACT) and the project monitored financial reporting, performance and liquidation of NEX advances closely. Please see all timely and accurate NEX advance reporting and liquidation, accepted by Finance Pacific Office.

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:

Yes the project board reviewed the plan for the transitional phase and VEEP I phase-out, ensuring that the project has remained on track and meeting requirements on all administrative, operational, legal and financial aspects. Currently they are awaiting the submission of the Final Report as agreed in prodoc. Please see latest Project Board presentation for further details.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments