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# UNDP Programming Process

UNDP in Kuwait has developed a Country Programme Document (CPD) and Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) both for the timeframe of 2015-2018; under UNDP’s Strategic Plan (2014-2017) which is UNDP’s strategic programming response to contribute towards achieving selected outcomes at country, regional and global levels.

## UNDP Implementation Modalities

Depending on local needs, capacities and decisions taken by UNDP and the Government collectively, UNDP applies one of two modalities for project execution in all country offices:

* Direct Implementation Modalities (DIM)
* National Implementation Modalities (NIM)

UNDP applies NIM where national authorities have adequate capacity to undertake the functions and activities of the country programme or a project(s).  NIM is used to empower national institutions to exercise ownership and management of UNDP supported projects. This ensures the sustainability of UNDP support, as the assistance is integrated into a nationally driven effort. In Kuwait UNDP applies a NIM with Country Office support approach, where by the Country Office at the request of the Government provides services during project design and implementation for administrative and financial management.

Through NIM, overall supervision of UNDP programme/project activities in Kuwait is carried out by an eligible national entity in partnership with the Government Coordinating Agency in Kuwait (General Secretariat of the Supreme Council for Planning and Development – GSSCPD). In Kuwait, GSSCPD serves as the Executive for all UNDP implemented projects. A ministry, a department within a ministry, or a governmental institution of a semi-autonomous nature (e.g. central bank, a university, a regional or local authority or a municipality), serves as the project’s Implementing Partner.

Starting in 2015 UNDP as part of its CPD and capacity development approach in Kuwait, all projects will conduct institutional capacity needs assessments during development or in the initial steps of project implementation. This assessment will determine where institutional strengths/weaknesses exist, ensure that project interventions are designed to address actual needs, define how UNDP can assist to build and develop new capacities, and provide context for the sustainability of the project’s interventions.

For purposes of all UNDP initiatives implemented in Kuwait through the NIM with CO Support Modality, UNDP programmes and projects in Kuwait remain subject to the same policies, procedures, regulations and management arrangement requirements as contained in this SOP.

**Figure 1: UNDP Project Management Life Cycle**



FIGURE: [UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](http://web.undp.org/evaluation/handbook/documents/english/pme-handbook.pdf)

UNDP’s project management cycle begins with justifying a project’s concept/business case based on the corresponding CPD/CPAP outcome and outputs, and ends with achievement of project level outputs and outcomes as assessed in the CPD/CPAP review/evaluation.

Through the Project Cycle Management approach, UNDP covers the entire project life cycle from concept generation to formulating a project, implementing the activities in the project, monitoring and evaluating the project outputs/outcomes/impact, and realizing the project’s intended contribution to programme and development outcomes.

The core sections of the SOPs outline the necessary information and process to ensure all project counterparts follow required national and UNDP policies, ensures key stakeholders are kept informed, establishes appropriate project management structures, monitors outputs and activity deliverables, with the final objective to deliver a project that is well managed.

The project cycle diagram illustrates (with dotted lines) key management review points within the cycle. The dotted lines at the far left and far right indicate the start and stop points, and the remaining dotted lines indicate management approval or decision points between or within processes. The dotted lines intersecting the “Implementing a Project” process indicate there will be reviews at each major decision point during the implementation of the project (these reviews are typically aligned with calendar years and project Annual Review processes).

The bottom ovals in the diagram indicate different review mechanisms applicable. For example, the first three “Decision Point” ovals are points to consider the following questions:

* 1st (Primary) Decision Point: *Is this project the best response to the country needs as identified in the CPD/CPAP? Will it contribute substantially to the results expected from UNDP?* This decision is made by UNDP management, and confirms the project idea corresponds and supports CPD/CPAP outcomes.
* 2nd (Secondary) Decision Point: *Is the project scope realistic – both with regards to outputs and the specified time frame? How can the expected outputs be achieved most effectively? Do these intended outputs contribute to related national outcomes?* This decision is one of the issues considered during appraisal of the project by the LPAC to review the project scope and approach.
* 3rd (Tertiary) Decision Point: *Does the design of the project demonstrate an achievable plan to implement and assess progress towards delivering results to ensure success? Is monitoring clearly defined?* The Project Board when reviewing the project Results and Resources Framework (RRF) and detailed project budget/work plan considers this decision.

“Project Reviews” indicates multiple scheduled decision points that must be made while a project is being implemented typically at monitoring and evaluation events (e.g. Annual Review), to answer the questions: *Is the project still relevant? Is the project yielding the desired results? Are those results still relevant and effectively contributing to the intended higher-level outcome? Is the project being run as planned? Is there a need to redesign, cancel or modify the project in any way in order to ensure meaningful contribution to development results?*

# Justifying, Defining and Initiating a Project (Formulation till Appraisal)

UNDP supported projects are directly derived from the UNDP Strategic Plan, UNDP CPD and UNDP CPAP. These strategic planning frameworks, as described above, are related to the priorities as reflected in the Kuwait National Development Plan (KNDP). These documents collectively provide a prioritization of UNDP assistance and services towards supporting achievement of KNDP objectives and translation of relevant international development agenda objectives into national action. Together this provides the structure for coordination among UN agencies and other development partners to enhance effectiveness of assistance to the Government of Kuwait.

## Institutional Capacity Assessment

As a part of ensuring that UNDP programming not only strategically contributes to the KNDP priorities and objectives, but is also based on a sound approach to institutional capacity development of implementing partners and beneficiaries, UNDP in Kuwait for all programming under the CPD/CPAP 2015-2018 cycle will conduct a specific and analytically based beneficiary capacity assessment either as part of project design or shortly after initiation of a project. The capacity assessment is intended to inform the types of assistance provided through a project and ensures that the capacities targeted for project interventions contributes towards institutional results in a sustainable manner. Where possible the capacity assessment should be independently conducted (either by an external consultant or a Regional/Global UNDP advisor).

## Pipeline Projects and Initiation of Project Proposals

Pipeline is the initial process by which UNDP identifies ideas and translates them into projects as part of the strategic support for development in Kuwait. Substantively this will include identifying linkages for proposed engagement to UNDP’s Strategic Plan, the Kuwait CPD and CPAP, and the KNDP. When a Programme Analyst begins the conceptualization for any project it becomes part of the programming pipeline management within the CO. This will include the creation of a project proposal (sometimes called a concept note), which should outline the framework, gaps and core contributions for results. It will also include engaging and drafting the project document and should be informed if at all possible by the institutional capacity assessment. Based on these inputs the project is entered into ATLAS. This will track the project’s development from Ideas, to hard pipeline (6-12 months until implementation), soft pipeline (3-6 months until implementation) and finally conversion into an operational project with the signature of a project document and implementation.

**Table 1: Project Formulation to Appraisal Work Flow**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Steps** | **Responsible** | **Action to be Taken** | **Time Frame** |
| 1 | Relevant UNDP Programme Unit | Develop a **project proposal** based on CPD/CPAP. Proposed content includes:   * Project Outcome and Output(s) and linkages to UNDP SP/CPD/CPAP Outcome(s)/Output(s); * Approach, method and capacity development strategies; * Stakeholder analysis and Institutional (Beneficiary) Capacity and Needs Assessment; * Potential Beneficiary(ies); * Indicative funding requirements | 2-4 weeks  (varies due to size and scope of project proposal) |
| 2 | UNDP Senior Management | Validate original project proposal and agree to further develop the project. | 5 business days after submission |
| 3 | IP/Beneficiary | Appoint a counterpart to be involved and provide input as UNDP further refine the project proposal into a project document. | 5 business days after submission |
| 4 | UNDP | Ensure funding is available to support the process and project formulation activities (data collection etc.). | 1 business day after proposal approval |
| 5 | Relevant UNDP Programme Analyst | If necessary recruit a substantive resources person (consultant, UNDP regional or global advisor etc.) to support project document development. | 3 - 4 weeks (Dependent on HR SOP and IC contracting v. Regional Hub etc.) |
| 6 | Relevant UNDP Programme Analyst (and/or Consultant) | Conduct consultation meetings, data collection and information gathering. Ensure there is no overlap or duplication with other project(s).  Identify inter-linkages and synergies with ongoing projects by UNDP or other development partners. | 2 weeks |
| 7 | Relevant UNDP Programme Analyst (and/or Consultant) | Conduct capacity assessment of the potential Beneficiary if not previously available. Any funds required to carry out the above assessments should be advanced by UNDP and subsequently charged to the project once approved.  [Annex 1 - Capacity Assessment for Project Implementation checklist] | 2 -4 weeks  (varies due to size and scope of beneficiary and project proposal) |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Steps | Responsible | | Action to be Taken | Time Frame |
| 8 | Relevant UNDP Programme Unit (and/or Consultant) | Prepare a draft **project document** **and Annual Work Plan (AWP) for the first year**. The Project Document/AWP shall contain:   * Results to be achieved that are SMART: Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Realistic, and Time-based; based on a logical results chain and as captured in a RBM based Results and Resources Framework (RRF) for the entire project duration * Indicative AWP for the first year with budgeted activities * Management arrangements with clearly articulated project roles, responsibilities, and accountabilities * Initial Risk Log * Preliminary Monitoring and Evaluation Framework   [Annex 2- Project Document Template]  [Annex 3 - Initial Risk Logs Template]  [Annex 4 - Project Quality Assurance Checklist] | | 2-6 weeks  (varies due to size and magnitude of project document) |
| 9 | Relevant UNDP Programme Analyst (and/or Consultant) | Finalize draft project document and share through a stakeholder workshop/consultation with the Government (IP/Beneficiary & GSSCPD) and UNDP. | | 2 weeks |
| 10 | GSSCPD, IP, UNDP | Review proposed project against KNDP and UNDP CPD/CPAP, and decide whether to proceed with an LPAC for project appraisal. | | 1-2 business day(s) |
| 11 | Relevant UNDP Programme Analyst and Beneficiary | Following the stakeholder workshop, finalize any revisions to the draft Project Document | | 5 business days |
| 13 | Beneficiary/IP | Request GSSCPD and UNDP Senior Management to proceed to project appraisal and approval (LPAC) | | 1-2 business day(s) |

## Project Appraisal and Approvals

Appraisal incorporates a critical analytical review of the design and formulation of the project that leads to its approval or rejection. All UNDP supported programme and projects are required to be appraised by a local project appraisal committee (LPAC) before approval. The final outputs of this process are the organization of an LPAC meeting, the signed minutes of the meeting and completion of UNDP’s quality assurance process documentation.

Prior to a formal LPAC meeting, UNDP shall organize an internal “pre-PAC” meeting within UNDP to review the draft Project Document, chaired by the DRR with participation from all programme units. The draft Project Document will be revised by incorporating comments and recommendations from the pre-PAC meeting. After which the draft Project Document will be shared with GSSCPD and Beneficiaries.

The formal LPAC should be inclusive with participation by a wide range of stakeholders. It should involve not only a representative from UNDP’s Programme Units, but where relevant other UN agencies to facilitate collaboration among UN agencies. The LPAC meeting shall also include participation by both GSSCPD and the beneficiary partner (national institutions receiving support from the project). Other project stakeholders such as technical experts, and CSOs may attend the LPAC and participate in an ex officio capacity.

The LPAC meeting will discuss if the proposed project is designed with a clear focus on agreed results. The LPAC will review the project RRF and work plan, proposed implementation arrangements and roles, budget, cost effectiveness, relevance, and feasibility of the project. The meeting also examines if project design is adequately results-oriented by determining if output indicators, targets, and baselines in the RRF are SMART (Specific, Measureable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-bound). The LPAC pays special attention to the AWP for the first year. Specifically, an LPAC meeting shall review and appraise the project along the following dimensions:

* Clarity in project objective
* Clarity in definition of measurable and achievable results
* Appropriate designation of IP and management arrangements
* Achievable project approach and plan, including capacity development activities
* Integration of development effectiveness drivers (e.g. gender, capacity development, South-South cooperation etc.) as appropriate
* Realistic and justifiable project budget
* Complete and comprehensive identification of project risks and selected actions and strategy to manage those risks
* Determination of the need for and timing of evaluation

## Project Document Signatures

All UNDP supported programme/ projects go through an internal clearance process by the Government of Kuwait before approval and implementation begins. After incorporating all comments and feedback from UNDP and counterparts during appraisal via the LPAC meeting, the Programme Officer/ Project Manager must revise the project document and the proposed IP will submit the final document for Government internal clearance through GSSCPD.

Upon agreement of the project document through the LPAC the Implementing Partner, and where relevant the beneficiary, with UNDP will sign the project document. Once the project document is signed the project budget is activated and project implementation begins.

**Table 2: Project Appraisal and Approval Work Flow**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Steps** | **Responsible** | **Action to be Taken** | **Time Frame** |
| 1 | UNDP Programme Analyst (and/or consultant) | Share draft project document within UNDP for Desk Review for comments (“Pre-Pac”)  [Annex 5 - Key Considerations for Quality Programming] and clearance by M&E Specialist. | 5-10 business days |
| 3 | UNDP Programme Analyst (and/or consultant) | Revise draft Project Document by incorporating comments from other UNDP programme units. | 3 business days |
| 4 | UNDP Programme Analyst (and/or consultant) | Draft project document (with RRF and AWP for the first year as the core component), and share with the potential Beneficiary for comment | 7-10 business days |
| 5 | UNDP Programme Analyst (and/or consultant) | Revise and finalize draft Project Document by incorporating comments from the consultations. | 3 business days |
| 6 | UNDP Programme Analyst, GSSCPD and Beneficiary | Schedule a LPAC meeting, securing participation of UNDP and GSSCPD Senior Management to co-chair and key government counterparts to participate. | 1-3 business days |
| 7 | UNDP Programme Analyst, GSSCPD and Beneficiary | Co-organize LPAC meeting   * UNDP Senior Management to send an invitation to LPAC meeting, along with draft Project Document and an agenda, at least 1 week before the meeting * Secure a meeting venue * Invite GSSCPD, beneficiary, stakeholders, etc. | 3-5 business days |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Steps | Responsible | Action to be Taken | Time Frame |
| 8 | UNDP Senior Management,  DG or above of GSSCPD and senior Beneficiary representative | Co-chair LPAC meeting   * UNDP, IP, or consultant - presents summary of project document * Discussion of project document * Co-Chairs summarize discussions and indicate whether the project document is endorsed or not, and inform the participants of the follow-up process | 1 business day |
| 9 | UNDP Programme Unit (and/or consultant) | Prepare draft minutes of LPAC deliberations, summarizing issues and recommendations. | 3 business days |
| 10 | UNDP Programme Unit | Circulate minutes of LPAC to all participants for comments, as soon as possible but no later than 2 weeks after LPAC. | 3-10 business days |
| 11 | UNDP Programme Unit | After finalizing LPAC minutes, incorporating comments provided, submit LPAC minutes to the Co-Chairs (UNDP and IP representative) for approval with signature. | 1 business days |
| 12 | Co-Chairs of LPAC | Approve and sign LPAC minutes | 2-5 business days |
| 13 | GSSCPD, UNDP Programme Unit | Revise Project Document as per LPAC minutes. | 3-5 business days |
| 14 | UNDP Senior Management, GSSCPD and Beneficiary | Review and endorse revised Project Document. | 3 business days |
| 15 | UNDP Programme Unit and Beneficiary | Translate the Project Document into Arabic, if needed/required by IP | 5-7 business days |
| 16 | UNDP Programme Analyst | Prepare an official letter signed by UNDP RR shared together with the revised project document and signed LPAC minutes, sent to GSSCPD and copy to IP as confirmation of UNDP endorsement of project. | 1 business day |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Steps | Responsible | Action to be Taken | Time Frame |
| 17 | IP | Prepare and submit an official letter signed by the relevant Minister along with Project Document to GSSCPD requesting approval with attachment of UNDP official letter. | 1-3 business days |
| 18 | GSSCPD | Inform the Beneficiary and UNDP in writing of the clearance outcome. After Government clearance is granted, the project document and signed LPAC minutes will then be forwarded to UNDP RR and Government for signature. | 3-5 business days |
| 19 | GSSCPD, Beneficiary, and relevant UNDP Programme Unit | Upon Government internal clearance and approval, discuss potential of a signing ceremony and if so, invite UNDP, GSSCPD and relevant government agencies, development partners (if any) and media/press (if appropriate). | 1 business day |
| 20 | Relevant UNDP Programme Unit and GSSCPD | Keep for permanent records a copy of the agenda, participants list, and signed minutes of LPAC meeting (original at UNDP, and a copy to Government). | N/A |
| 21 | GSSCPD and Beneficiary | Ensure original copies of all signed project documents are kept in their respective files. | N/A |
| 22 | UNDP Programme Analyst and Associate | Translate the approved budget as per the AWP into ATLAS, and request budget approval through Budget and Finance to the DRR. | 1-2 business days |
| 23 | UNDP Programme Finance | Upon DRR approval, send the budget to Commitment Control (KK) in ATLAS. | 1 business day |
| 24 | Beneficiary | Officially “activate” the project and initiate the activities | N/A |

# Implementing a UNDP Project

Appraisal incorporates a critical analytical review of the design and formulation of the project that leads to its approval or rejection. All UNDP supported programme and projects are required to be appraised by a local project appraisal committee (LPAC) before approval. The final outputs of this process are the organization of an LPAC meeting, the signed minutes of the meeting and completion of UNDP’s quality assurance process documentation.

The focus of this process is to achieve project results as defined in the approved project document/AWP through implementation and monitoring. Project outputs are produced through a set of activities. The plan to achieve outputs contributing to the project results for a given year is articulated in the Annual Work Plan (AWP). Fundamental responsibilities for this process lies with the project manager and the IP.

To summarize, during this process the IP and Beneficiary are responsible for:

* Managing the overall conduct of the project and its relevance
* Reviewing progress and watch for deviations from approved work plans
* Ensuring that changes are controlled and problems addressed
* Monitoring risks

UNDP’s role is mainly to:

* Where UNDP is identified as a Responsible Party, perform duties as associated with this role including, when requested and agreed to, provide implementation support such as mobilizing goods and services
* Monitoring the project’s progress towards intended outputs and results
* Verifying resources entrusted to UNDP are utilized appropriately
* Ensuring national ownership, ongoing stakeholder engagement and sustainability
* Aligning project’s outputs in order to contribute to the intended Country Programme Document (CPD) and Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) outcomes
* Report on progress to UNDP through corporate and donor reporting mechanisms

As project implementation progresses, the Project Board is responsible for addressing the following questions:

* Is the project still relevant and effectively contributing to the intended outcomes?
* Is the project yielding the desired results in a timely manner?
* Are risks being properly managed?
* Is the project being implemented and expenditures delivery proceeding as planned?
* Is there a need to redesign, cancel or modify the project in any way in order to ensure its meaningful contribution to development results?

In addition to periodic reviews within the year (quarterly Project Boards and reporting), an Annual Review Meeting shall take place in December or January to assess results achieved against yearly targets and to approve the subsequent AWP.

## Role of an Implementing Partner

In light of the [Busan Partnership Agreement for Effective Development](http://www.oecd.org/development/effectiveness/busanpartnership.htm) UNDP-supported projects focus on ensuring that all projects implemented in Kuwait apply the following principles: national ownership, management for development results focus, expanding partnerships for development; transparency and mutual accountability. Accordingly UNDP projects are not considered an “additional layer” but instead are expected to form a part of the GoK’s core work.

The IP is accountable for attainment of project results defined in the Project Document RRF/AWP, to contribute to outcomes contained in the CPD/CPAP, which in turn contributes to achievement of national development priorities identified in the KNDP.

An IP is fully responsible and accountable for managing UNDP resources and delivering UNDP project outputs. In exercising this responsibility, the IP shall provide leadership and operational management. It will appoint a National Project Coordinator/Focal Point, with adequate decision-making authority to take project management decisions.

The IP is responsible for mobilizing and managing all project inputs. Thus at a minimum the IP is responsible for ensuring its capacity to undertake recruitment of national project personnel, local procurement of goods and services, managing travels and training activities, and operational management of all other project inputs.

## Role of a Beneficiary

The beneficiary must send reports to UNDP copied to GSCCPD on project progress and achievement of development results.

The beneficiary in collaboration with the Project Manager (PM) is responsible for formulating work plans and supervising timely and effective implementation of all project activities as per the AWP. The beneficiary should incorporate planning and implementation of UNDP-supported projects into their ministry/department’s core work, and also coordinate their project activities with other Government agencies and national institutions for greater synergies in achieving national development goals including the SDGs.

## Role Responsible Parties

A Responsible Party (RP) can be a Government agency, UNDP, another UN agency, an inter-governmental organization (IGO), a NGO/CSO, or a private firm. Identification of RP(s) normally occurs during the project formulation phase. However, RP(s) may also be selected during the course of implementation of the project.

The role of an RP includes not only the purchase of goods and services but also may include carrying out activities and producing outputs within the scope of the project framework. In Kuwait where projects are implemented under a CO Support to NIM approach, at the request of the Government UNDP serves as an RP to most projects for the purchase of goods or services using the project budget. UNDP, the IP and Beneficiary may also agree to engage RP(s) to carry out specific activities from an AWP (often procured as contracted service) to produce and deliver specific outputs within the scope of the project framework. All RPs are directly accountable to the Executive Agency and IP in accordance with the terms of their agreement or contract with the IP. However UNDP services can go beyond the mobilization of inputs and include substantive as well as administrative responsibilities. As an RP, UNDP becomes accountable under its rules and regulations for any services provided under agreements with the IP and is entitled to reimbursement for the costs of service provision negotiated at the time of project formulation and included in the project budget.

The following table summarizes the legal instruments available for use by an IP to engage a RP in implementing a project. The precise reporting and accountability requirements of a RP to an IP should be clearly specified in these legal instruments.

## Summary of Legal Instruments Used to Engage a Responsible Party (RP)

The following table summarizes the legal instruments available for use by an IP to engage a RP in implementing a project. The precise reporting and accountability requirements of a RP to an IP should be clearly specified in these legal instruments.

**Table 3: Legal Instruments**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Type of Partner** | **Type of Agreement** |
| Responsible Party | Government institution | * Government Letter of Agreement (LOA) |
| UN agency | * [Standard Letter of Agreement between Government and a UN agency under NIM](http://content.undp.org/go/prescriptive/Project-Management---Prescriptive-Content-Documents/download/?d_id=1140400) |
| CSO | * Government contract * [Micro-Capital Grant Agreement for Credit Related Activities](http://content.undp.org/go/prescriptive/Project-Management---Prescriptive-Content-Documents/download/?d_id=1701610&) * [Micro-Capital Grant Agreement for Non-Credit Related Activities](http://content.undp.org/go/prescriptive/Project-Management---Prescriptive-Content-Documents/download/?d_id=1701619&) |
| UNDP Kuwait | * [Standard Letter of Agreement between United Nations Development Programme and the Government for the Provision of Support Services (including Description of Support Services)](http://content.undp.org/go/prescriptive/Project-Management---Prescriptive-Content-Documents/download/?d_id=1140403) * UNDP Procurement based contracting for provision of services |
|  |  |

**Table 4: Responsible Party Work Flow**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Steps | Responsible | Action to be Taken | Time Frame |
| 1 | UNDP and Beneficiary | Identify potential RP(s) during project formulation | 1-2 weeks |
| 2 | UNDP, GSSCPD and RP | Based on the signed Project Document and AWP, enter into a written agreement which stipulates the details of RP's activities, reporting method (e.g. form, and frequency), funds transfer modality, etc. | 1 week |
| 3 | UNDP | Transfer funds as "Pre-Payment" to RP based on the agreement | Within 1 month from agreement or in the specified year/quarter |
| 4 | RP | Report back to IP within 3 months after the funds transfer about the results and status of fund utilization | 3 months from receipt of resources |
| 5 | RP | Report back to UNDP as part of quarterly reporting | Within 2 weeks of closure for the respective quarterly reporting cycle |

**Programme**

## Project Management Arrangements

Appropriate management and oversight arrangements of UNDP projects are established under the UNDP CPAP Review mechanisms as well as at the project level to ensure collective accountability for programming activities and the use of resources, while ensuring development results and fostering national ownership.

An annual systematic review of the UNDP CPAP is mandatory. The purpose of the CPAP Annual Review process is to:

* Assess the delivery and achievement of the overall annual targets for UNDP funded activities in the context of national results/outcomes;
* Identify and address operational issues in CPAP implementation, including those that could lead to revisions of the CPAP if required;
* Ensure clarity on UNDP’s contribution to a systematic comprehensive country level results review process.

The CPAP Steering Committee process has several stages during which UNDP will carry out sequenced monitoring actions: (1) Hold yearly reviews; (2) Review and analyze results by thematic or outcome or sector/inter sectoral groups; (3) Conduct CPAP Annual Review Meeting by January of a given calendar year in partnership with GSSCPD and beneficiaries.

The CPAP Annual Review meeting seeks to verify that the recommendations of the previous Annual Review process were appropriately followed-up by the parties concerned and provide suggestions/recommendations to seize opportunities identified and overcome any issues raised. The conclusions and recommendations from the Annual Review enable UNDP to update and/or revise programme interventions for the coming year, review and finalize project revisions and AWPs, and prepare inputs into UNDP’s corporate Results Oriented Annual Reporting (ROAR) and other reporting as required.

Management and oversight arrangements are illustrated in the following diagram.

**Figure 2: UNDP Project Management Arrangements Framework**
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# Project Board Roles and Responsibilities

## Establishment of Project Board

The Project Board is responsible for making management decisions (by consensus) when guidance is required by the Project Manager (PM), including recommendations for UNDP's and IPs approval of project plans and revisions (substantial or budgetary). The Project Board will:

* Provide overall guidance and direction to the project, ensuring it remains within the scope of the project.
* Address project issues as raised by the PM and IP.
* Provide guidance and agree on possible countermeasures/management actions to address specific risks.
* Agree on PM’s tolerances and threshold (as per a %) of budget revisions, as required.
* Review Project Progress Report(s) and provide direction and recommendations to ensure agreed deliverables are produced satisfactorily according to plans.
* Review Combined Delivery Reports (CDR) prior to certification by the IP.
* Appraise Project Annual Review Report and make recommendations for the next AWP.
* Provide ad-hoc direction and advice for exceptional situations when PM’s tolerances are exceeded.
* Assess and decide on project changes through project document, work plan or budget revisions.
* Advise on project advocacy and networking

The Project Board is required to ensure it prepares minutes for every board meeting held, disseminates them (electronically if possible) and files them in the project documentation.

## Executive

Executive is the government representation as a commitment to national Programme ownership and co-chairs the Project Board. In Kuwait this roles is fulfilled by GSSCPD in Kuwait.

The Executive may, where necessary, delegate tasks however to avoid any conflicts of interest, tasks may not be delegated to the Project Manager or Project Management team.

## Senior Supplier

Senior Supplier is an individual or a group representing the interests of parties concerned which provide funding and/or technical expertise to the project. The primary function is to provide guidance regarding technical feasibility of the project. In most cases for Kuwait, UNDP acts as Senior Supplier and a co-chair.

## Senior Beneficiary

Senior Beneficiary is representation from the Implementing Partner and/or a group representing the interests of those who will ultimately benefit from the project. The primary function is to ensure the realization of project results from the perspective of project beneficiaries.

In many cases, representatives of relevant line ministries and/or local authorities serve as Senior Beneficiary on the Board.

## Project Manager

The Project Manager (PM) is responsible for day-to-day management and decision-making related to the project, within constraints specified by the Project Board. Appointment or recruitment of a PM should be made upon approval/signature of the project document.

The major roles and responsibilities of a PM are:

* Accountable for day-to-day management of UNDP supported project, as the certifying officer and signatory of documents as appointed by the IP through the Project Board.
* Plan activities of the project and monitor progress against Project Document indicators and RRF.
* Mobilize and manages goods and services to initiate activities, including drafting TORs and work specifications.
* Creates requisitions for payments up to $5000 USD.
* Monitor financial resources and accounting to ensure accuracy and reliability of financial reports.
* Responsible for preparing and submitting financial expenditures reporting to UNDP and IP on a quarterly basis.
* Manage and monitor project risks initially identified, submit new risks to Project Board for consideration and decision on possible actions if required; update status of these risks by maintaining project Risks Log.
* Prepare the Project Progress Report (progress against planned activities, update on Risks and Issues, expenditures) and submit the report to the Project Quality Assurance (see below) for clearance to share with Project Board.
* Prepare Annual Review Report, and submit report to the Project Board.
* Prepare AWP for the following year, as well as Quarterly Plans as necessary.
* Update ATLAS Project Management module with all mandatory documentation as part of UNDP’s commitment to transparency and IATI requirements.
* Review technical reports submitted as part of project activities

## Project Quality Assurance

Monitoring project implementation is the responsibility of each Project Board member. The administration project quality assurance functions supports the Project Board through provision of independent project oversight and monitoring functions.

Usually, Project Quality Assurance functions are delegated to the UNDP Programme Analyst (and/or Programme Associate) for the project concerned, who ensures general quality assurance and compliance with UNDP’s rules and regulations.

Project Quality Assurance will:

* Ensure funds are made available to the project in ATLAS and expenditures are processed in a timely manner.
* Ensure risks and issues are properly managed by the PM (where in place), and that RBM logs in ATLAS are regularly updated by the PM.
* Ensure critical project information is monitored and updated in ATLAS in line with IATI requirements.
* Review and ensure project’s progress reporting towards intended outputs.
* Ensure Project Progress Reports are prepared and submitted on time, and assure reports meets UNDP quality standards for format, content, and results orientation.
* Perform oversight activities, such as periodic monitoring visits and “spot checks.”
* Knowledge management for dissemination of lessons learnt during project implementation.

## Project Support

Project Support provides primarily technical project support as required and outlined in the Project Document activities and results, and if justified by the scope or size of the project administrative support to a given PM.

Ideally and to ensure sustainability, Project Support should be undertaken by the IP/beneficiary through the Government's existing human resource capacity. However, when a need exists a project may opt to hire national or international project staff.

For recruitment and management of national project staff, refer to the Section on Recruitment of Project Staff, Experts and Consultants.

Project Support will:

* Collects project related information and data
* Provides substantive advisory services to the beneficiaries
* Establishes and maintains project files
* Updates plans
* Assists in financial management tasks under the responsibility of the PM
* Helps organize Project Board meetings and other meetings/workshops
* Compiles, copies and distributes all project reports
* Assists the PM in monitoring activities carried out by responsible parties

# Project Activation

Project activation constitutes the below set of actions leading to commencement of project implementation, including:

* Official establishment of Project Board
* Confirmation of project offices
* Appointment/recruitment of core project support personnel (if needed)
* Attendance by all project staff and Government staff counterparts at an orientation workshop organized by UNDP
* Project Inception Meeting
* Ensure updates or any necessary revisions to the initial proposed AWP in the signed Project Document.
* If needed establish any project protocol for correspondence beyond the general protocol.

In case the IP cannot initiate an approved project within three months after the date of approval, the IP will prepare a note explaining the reasons for the delay and describing measures being taken to activate the project. The report should be sent to UNDP and GSSCPD.

## Official Establishment of Project Board

At the conclusion of the LPAC and signing of the Project Document, the Government counterparts (IP and Beneficiary) are required within the first month of project implementation to send a letter to UNDP confirming the representative(s) appointed as the Project Board Executive and Project Board Senior Beneficiary.

## Confirmation of Project Offices

The IP/Beneficiary are responsible for providing the project with appropriate space at project initiation for all necessary staff, including where applicable project management and technical staff, as well as accommodation of office furniture and other necessary equipment/IT access.

## Appointment/Recruitment of a Core Project Management Team

For sustainability, and to the extent possible, UNDP supported projects are intended to form part of the core Government activities in Kuwait. And thus Government staff should participate in project activities as part of their regular work responsibilities.

Upon notification of project approval by UNDP and GoK (through GSSCPD) and agreement on the appointment of the PM, the IP and beneficiary begin fulfilling obligations as specified in the Project Document. Once officially established the Project Board are responsible for ensuring core project management staff specified in the project document are in place.

When necessitated and outlined in an approved Project Document and initial AWP, UNDP will proceed after signature of the project document to recruit the necessary project management team and technical staff necessary at the start of project implementation. The formal appointment of the members of a project management team should be finalized prior to the start date of the project as per the Project Document (or at latest within 1 month after project approval by UNDP and the GoK). The IP will notify UNDP of any appointed governmental staff assigned to the project in writing within the first month of project implementation.

## Conduct Project’s Orientation Training

Project Orientation workshops are conducted by UNDP and GSSPCD at least once to twice a year on general UNDP rules and regulations. Shortly after the establishment of a project, it is mandatory for the project management team and all technical staff to participate at least once during the project cycle and preferably during the first year of initiation/implementation phases, in a project management orientation workshop co-organized by UNDP and GSSCPD.

## Conduct Project Inception Meeting

Per project an inception workshop is held. The purpose of holding an inception workshop is to inform all relevant actors – i.e. project staff, consultants, stakeholders and Government counterparts – of the scope and context of the project, intervention strategies, intended project results and how activities and consultants are designed to contribute to progress against the project RRF, role of key institutions, AWP, staffing and procurement of equipment and other assets. This meeting must take place within the first three months of a project. The UNDP CO colleagues (DRR and/or M&E Specialist) and where relevant the PM will conduct the project inception workshop in collaboration with the Beneficiary.

## Revisions to the Initial Annual Work plan from the signed Project Document

Based on discussions during the project initiation workshop and in response to any changes in context after signature of the Project Document; the PM is responsible for ensuring that the AWP is updated from the original Project Document proposed AWP, and that all expenditures in the AWP follow a results-based budgeting approach and remains consistent with the Project Document RRF and any revisions therein.

## Protocol of Project Correspondence

Any project related communications should take place initially between UNDP Senior Management and the Senior Beneficiary. Official communication between the Project Manager and the Beneficiary/IP should be channeled through the UNDP Programme Analyst and approved by UNDP Senior Management before being circulated to the Beneficiary/IP.

**Table 5: Project Activation Work Flow**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Steps | Responsible | Action to be Taken | Time Frame |
| 1 | Senior Beneficiary | After official approval of the project document, the Government shall appoint by letter to UNDP a Project Board Executive and Senior Beneficiary representative for the Project Board’s establishment. | Within 4 weeks from project approval/start date |
| 2 | Beneficiary | To confirm and advise on availability of project offices. | Within 4 weeks from project approval/start date |
| 3 | UNDP | In case suitable government staff is not available as a PM or other technical/ administrative project personnel (per the Project Document), initiate external recruitment process (es). | As per the HR/Recruitment SOP |
| 4 | UNDP/Beneficiary | Discuss and establish protocol for all aspects of communications in relation to project implementation | Within 4 weeks from project approval/start date |
| 5 | Beneficiary/PM | Advise GSSCPD and UNDP of the need for staff to participate in an Orientation Workshop, to ensure project staff, consultants and government staff familiarity with the project implementation framework. | Within 4 weeks from project approval/start date |
| 6 | PM | Coordinate with GSSCPD and UNDP on time, date, venue for an orientation workshop on SOP’s, rules and regulations for project management. | Within 4 weeks from project initiation |
| 7 | UNDP | Conduct Project Inception Workshop with all project staff, consultants and Government counterparts to review the Project Document and expectations for staff and consultant’s tasks as they contribute towards project progress against planned activities and results. | 3 months from project  approval/start date |
| 8 | UNDP | As part of Project Inception Workshop with all project staff, consultants and Government counterparts, review the RRF and initial AWP from the signed Project Document for any revisions/changes. | 3 months from project  approval/start date |
| 9 | PM | As needed revise the original project document indicative AWP in response to any changes in context or changes that arise based on the project inception workshop. | Within 4 weeks from Project Inception Workshop |

# Work Planning and Project Budgeting

UNDP and the IP/Beneficiary jointly prepare three (3) time-bound work plans – (a) an initial Annual Work Plan contained in the project document, (b) subsequent AWS, and (c) QWPs. The Executive/Beneficiary and UNDP approve the initial AWP. The Beneficiary in consultation with UNDP approves the QWPs. And the Project Board endorses subsequent AWPs as appropriate (which are put into effect through signature of Project Board minutes by relevant partners).

## Cycle of Annual Work planning and budgeting

At the initiation stage of project implementation (e.g. through an inception workshop) project management, specifically the IP/Beneficiary and PM in consultation with UNDP and other stakeholders, will review the original AWP attached to the project document prepared during the formulation stage.

An AWP is an important instrument, and the signed AWP constitutes a legal agreement for UNDP-supported projects to operate in the country within a calendar year.  An approved AWP is the legal basis for the delegation of authority from the Project Board to the PM for implementation. Thus, when the Project Board approves the AWP, the PM receives the authority for operational implementation of the project on behalf of the IP for successful implementation of the project. The AWP will indicate what results based expenditures are anticipated and when activities are, to be taken to deliver each activity result, output and outcome.

The budget, which is an integral part of a Project Document RRF and the corresponding aligned AWP, shall serve as the basis for results oriented and evidence based planning and budgeting throughout the project life. Budgeting is expected to be done in consultation with all stakeholders and approved by the UNDP Senior management. The budget should represent the most economical, efficient and effective means of attaining planned project outputs. Each project output has its budget, which will also consist of various budget lines, i.e. personnel, procurement of equipment, travel, etc.

**Table 6: Annual Work planning Cycle Workflow**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Steps | Responsible | Action to be Taken | Time Frame |
| 1 | Project | * Plan Annual Review Meeting (ARM) * Develop an AWP for the following year | November |
| 2 | Project | * Discuss and finalize AWP for the following year with provisional budget * Organize an ARM (to take place no later than January of the following calendar year) * Review Monitoring and Evaluation Plan * Ensure all RBM Logs are updated (Risks, Issues, and Lessons Learnt etc.) | December |
| UNDP | * Project level inputs generated for UNDP Corporate Strategic Planning (IRRF), Strategic Planning (IWP) and Results Oriented Annual Reporting (ROAR) * Enter budget into ATLAS for a project to be ready/able to spend from 1 January |
| 3 | Project | * Submit Q4 Progress and Financial Reports * Prepare Q1 Work plan * Clearance for Annual Progress Report | January |
| 4 | UNDP | * Where identified project level actions are incorporated into Kuwait CO’s Corporate Strategic Planning – Integrated Work Plan (IWP) | February |
| 5 | UNDP | * NIM Audits start * Issue previous year’s Combined Delivery Report (CDR) | March |
| Project | * Prepare revision of the year to reflect carry-over from previous year and fine-tune budget |
| 5 | Project | * Submit Q1 Progress and Financial reports * Prepare Q2 Work plan | April |
| UNDP | * NIM Audit completed and Audit Recommendations Action Plan prepared |
| 5 | Project | * Review Monitoring and Evaluation Plan * Ensure all RBM Logs are updated (Risks, Issues, and Lessons Learnt etc.) | June |
| UNDP | * Review AWP implementation and expenditures to date with forecasted planning and adjust project delivery if necessary * Review and update for project level IWP inputs |
| 5 | Project | * Submit Q2 Progress and Financial reports * Prepare Q3 Work plan | July |
| 5 | Project | * Submit Q3 Progress and Financial reports * Prepare Q4 Work plan | September |

## Process of Annual Work planning and budgeting

The project AWP is a legal instrument that constitutes an integral part of the approved Project Document, which once signed by UNDP Senior Management and IP operationalizes the project. During project implementation, the AWP can and should be updated as necessary when e.g. there is a change in budget or substantive course correction. The first update of the AWP is done at the end of the first three months of the project Inception period, following the Project Inception Workshop.

For monitoring purposes (please see the Section on Managing for Development Results), it is critical to establish in addition to the project level indicators, annual targets for outputs based on the Prodoc RRF results and clearly reflect them in the AWP. The AWP will then serve as a means to monitor progress towards the outputs against the annual targets in proportion to their relation to the overall project results progress.

To the extent possible, formulation of the AWP should:

* Consider reducing “administrative management costs.” All costs where possible should be integrated into the project's relevant outputs and corresponding activity budget.
* Contain at least one distinct activity, with dedicated resources, which is intended to contribute to gender mainstreaming and equality. Any AWP without a well-defined gender-related output/activity plan will not be approved.

The PM is primarily responsible for preparing an AWP annually with SMART targets and baselines and for any necessary revisions of the AWP. The PM should consult with the UNDP Programme Analyst and Senior Management for technical assistance, advice and data that may be needed to complete an AWP. On completion of the AWP, the PM shall have it reviewed and signed by the Project Board as part of the Annual Review Meeting process. Once UNDP Senior Management signs off on the AWP, the AWP takes effect legally, and will be forwarded back to the Executive/Beneficiary. Thereafter, the AWP is used to mobilize and allocate resources to carry out project implementation as scheduled in the AWP and corresponding QWPs.

Updates or revisions of the AWP can be done at any time. However this must be cleared by the Project Board and signed by UNDP Senior Management for each revision to an AWP. Mandatory revision of the AWP including resource budgeting must be reviewed for delivery estimates in June and are also undertaken at the completion of each calendar year.

**Table 7: Annual Work Plan Development and Revision Workflow**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Steps | Responsible | Action to be Taken | Time Frame |
| 1 | PM | * Discuss priorities for the year with the Project Team, Beneficiary and UNDP * Draft an AWP based on the project RRF structure with inputs from Beneficiary including: an estimated annual budget. The AWP will include “annualized” output targets, activity details, a schedule and budget with available funding and any shortfalls * Revise draft AWP after ensuring that project activities will contribute to and measure project progress (against project document indicators) and is gender responsive * Discuss with the project team the RBM Logs (Risks, Issues, and Lessons Learnt etc.) * Ensure that a complimentary Annual Procurement Plan and Project Recruitment plan are prepared based on the AWP activities | November/December |
| 2 | UNDP Programme Analyst/Associate | * Review, provide quality assurance and approve project level AWP and RBM logs, inclusive of any comments from the Annual Project Review * Submit AWP to UNDP Senior Management for approval * Review and verify the AWP and Budget before entering the annual budget into ATLAS * Enter the project work plan into ATLAS (ensuring the AWP budget includes any indirect costs and GMS). | December/January |
| 3 | UNDP | * Review expenditure to-date against originally set delivery and forecast expenditures to revise delivery expectations as needed. | June |
| 4 | UNDP Programme Analyst/Associate | In the case of any budget revisions throughout the year:   * Verify budget revision is aligned with the resource planning and contributions allocated * Prepare Budget Revision Proposal to share with Programme Finance * Forward the AWP with budget revision to UNDP Senior Management for approval | On-Going |
| UNDP Programme Finance | * Enter the budget revision and send to KK (Commitment Control) |
| UNDP Senior Management | * Approve the budget revision and sign the AWP to be shared with IP and Beneficiary |
| 5 | UNDP Programme Analyst/Associate | * Circulate approved AWP and budget revision to IP, Beneficiary, and Project/PM, as well as maintain a copy for project files. |
| 6 | PM | * Prepare QWPs according to the approved AWP | On-Going |

## Quarterly Work planning and Risk Management

As part of the previous quarter’s reporting and an accountability measure for monitoring project progress, a Quarterly Work Plan (QWP) is prepared by the PM in line with the AWP and overall project RRF, presented to the Project Board as part of the project progress report and is endorsed by the IP/Beneficiary.

Each QWP specifies the results to be achieved that quarter as part of the approved AWP. The precise budget requirement for each activity contributing towards achievement of project outputs/outcomes within a quarter shall be estimated and outlined in specific details through the QWP. The budget is expressed with the chart of account (COA) information used in ATLAS.

**Table 8: Quarterly Work plan/Reporting Workflow**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Steps | Responsible | Action to be Taken | Time Frame |
| 1 | PM/IP | * Draft a quarterly progress report, providing narrative and financial reporting at the output and activity result level against the work plan from the previous quarter as well as updates to the RBM logs (risks, issues, lessons learnt etc.) | 2 weeks  (Last week of the given quarter and first week of new quarter) |
| 2 | PM/IP | * Discuss priorities and any work that is carried over from the previous quarter for the forthcoming quarter with the IP/Beneficiary, Project Team and UNDP Programme Analyst | 1-2 days within 1 week  (first week of new quarter) |
| 3 | PM/IP | * Draft a QWP forecasting activities and estimated budget based on the AWP | 1-2 days within 1 week  (first week of new quarter) |
| 4 | PM | * Submit Quarterly Project Report to UNDP Programme Analyst for review and quality control | Within no more than one month from closure of the quarter  (e.g. end of January; April; July; October) |
| 5 | UNDP Programme Analyst/Associate | * Read, review the project progress, ensure progress on project Annual Targets, collection of data on indicators, and review the RBM logs and financial reporting to ensure accuracy and progress against financial delivery benchmarks. * Provide PM with comments and corrections if needed, raise any broader issues for resolution if needed with UNDP Senior Management * Clear the report to be issued | 3-5 business days |
| 6 | PM | * Provide any corrections and respond to comments to finalize the report * Submit the report to the IP and maintain a copy in project files/records | 3-5 business days |
| 7 | IP | * Submit a copy of the report to GSSCPD as Executive Agency | 3-5 business days |

# Extending or Closing a Project

## Project Extension

UNDP and the Government must approve any project extension(s) officially in writing. The extension should be first proposed by the Project Board and agreed upon. Then the IP/Beneficiary must submit a proposal to UNDP Senior Management, explaining the rationale for the proposed extension including a substantive and financial plan for the extended period. After UNDP approval, the IP/Beneficiary submits the proposal for the extension to GSSCPD as Executive, with the letter of agreement from UNDP.

**Table 9: Project Extension Workflow**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Steps | Responsible | Action to be Taken | Time Frame |
| 1 | Project Board | Discuss and agree on the extension in the project – agreement must be included in meeting minutes | 1 day |
| 2 | IP/Beneficiary | Submit an official request letter for extension to GSSCPD and UNDP Senior Management through the relevant Programme Analyst/Associate, explaining the rationale for the extension, proposed timeframe, planned activities and budget resource availability | Within 2 weeks from Project Board meeting agreement |
| 3 | UNDP | Review the request and inform the IP/Beneficiary in writing of UNDP’s decision on the extension and budget allocation for the extended period. | No more than 2 weeks |
| 4 | IP/Beneficiary | Upon successful extension of the project, prepare a letter signed by a senior representative of the IP/Beneficiary to share with GSSCPD. | Within 2 weeks of approval |
| 5 | GSSCPD | Review and approve or disapprove the project extension request and inform UNDP and the IP/Beneficiary of the outcome. | N/A |

## Project Closure

UNDP supported projects must be closed upon completion of project activities as per the requirements of the Project Document. Project closure is comprised of two distinct stages: operational closure and financial closure.

## Operational Closure

A project is operationally complete when the last UNDP-financed inputs have been provided and all the planned project activities, including the Final Project Review Meeting and Reporting, as well as any required evaluation, have been completed. The Beneficiary notifies GSSCPD and UNDP in writing when the project is operationally complete.

Before declaring a project’s operational closure, the IP shall ensure:

* All project funded personnel have completed their assignments, and all required technical reports from experts have been received, approved and distributed
* All UNDP supported sub-contracts have been completed
* If relevant UNDP and the IP have agreed on the disposal of any project equipment. (Please see the Section on transfer or disposal of Assets).

**Table 10: Operational Closure Workflow**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Steps | Responsible | Action to be Taken | Time Frame |
| 1 | PM | Submit request to UNDP for project’s operational closure  Prepare a Final Project Progress Report | 3 months prior to project closure date |
| 2 | UNDP | Commission project final evaluation, if required | 3 months prior to project closure date |
| 3 | PM | Ensure that all project funded contracts are completed and all financial transactions issued | Within one month of project closure |
| 4 | Project Board | Conduct a Final Project Review Meeting | Within one month of project closure |
| 5 | Project Board | Review and endorse final project progress report and lessons learnt report | Within one month of project closure |
| 6 | Beneficiary | Dispose or transfer of project assets | Within 2 months after project board decision |

## Financial Closure

A project is financially completed when:

* It is operationally completed
* UNDP has closed the accounts
* UNDP and the Executive have certified a final CDR

The project should be financially completed within 12 months after being operationally completed. The final financial reporting must be prepared by the PM and submitted to UNDP in order to record the expenditures made during the last period.

Based on the financial reports received from the project, UNDP prepares the final CDR to be reviewed by the Project and then signed by UNDP and IP, confirming final project financial accounts and expenditures.

Once confirmed, UNDP will change the project status in ATLAS to “Financially Closed”. After this action has taken place, no further financial transactions can be made related to the project.

**Table 11: Financial Closure Workflow**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Steps | Responsible | Action to be Taken | Time Frame |
| 1 | Beneficiary | Settle all outstanding obligations through PO | No later than 2 months of project closure |
| 2 | Beneficiary | Ensure financial transactions are recorded in ATLAS | No later than 3 months of project closure |
| 3 | Beneficiary | Prepare a final CDR and send to GSSCPD to verify | March of the following calendar year from project closure |
| 4 | GSSCPD | Certify and sign the final CDR | Within 2 weeks from receipt of CDR |

## Implications of Project Closure

The IP/Beneficiary and UNDP must bear in mind an implication(s) of the project’s operational closure. Once a project is operationally closed no further substantive activities can take place or payments initiated for new engagements.

Additionally the project may be subject to audit even after its operational closure. In this case, after the operational closure of a project, UNDP Programme Analyst/Associate will serve as project support staff for necessary administrative tasks (e.g.: support to final payments/closure of accounts, preparation for receiving the auditors, etc.)

# Annexes:

## Annex 1: Capacity Assessment for Project Implementation checklist

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title | |  | | |
| Name of the Institution | |  | | |
| Date of assessment | |  | | |
| **INDICATOR** | **AREAS FOR ASSESSMENT** | | **APPLICABLE DOCUMENTS/TOOLS** | **COMMENTS** |
| **PART I – REFERENCES AND PRELIMINARY CHECKS** | | | | |
| **1.1 History and Compliance with International Resolutions/Standards** | | | | |
| 1.1.1 History | Date of creation and length in existence  Has the institution gone through a recent re-organization/re-structuring? | | Annual Reports  Media Kit  Website |  |
| 1.1.2 United Nations Security Council 1267 | Is the institution listed in any reference list? | | United Nations Security Council 1267 Committee’s list of terrorists and terrorist financiers |  |
| 1.1.3 Certification | Is the institution already certified through international standards? | | ISO, Project Management standard, other standards |  |
| **PART II. ASSESSING NATIONAL INSTITUTION CAPACITY FOR PROJECT MANAGEMENT** | | | | |
| **2.1 Managerial Capacity**  Ability to plan, monitor and coordinate activities | | | | |
| Planning, Monitoring & Evaluation | Does the institution produce clear, internally consistent proposals and intervention frameworks, including detailed workplans?  Does the institution hold regular programme or project review meetings?  Are there measurable outputs/deliverables in the defined project plans?  Was the institution previously exposed to UNDP RBM approach/methodology or equivalent in other donor agencies? | | Well-designed project and programme documents  Action Plans/Work plans  Log frame or equivalent  Project reports  Evaluation reports  Indicators available in project plans  Lessons-Learned reports |  |
| 2.1.2 Reporting and performance track record | Does the institution monitor progress against well defined indicator and targets, and evaluate its programme/project achievements?  Does the institution report to its stakeholders on a regular basis? | | Reports to donors and other stakeholders  Reporting system |  |
| **2.2 Technical Capacity** | | | | |
| 2.2.1 Specialization | Does the institution have the technical skills required?  Does the institution have the knowledge needed?  Does the institution keep informed about the latest techniques/ competencies/policies/trends in its area of expertise?  Does the institution have the skills and competencies that complement those of UNDP? | | Publications on activities, specific issues, analytical articles, policies  Reports from participation in international, regional, national or local meetings and conferences  Tools and methodologies  Evaluations and assessments |  |
| 2.2.2 Ability to monitor the technical aspects of the project. | Does the institution have access to relevant information/resources and experience?  Does the institution have useful contacts and networks?  Does the institution know how to get baseline data, develop indicators?  Does it apply effective approaches to reach its targets (i.e participatory methods)? | | Evaluations and Assessments  Methodologies/training materials  Use of toolkits, indicators and benchmarks/capacity-development tools  Databases |  |
| 2.2.3 Human Resources | Does the institution staff possess adequate expertise and experience?  Does the institution use local capacities (financial/human/other resources)?  What is the institution capacity to coordinate between its main office and decentralized entities/branches (if relevant)?  Have staff been trained on project management methodology? | | Profile of staff, including expertise and professional experience  Staff turnover  Chart of assignments of roles and functions  Reports on technical experience from national or international agencies for operations and capacity-building  Individual certification on project management such as PRINCE2 |  |
| **PART III. ASSESSING NATIONAL INSTITUTION CAPACITY FOR ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT** | | | | |
| **3.1 Administrative capacity** *Ability to provide adequate logistical support and infrastructure* | | | | |
| 3.1.1 Ability to manage and maintain infrastructure and equipment | Does the institution possess logistical infrastructure and equipment?  Can the institution manage and maintain equipment? | | Adequate logistical infrastructure: office facilities and space, basic equipment, utilities  Computer capability and library materials  Proper equipment for area of specialization  inventory to track property and cost |  |
| 3.1.2 Ability to procure goods services and works on a transparent and competitive basis. | Does the institution have the ability to procure goods, services and works on a transparent and competitive basis?  Does the institution have standard contracts or access to legal counsel to ensure that contracts meet performance standards, protect UNDP and the institution’s interests and are enforceable?  Does the institution have the authority to enter into contracts? | | Standard contracts  Examples of how procurement is done  Written procedures for identifying the appropriate vendor, obtaining the best price, and issuing commitments |  |
| 3.1.3 Ability to recruit and manage the best-qualified personnel on a transparent and competitive basis. | Is the institution able to staff the project and enter into contract with personnel?  Does the institution use written job descriptions for consultants or experts? | | Standard contracts  Job descriptions |  |
| **3.2 Financial Capacity**  *Ability to ensure appropriate management of funds*  In addition to the following questions, see also the questionnaire provided in the Guidelines on Micro-assessment of the Framework on Harmonized Approach for Cash Transfer (HACT):  [**http://www.undg.org/archive\_docs/7110-Framework\_for\_Cash\_Transfers\_to\_Implementing\_Partners.doc**](http://www.undg.org/archive_docs/7110-Framework_for_Cash_Transfers_to_Implementing_Partners.doc) **(ANNEX 3)**  The assessment report is reviewed by the UN agencies to select the most suitable cash transfer modality, and establish appropriate cash transfer procedures and assurance activities to be used with the Implementing Partner. | | | | |
| 3.2.1 Financial management and funding resources | Is there a regular budget cycle?  Does the institution produce programme and project budgets?  What is the maximum amount of money the institution has managed?  Does the institution ensure physical security of advances, cash and records?  Does the institution disburse funds in a timely and effective manner?  Does the institution have procedures on authority, responsibility, monitoring and accountability of handling funds?  Does the institution have a record of financial stability and reliability? | | Operating budgets and financial reports  List of core and non-core donors and years of funding  Written procedures ensuring clear records for payable, receivables, stock and inventory  Reporting system that tracks all commitments and expenditures against budgets by line |  |
| 3.2.2. Accounting System | Does the institution keep good, accurate and informative accounts?  Does the institution have the ability to ensure proper financial recording and reporting? | | A bank account or bank statements  Audited financial statements  Good, accurate and informative accounting system  Written procedures for processing payments to control the risks through segregation of duties, and transaction recording and reporting |  |
| 3.2.3. Knowledge of UNDP financial system | Does the institution have staff familiar with Atlas through External Access? | | External access provided |  |

## Annex 2: Project Document Template

**United Nations Development Programme**

**Country: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Project Document**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project Title:** |  |
| **UNDAF/CPD Outcome:** |  |
| **Expected Output(s):** |  |
| **Implementing Partner:** |  |

**Brief Description**

*In this box, briefly describe the overall development challenge and expected results of the project.*

Total resources required: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Total allocated resources: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Regular \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Other:

Donor: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Donor: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Government: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Pipeline: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Unfunded: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

In-kind Contributions \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Strategic Plan Output: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Atlas Project ID: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Start Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

End Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

PAC Meeting Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Agreed by (Government): Date:

Agreed by (Implementing Partner): Date:

Agreed by (UNDP): Date:

1. **Development Challenge**

*Describe the development challenge that the project seeks to address and how it is relevant to national development priorities. Include evidence to support the analysis, such as data demonstrating the magnitude of the problem, how it affects different population groups (esp. women and men, and minority and other excluded groups) and why it is important for poverty reduction and addressing inequality and exclusion. Identify the immediate, underlying and root causes of the challenge (including capacity limitations) which have been identified in the problem tree analysis feeding into the Theory of Change. Please be specific.*

1. **Strategy**

*Explain the detailed theory of change (ToC) for this project and what UNDP with partners will do to address the development challenge described above. Identify the approach that has been selected, with a clear rationale backed by credible evidence, integrating gender concerns into the approach. Identify what knowledge, good practices and lessons learned (including from evaluation) have informed the analysis of available choices and the selected strategy.*

*Detail the project’s selected approach and explain how it is expected to lead to change at the output level, outcome level and eventually at the level of the development challenge. Clearly link the project’s ToC to the programme’s ToC. State key assumptions about what will change, for whom, and how this will happen. Assumptions should include consideration of internal factors (relating to project design and implementation) and external factors (relating to other partners, stakeholders and context) that will be critical for achieving expected changes. Cite best available evidence which supports these key assumptions in the ToC, including findings from evaluation and other credible research, as well as knowledge, good practices and lessons learned from previous work by UNDP and others, in this country and in other relevant contexts.*

*Include a theory of change diagram showing the linkages between the development challenge and the immediate, underlying and root causes.*

1. **Results and Partnerships**

***Expected Results***

* *The text under this heading should translate the strategy above into the work we will do through the project. Describe the planned interventions of the project and what change we expect to see that will be attributable to the project. This change should be included in the results framework and monitored regularly by the project. Link the expected results to the relevant higher level results (i.e., programme outcome, UNDAF, Strategic Plan.)*

***Partnerships***

* *Describe how the project will work with partners to achieve results and briefly map what other stakeholders and initiatives are doing to address the development challenge. This should not be simply a list of partners, it should be linked to the theory of change. For example, what are the assumptions and expected results achieved by partners that are critical for the achievement of results of this project?*

***Stakeholder Engagement***

* Identify key stakeholders and outline a strategy to ensure stakeholders are engaged throughout, including:
* *Target Groups: Identify the targeted groups that are the intended beneficiaries of the project. What strategy will the project take to identify and engage targeted groups?*
* *Other Potentially Affected Groups: Identify potentially affected people and a strategy for engagement and ensuring they have access to and are aware of mechanisms to submit concerns about the social and environmental impacts of a project (e.g. UNDP’s Social and Environmental Compliance Review and Stakeholder Response Mechanism).*
* *Partners:* *Describe how the project will work with partners to achieve results and briefly map what other stakeholders and initiatives are doing to address the development challenge.*

***South-South and Triangular Cooperation (SSC/TrC)***

* *Describe how the project intends to use SSC/TrC to achieve and sustain results, if applicable.*

***Sustainability and Scaling Up***

* *Describe how the project will use relevant national systems, and specify the transition arrangement to sustain and/or scale-up results, as relevant. Describe how national capacities will be strengthened and monitored as relevant, and how national ownership will be ensured.*

**IV. Project and Risk Management**

***Risk Management***

* *Specify the key risks that can threaten the achievement of results through the chosen strategy. Describe how project risks will be mitigated, especially how potential adverse social and environmental impacts will be avoided where possible and otherwise managed.*

***Cost Efficiency and Effectiveness***

* *Identify how the strategy is expected to deliver maximum results with available resources, with reference to evidence on similar approaches in this country or similar contexts. Include measures based on good practices and lessons learned. Explain why the selected pathway is the most efficient and effective of available options. Possible approaches can include:*

1. *Using the theory of change analysis to explore different options to achieve the maximum results with available resources*
2. *Using a portfolio management approach to improve cost effectiveness by leveraging activities and partnerships with other initiatives/projects*
3. *Through joint operations (e.g., monitoring or procurement) with other partners.*

***Project Management***

* *Information on the location(s) where the project will be operationalized, the number and location of physical project offices, arrangements for dedicated or shared operations support, how the project will work with other projects, etc.*

**V. Results and Resources Framework**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Intended Outcome as stated in the UNDAF/Country Programme Results and Resource Framework:** | | | | |
| **Outcome indicators as stated in the Country Programme Results and Resources Framework, including baseline and targets:** | | | | |
| **Applicable Output(s) from 2014-17 Strategic Plan:** | | | | |
| **Project title and ID :** | | | | |
| **OUTPUTS AND TOC** | **OUTPUT INDICATORS[[1]](#footnote-1)** | **ACTIVITIES, RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS** | **ROLE OF PARTNERS** | **INPUTS** |
| *Specify each output that is planned to help achieve the outcome.*  **Output 1**  *For each output, describe how it relates to the project’s theory of change about how it will help to achieve the outcome.* | ***Results Indicator 1.1***  *Data Source:*  *Frequency:*  *Baseline (year):*  *(Women: ; Men: )*  *Target (year):*  *(Women: ; Men: )*  ***Results Indicator 1.2***  *…* | 1.1 Activity  1.2 Activity  1.3 Activity  1.4 Activity  *Cite assumptions made about how activities will deliver this output, and key risks that would affect delivery of the output.* | *Specify partner that will be engaged by the Implementing Partner, if applicable, to carry out these activities.*  *Specify the role of other stakeholders and/or initiatives that will work with or alongside the project to achieve the outputs.* | *Specify the nature and total costs of the inputs needed to produce each output.*  *Can also include inputs provided in kind that are key to achieving the output.* |
| *Monitoring Costs:* |
| **Output 2**  *For each output, describe the theory of change about how it will help to achieve the outcome.* | ***Results Indicator 2.1***  *Data Source:*  *Frequency:*  *Baseline (year):*  *Target (year):* | 2.1 Activity  2.2 Activity  *Cite assumptions made about how activities will deliver this output, and key risks that would affect delivery of the output.* | *As above.* | *As above.* |
| *Monitoring Costs:* |
|  |  |  |  | *Evaluation Costs:* |

**VI. Monitoring And Evaluation**

In accordance with UNDP’s programming policies and procedures, the project will be monitored through the following:

**Within the annual cycle**

* **Track Progress.** Following the frequency cited in the monitoring plan, progress data against the results indicators will be collected and analysed to assess the progress of the project in achieving the agreed outputs. National data sources should be used whenever possible. Slower than expected progress will be addressed by the project management. Beneficiary feedback will be part of regular data collection and performance assessment.
* **Monitor and Manage Risk.** Based on the initial risk analysis submitted (see annex 2), a risk log shall be actively maintained, including by reviewing the external environment that may affect the project implementation. Risk management actions will be identified and monitored using a risk log. This includes monitoring social and environmental management measures and plans that may have been required as per UNDP’s Social and Environmental Standards (see annex 3). Audits will be conducted in accordance with UNDP’s audit policy to manage financial risk.
* **Evaluate and Learn.** Evaluations shall be conducted in accordance with the evaluation plan. Knowledge, good practices and lessons should be captured and shared, as well as actively sourced from other projects and partners, and integrated back into the project. If a project evaluation is required (e.g., when mandated by partnership principles, or due to the complexity or innovative aspects of the project), is should be conducted in accordance with the project’s evaluation plan.
* **Review and Make Course Corrections.** The project management will review the data and evidence collected (through all of the above) on a regular basis within the annual cycle, and make course corrections as needed. The frequency of review depends on the needs of the project, but an internal review of the available progress data against the results indicators is required at least quarterly. Any significant course corrections that require a decision by the Project Board should be raised at the next Project Board meeting.

**Annually**

* **Annual Project Quality Rating.** On an annual basis and at the end of the project, the quality of the project will be rated by the QA Assessor against the quality criteria identified in UNDP’s Project Quality Assurance System. Any quality concerns flagged by the process must be addressed by project management.
* **Annual Project Review and Report**. The Project Board shall hold a project review at least once per year to assess the performance of the project and appraise the Annual Work Plan for the following year. An annual report will be presented to the Project Board for the review, consisting of progress data showing the results achieved against pre-defined annual targets at the output level, the annual project quality rating summary, an updated risk long with mitigation measures, and any evaluation or review reports prepared over the period. Any quality concerns or slower than expected progress should be discussed by the project and management actions agreed to address the issues identified. This review is driven by the Project Board and may involve other stakeholders as required.

**Closure**

* In the project’s final year, the Project Board shall hold an end-of project review to capture lessons learned and discuss opportunities for scaling up.

**VII. Multi-Year Work Plan**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **EXPECTED OUTPUTS and RESULT INDICATORS** | **PLANNED ACTIVITIES** | **TIMEFRAME** | | | | **RESPONSIBLE PARTY** | **PLANNED BUDGET** | | |
| Y1 | Y2 | Y3 | Y4 | Funding Source | Budget Description | Amount |
| **Output 1**  *Result indicator 1.1*  *Baseline (year):*  *Target (Y1, Y2, Y3, Y4):* | * 1. Activity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.2 Activity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.3 Activity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.4 Activity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MONITORING |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Output 2**  *Result indicator 2.1*  *Baseline (year):*  *Target (Y1, Y2, Y3, Y4):* | 2.1 Activity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.2 Activity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.3 Activity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.4 Activity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| MONITORING |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Evaluation** *(as relevant)* | EVALUATION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **TOTAL** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**VIII. Governance and Management Arrangements**

*Explain the roles and responsibilities of the parties involved in governing and managing the project. While an example diagram is below, it is not required to follow this diagram exactly. A project can be jointly governed with other projects, for example, through a national steering sub-committee linked to Results Groups under the UNDG Standard Operating Procedures for countries adopting the Delivering as One approach.*

*Minimum requirements for a project’s governance arrangements include stakeholder representation (i.e., UNDP, national partners, beneficiary representatives, donors, etc.) with authority to make decisions regarding the project. Describe how target groups will be engaged in decision making for the project, to ensure their voice and participation. The project’s management arrangements must include, at minimum, a project manager and project assurance that advises the project governance mechanism.*

*In this section, also describe the audit arrangements, collaborative arrangements with related projects and UNDP Direct Country Office Support Services, if applicable.*

**Team C**

**Team B**

**Team A**

**Project Assurance**

**[Specify]**

**Project Support**

**Project Manager**

**Senior Beneficiary**

**[Specify]**

**Senior Supplier**

**[Specify]**

**Executive**

**[Specify]**

**Project Board (Governance Mechanism)**

**Project Organisation Structure**

**Evaluation Plan[[2]](#footnote-2)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Title** | **Partners (if joint)** | **Related Strategic Plan Output** | **UNDAF/CPD Outcome** | **Planned Completion Date** | **Key Evaluation Stakeholders** | **Cost and Source of Funding** |
| Project Mid-Term Evaluation | Ministry of… | 4.2 | 2 | June 2018 | Ministry of…., DFID, UNDP | $50,000, project budget |

**IX. Legal Context**

Click [here for the standard text](https://intranet.undp.org/global/documents/ppm/Standard%20text%20for%20Legal%20Context%20section.docx).

**X. ANNEXES**

1. **Project Quality Assurance Report**
2. **Social and Environmental Screening Template** for projects $500,000 or more [English][French][Spanish], including additional Social and Environmental Assessments or Management Plans as relevant.
3. **Risk Analysis**. Use the standard [Risk Log template](https://intranet.undp.org/global/documents/ppm/FINAL_Risk_Log_Template.doc). Please refer to the [Deliverable Description of the Risk Log](https://intranet.undp.org/global/documents/ppm/FINAL%20Risk%20Log%20Deliverable%20Description.doc) for instructions
4. **Capacity Assessment:** Results of capacity assessments of Implementing Partner (including HACT Micro Assessment)
5. **The project’s first year detailed Annual Work Plan (AWP)**
6. **Project Board Terms of Reference and TORs of key management positions**

## Annex 3: Initial Risk Logs Template

*bundp20mm***OFFLINE RISK LOG**

*(see* [*Deliverable Description*](http://content.undp.org/go/prescriptive/Project-Management---Prescriptive-Content-Documents/download/?d_id=1266195&) *for the Risk Log regarding its purpose and use)*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Title:** | **Award ID:** | **Date:** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Description** | **Date Identified** | **Type** | **Impact &**  **Probability** | **Countermeasures / Mngt response** | **Owner** | **Submitted, updated by** | **Last Update** | **Status** |
| 1 | Enter a brief description of the risk  *(In Atlas, use the Description field.* ***Note: This field cannot be modified after first data entry)*** | When was the risk first identified  *(In Atlas, select date. Note: date cannot be modified after initial entry)* | Environmental  Financial  Operational  Organizational  Political  Regulatory  Strategic  Other  Subcategories for each risk type should be consulted to understand each risk type (see Deliverable Description for more information)  *(In Atlas, select from list)* | Describe the potential effect on the project if this risk were to occur  Enter probability on a scale from 1 (low) to 5 (high)  P =  Enter impact on a scale from 1 (low) to 5 (high)  I =  *(in Atlas, use the Management Response box. Check “critical” if the impact and probability are high)* | What actions have been taken/will be taken to counter this risk  *(in Atlas, use the Management Response box. This field can be modified at any time. Create separate boxes as necessary using “+”, for instance to record updates at different times)* | Who has been appointed to keep an eye on this risk  *(in Atlas, use the Management Response box)* | Who submitted the risk  *(In Atlas, automatically recorded)* | When was the status of the risk last checked  *(In Atlas, automatically recorded)* | e.g. dead, reducing, increasing, no change  *(in Atlas, use the Management Response box)* |
| 2 |  |  | Environmental  Financial  Operational  Organizational  Political  Regulatory  Strategic  Other | Text  P =  I = |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 |  |  | Environmental  Financial  Operational  Organizational  Political  Regulatory  Strategic  Other | Text  P =  I = |  |  |  |  |  |

## Annex 4: Project Quality Assurance Checklist

| **Project QA Assessment: Design and Appraisal** | | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Overall Project** | | |  | | | | | |
| **Exemplary (5)**  **🞋🞋🞋🞋🞋** | | **Highly Satisfactory (4)**  **🞋🞋🞋🞋⭘** | | **Satisfactory (3)**  **🞋🞋🞋⭘⭘** | **Needs Improvement (2)**  **🞋🞋⭘⭘⭘** | **Inadequate (1)**  **🞋⭘⭘⭘⭘** | | |
| At least four criteria are rated Exemplary, and all criteria are rated High or Exemplary. | | All criteria are rated Satisfactory or higher, and at least four criteria are rated High or Exemplary. | | At least six criteria are rated Satisfactory or higher, and only one may be rated Needs Improvement. The SES criterion must be rated Satisfactory or above. | At least three criteria are rated Satisfactory or higher, and only four criteria may be rated Needs Improvement. | One or more criteria are rated Inadequate, or five or more criteria are rated Needs Improvement. | | |
| **DECISION** | | | | | | | | |
| * **APPROVE** – the project is of sufficient quality to continue as planned**.** Any management actions must be addressed in a timely manner. * **APPROVE WITH QUALIFICATIONS** – the project has issues that must be addressed before the project document can be approved. Any management actions must be addressed in a timely manner. * **DISAPPROVE** – the project has significant issues that should prevent the project from being approved as drafted. | | | | | | | | |
| **RATING CRITERIA** | | | | | | | | |
| **Strategic** |  | | | | | | | |
| 1. **Does the project’s Theory of Change specify how it will contribute to higher level change? (Select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project):**  * **3:** The project has a theory of change with explicit assumptions on how the project will contribute to higher level change as specified in the programme’s theory of change, backed by credible evidence of what works effectively in this context. The project document clearly describes why the project’s strategy is the best approach at this point in time. * **2:** The project has a theory of change related to the programme’s theory of change. It has explicit assumptions that explain how the project intends to contribute to higher level change and why the project strategy is the best approach at this point in time, but is backed by limited evidence. * **1:** The project does not have a theory of change, but the project document may describe in generic terms how the project will contribute to development results, without specifying the key assumptions. It does not make an explicit link to the programme’s theory of change. The project document does not clearly specify why the project’s strategy is the best approach at this point in time.   \*Note: Management Action or strong management justification must be given for a score of 1 | | | | | | | 3 | 2 |
| 1 | |
| **Evidence** | |
| 1. **Is the project aligned with the thematic focus of the UNDP Strategic Plan? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project):**  * **3:** The project responds to one of the three areas of development work[[3]](#footnote-3) as specified in the Strategic Plan; it addresses at least one of the proposed new and emerging areas[[4]](#footnote-4); an issues-based analysis has been incorporated into the project design; and the project’s RRF includes all the relevant SP output indicators. *(all must be true to select this option)* * **2:** The project responds to one of the three areas of development work1 as specified in the Strategic Plan. The project’s RRF includes at least one SP output indicator, if relevant. *(both must be true to select this option)* * **1:** While the project may respond to one of the three areas of development work1 as specified in the Strategic Plan, it is based on a sectoral approach without addressing the complexity of the development issue. None of the relevant SP indicators are included in the RRF. This answer is also selected if the project does not respond to any of the three areas of development work in the Strategic Plan. | | | | | | | 3 | 2 |
| 1 | |
| **Evidence** | |
| **Relevant** |  | | | | | | | |
| 1. **Does the project have strategies to effectively identify, engage and ensure the meaningful participation of targeted groups/geographic areas with a priority focus on the excluded and marginalized? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects this project):**  * **3:** The target groups/geographic areas are appropriately specified, prioritising the excluded and/or marginalised. The project has an explicit strategy to identify, engage and ensure the meaningful participation of specified target groups/geographic areas throughout the project. Beneficiaries will be identified through a rigorous process based on evidence (if applicable.) The project plans to solicit feedback from targeted groups regularly through project monitoring. Representatives of the targeted group/geographic areas will contribute to project decision-making, such as being included in the project’s governance mechanism (i.e., project board.) *(all must be true to select this option)* * **2:** The target groups/geographic areas are appropriately specified, prioritising the excluded and/or marginalised, and are engaged in project design. The project document states clearly how beneficiaries will be identified, engaged and how meaningful participation will be ensured throughout the project. Collecting feedback from targeted groups has been incorporated into the project’s RRF/monitoring system, but representatives of the target group(s) may not be directly involved in the project’s decision making. *(all must be true to select this option)* * **1:** The target groups/geographic areas do not prioritize excluded and/or marginalised populations, or they may not be specified. The project does not have a written strategy to identify or engage or ensure the meaningful participation of the target groups/geographic areas throughout the project.   \*Note: Management Action must be taken for a score of 1 | | | | | | | 3 | 2 |
| 1 | |
| *Select (all) targeted groups: (drop-down)*  **Evidence** | |
| 1. **Have knowledge, good practices, and past lessons learned of UNDP and others informed the project design? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects this project):**  * **3:** Knowledge and lessons learned (gained e.g. through peer assist sessions) backed by credible evidence from evaluation, analysis and monitoring have been explicitly used, with appropriate referencing, to develop the project’s theory of change and justify the approach used by the project over alternatives. * **2:** The project design mentions knowledge and lessons learned backed by evidence/sources, which inform the project’s theory of change but have not been used/are not sufficient to justify the approach selected over alternatives. * **1:** There is only scant or no mention of knowledge and lessons learned informing the project design. Any references that are made are not backed by evidence.   \*Note: Management Action or strong management justification must be given for a score of 1 | | | | | | | 3 | 2 |
| 1 | |
| **Evidence** | |
| 1. **Does the project use gender analysis in the project design and does the project respond to this gender analysis with concrete measures to address gender inequities and empower women? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects this project):**  * **3:** A participatory gender analysis on the project has been conducted. This analysis reflects on the different needs, roles and access to/control over resources of women and men, and it is fully integrated into the project document. The project establishes concrete priorities to address gender inequalities in its strategy. The results framework includes outputs and activities that specifically respond to this gender analysis, with indicators that measure and monitor results contributing to gender equality. *(all must be true to select this option)* * **2:** A gender analysis on the project has been conducted. This analysis reflects on the different needs, roles and access to/control over resources of women and men. Gender concerns are integrated in the development challenge and strategy sections of the project document. The results framework includes outputs and activities that specifically respond to this gender analysis, with indicators that measure and monitor results contributing to gender equality. *(all must be true to select this option)* * **1:** The project design may or may not mention information and/or data on the differential impact of the project’s development situation on gender relations, women and men, but the constraints have not been clearly identified and interventions have not been considered.   \*Note: Management Action or strong management justification must be given for a score of 1 | | | | | | | 3 | 2 |
| 1 | |
| **Evidence** | |
| 1. **Does UNDP have a clear advantage to engage in the role envisioned by the project vis-à-vis national partners, other development partners, and other actors? (select from options 1-3 that best reflects this project):**  * **3:** An analysis has been conducted on the role of other partners in the area where the project intends to work, and credible evidence supports the proposed engagement of UNDP and partners through the project. It is clear how results achieved by relevant partners will contribute to outcome level change complementing the project’s intended results. If relevant, options for south-south and triangular cooperation have been considered, as appropriate. *(all must be true to select this option)* * **2:** Some analysis has been conducted on the role of other partners where the project intends to work, and relatively limited evidence supports the proposed engagement of and division of labour between UNDP and partners through the project. Options for south-south and triangular cooperation may not have not been fully developed during project design, even if relevant opportunities have been identified. * **1:** No clear analysis has been conducted on the role of other partners in the area that the project intends to work, and relatively limited evidence supports the proposed engagement of UNDP and partners through the project. There is risk that the project overlaps and/or does not coordinate with partners’ interventions in this area. Options for south-south and triangular cooperation have not been considered, despite its potential relevance.   \*Note: Management Action or strong management justification must be given for a score of 1 | | | | | | | 3 | 2 |
| 1 | |
| **Evidence** | |
| **Social & Environmental Standards** | | | | | | | | |
| 1. **Does the project seek to further the realization of human rights using a human rights based approach? (select from options 1-3 that best reflects this project):**  * **3:** Credible evidence that the project aims to further the realization of human rights, specifically upholding the relevant international and national laws and standards in the area of the project. Any potential adverse impacts on enjoyment of human rights were rigorously assessed and identified with appropriate mitigation and management measures incorporated into project design and budget.*(all must be true to select this option)* * **2:** Some evidence that the project aims to further the realization of human rights. Potential adverse impacts on enjoyment of human rights were assessed and identified and appropriate mitigation and management measures incorporated into the project design and budget. * **1:** No evidence that the project aims to further the realization of human rights. Limited or no evidence that potential adverse impacts on enjoyment of human rights were considered.   \*Note: Management action or strong management justification must be given for a score of 1 | | | | | | | 3 | 2 |
| 1 | |
| **Evidence** | |
| **8. Did the project consider potential environmental opportunities and adverse impacts, applying a precautionary approach? (select from options 1-3 that best reflects this project):**   * **3:** Credible evidence that opportunities to enhance environmental sustainability and integrate poverty-environment linkages were fully considered and integrated in project strategy and design. Credible evidence that potential adverse environmental impacts have been identified and rigorously assessed with appropriate management and mitigation measures incorporated into project design and budget. *(all must be true to select this option)*. * **2:** No evidence that opportunities to strengthen environmental sustainability and poverty-environment linkages were considered. Credible evidence that potential adverse environmental impacts have been assessed, if relevant, and appropriate management and mitigation measures incorporated into project design and budget. * **1:** No evidence that opportunities to strengthen environmental sustainability and poverty-environment linkages were considered. Limited or no evidence that potential adverse environmental impacts were adequately considered.   \*Note: Management action or strong management justification must be given for a score of 1 | | | | | | | 3 | 2 |
| 1 | |
| **Evidence** | |
| **9. If the project is worth $500,000 or more, has the Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) been conducted to identify potential social and environmental impacts and risks?** Select N/A only if the project is worth less than $500,000. [if yes, upload the completed checklist] | | | | | | | Yes | No |
| N/A | |
| **Management & Monitoring** | | | | | | | | |
| 1. **Does the project have a strong results framework?** **(select from options 1-3 that best reflects this project):**  * **3:** The project’s selection of outputs and activities are at an appropriate level and relate in a clear way to the project’s theory of change. Outputs are accompanied by SMART, results-oriented indicators that measure all of the key expected changes identified in the theory of change, each with credible data sources, and populated baselines and targets, including gender sensitive, sex-disaggregated indicators where appropriate. *(all must be true to select this option)* * **2:** The project’s selection of outputs and activities are at an appropriate level, but may not cover all aspects of the project’s theory of change. Outputs are accompanied by SMART, results-oriented indicators, but baselines, targets and data sources may not yet be fully specified. Some use of gender sensitive, sex-disaggregated indicators, as appropriate. *(all must be true to select this option)* * **1:** The results framework does not meet all of the conditions specified in selection “2” above. This includes: the project’s selection of outputs and activities are not at an appropriate level and do not relate in a clear way to the project’s theory of change; outputs are not accompanied by SMART, results-oriented indicators that measure the expected change, and have not been populated with baselines and targets; data sources are not specified, and/or no gender sensitive, sex-disaggregation of indicators.   \*Note: Management Action or strong management justification must be given for a score of 1 | | | | | | | 3 | 2 |
| 1 | |
| **Evidence** | |
| **11. Is there a comprehensive and costed M&E plan with specified data collection sources and methods to support evidence-based management, monitoring and evaluation of the project?** | | | | | | | Yes (3) | No (1) |
| **12. Is the project’s governance mechanism clearly defined in the project document, including planned composition of the project board? (select from options 1-3 that best reflects this project):**   * **3:** The project’s governance mechanism is fully defined in the project composition. Individuals have been specified for each position in the governance mechanism (especially all members of the project board.) Project Board members have agreed on their roles and responsibilities as specified in the terms of reference. The ToR of the project board has been attached to the project document. *(all must be true to select this option)*. * **2:** The project’s governance mechanism is defined in the project document; specific institutions are noted as holding key governance roles, but individuals may not have been specified yet. The prodoc lists the most important responsibilities of the project board, project director/manager and quality assurance roles. *(all must be true to select this option)* * **1:** The project’s governance mechanism is loosely defined in the project document, only mentioning key roles that will need to be filled at a later date. No information on the responsibilities of key positions in the governance mechanism is provided.   \*Note: Management Action or strong management justification must be given for a score of 1 | | | | | | | 3 | 2 |
| 1 | |
| **Evidence** | |
| **13. Have the project risks been identified with clear plans stated to manage and mitigate each risks?** **(select from options 1-3 that best reflects this project):**   * **3:** Project risks fully described in the project risk log, based on comprehensive analysis which references key assumptions made in the project’s theory of change. Clear and complete plan in place to manage and mitigate each risk. *(both must be true to select this option)* * **2:** Project risks identified in the initial project risk log with mitigation measures identified for each risk. * **1:** Some risks may be identified in the initial project risk log, but no clear risk mitigation measures identified. This option is also selected if risks are not clearly identified and no initial risk log is included with the project document.   \*Note: Management Action must be taken for a score of 1 | | | | | | | 3 | 2 |
| 1 | |
| **Evidence** | |
| **Efficient** |  | | | | | | | |
| **14. Have specific measures for ensuring cost-efficient use of resources been explicitly mentioned as part of the project design? This can include: i) using the theory of change analysis to explore different options of achieving the maximum results with the resources available; ii) using a portfolio management approach to improve cost effectiveness through synergies with other interventions; iii) through joint operations (e.g., monitoring or procurement) with other partners.** | | | | | | | Yes (3) | No (1) |
| **15. Are explicit plans in place to ensure the project links up with other relevant on-going projects and initiatives, whether led by UNDP, national or other partners, to achieve more efficient results (including, for example, through sharing resources or coordinating delivery?)** | | | | | | | Yes (3) | No (1) |
| **16. Is the budget justified and supported with valid estimates?** | | | | | | | Yes (3) | No (1) |
| **17. Is the Country Office fully recovering its costs involved with project implementation?** | | | | | | | Yes (3) | No (1) |
| **Effective** |  | | | | | | | |
| **18. Is the chosen implementation modality most appropriate? (select from options 1-3 that best reflects this project):**   * **3:** The required implementing partner assessments (capacity assessment, HACT micro assessment) have been conducted, and there is evidence that options for implementation modalities have been thoroughly considered. There is a strong justification for choosing the selected modality, based on the development context. *(both must be true to select this option)* * **2:** The required implementing partner assessments (capacity assessment, HACT micro assessment) have been conducted and the implementation modality chosen is consistent with the results of the assessments. * **1:** The required assessments have not been conducted, but there may be evidence that options for implementation modalities have been considered.   \*Note: Management Action or strong management justification must be given for a score of 1 | | | | | | | 3 | 2 |
| 1 | |
| **Evidence** | |
| **19. Have targeted groups, prioritizing marginalized and excluded populations that will be affected by the project, been engaged in the design of the project in a way that addresses any underlying causes of exclusion and discrimination?**   * 3: Credible evidence that all targeted groups, prioritising marginalized and excluded populations that will be involved in or affected by the project, have been actively engaged in the design of the project. Their views, rights and any constraints have been analysed and incorporated into the root cause analysis of the theory of change which seeks to address any underlying causes of exclusion and discrimination and the selection of project interventions. * 2: Some evidence that key targeted groups, prioritising marginalized and excluded populations that will be involved in the project, have been engaged in the design of the project. Some evidence that their views, rights and any constraints have been analysed and incorporated into the root cause analysis of the theory of change and the selection of project interventions. * 1: No evidence of engagement with marginalized and excluded populations that will be involved in the project during project design. No evidence that the views, rights and constraints of populations have been incorporated into the project. | | | | | | | 3 | 2 |
| 1 | |
| **Evidence** | |
| **20. Does the project have explicit plans for evaluation or other lesson learning (e.g. through After Action Reviews or Lessons Learned Workshops), timed to inform course corrections if needed during project implementation?** | | | | | | | Yes  (3) | No  (1) |
| **21. The gender marker for all project outputs are scored at GEN2 or GEN3, indicating that gender has been fully mainstreamed into all project outputs at a minimum.**  \*Note: Management Action or strong management justification must be given for a score of “no” | | | | | | | Yes  (3) | No  (1) |
| **Evidence** | |
| **22. Is there a realistic multi-year work plan and budget to ensure outputs are delivered on time and within allotted resources? (select from options 1-3 that best reflects this project):**   * **3:** The project has a realistic work plan & budget covering the duration of the project *at the activity* level to ensure outputs are delivered on time and within the allotted resources. * **2:** The project has a work plan & budget covering the duration of the project at the output level. * **1:** The project does not yet have a work plan & budget covering the duration of the project. | | | | | | | 3 | 2 |
| 1 | |
| **Evidence** | |
| **Sustainability & National Ownership** | | | | | | | | |
| **23. Have national partners led, or proactively engaged in, the design of the project? (select from options 1-3 that best reflects this project):**   * **3:** National partners have full ownership of the project and led the process of the development of the project jointly with UNDP. * **2:** The project has been developed by UNDP in close consultation with national partners. * **1:** The project has been developed by UNDP with limited or no engagement with national partners. | | | | | | | 3 | 2 |
| 1 | |
| **Evidence** | |
| **24. Are key institutions and systems identified, and is there a strategy for strengthening specific/ comprehensive capacities based on capacity assessments conducted? (select from options 0-4 that best reflects this project):**   * **3:** The project has a comprehensive strategy for strengthening specific capacities of national institutions based on a systematic and detailed capacity assessment that has been completed. This strategy includes an approach to regularly monitor national capacities using clear indicators and rigorous methods of data collection, and adjust the strategy to strengthen national capacities accordingly. * **2.5:** A capacity assessment has been completed. The project document has identified activities that will be undertaken to strengthen capacity of national institutions, but these activities are not part of a comprehensive strategy to monitor and strengthen national capacities. * **2:** A capacity assessment is planned after the start of the project. There are plans to develop a strategy to strengthen specific capacities of national institutions based on the results of the capacity assessment. * **1.5:** There is mention in the project document of capacities of national institutions to be strengthened through the project, but no capacity assessments or specific strategy development are planned. * **1:** Capacity assessments have not been carried out and are not foreseen. There is no strategy for strengthening specific capacities of national institutions. | | | | | | | 4 | 3 |
| 2 | 1 |
| 0 | |
| **Evidence** | |
| **25. Is there is a clear strategy embedded in the project specifying how the project will use national systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluations, etc.,) to the extent possible?** | | | | | | | Yes (3) | No (1) |
| **26. Is there a clear transition arrangement/ phase-out plan developed with key stakeholders in order to sustain or scale up results (including resource mobilization strategy)?** | | | | | | | Yes (3) | No (1) |

## Annex 5 - Key Considerations for Quality Programming

The following considerations alert the user to quality dimensions in programming and are generic to all phases of the programming process. They serve as a reference in the preparation of country/regional/global programme documents, in project design, in appraisals of the programme or project.

| **QUESTIONS** | **YES** | **NO** | **COMMENTS** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **OVERALL CONSIDERATIONS** |  |  |  |
| ***A. EMPHASIS ON INTEGRATED UN PROGRAMMING*** |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the programme support a coordinated UN response? |  |  |  |
| 1. Does this programme respond to national priorities by focusing on where the UN can make the biggest difference? |  |  |  |
| 1. Is there a systematic plan and approach to monitoring and evaluation anchored in the UN systems M&E frameworks? |  |  |  |
| ***B. STRATEGIC FOCUS*** |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the programme focus on: (a) strategically supporting the MDGs as part of national development frameworks; accelerating MDGs than can be achieved; (b) addressing climate change; and (c) responding to crisis? |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the programme provide an opportunity for UNDP CO to review and get its own capacity in place? |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the programme contribute to scaling up and transformations? |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the programme provide an integrated approach to addressing development challenges in the country? |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the programme ensure the development of capacity, and exit leaving behind sustainable and resilient entities? |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the programme mainstream gender considerations? |  |  |  |
| 1. Is environmental sustainability mainstreamed throughout the programme? |  |  |  |
| 1. Have a variety of potential strategies been identified and considered? |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the chosen operational strategy represent the most promising approach to address the development problem? |  |  |  |
| 1. Have the following issues been addressed:    1. Social impacts and opportunities;    2. Risks including external factors;    3. Opportunities for synergies with other programmes or projects;    4. Opportunity costs & trade-offs between various human development dimensions?    5. Cumulative and indirect impacts |  |  |  |
| ***C. INTEGRATION, SYNERGIES, COMPLEMENTARITY*** |  |  |  |
| 1. Are linkages forged and pursued with other programmes on poverty, environment, governance, crisis, HIV/AIDS, gender, vulnerable groups, etc.). |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the programme or project support the mobilization of additional resources for development? |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the intervention enhance and complement the work of other development partners working toward the same outcomes or goals? |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the intervention complement the ongoing efforts of the national counterpart? |  |  |  |
| 1. Can the programme benefit and establish synergies from on-going or planned activities for the preparation of national or sub-national human development reports? |  |  |  |

| **QUESTIONS** | **YES** | **NO** | **COMMENTS** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **PROCESS CONSIDERATIONS** |  |  |  |
| ***A. BUILDING ON LESSONS LEARNED & KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT*** |  |  |  |
| 1. Has the relevant experiences of other development institutions within and outside the programme country taken into account in design and implementation? |  |  |  |
| 1. Are findings, recommendations and lessons from relevant evaluations (including those commissioned by government agencies, CSOs, research institutions, donors and other UN agencies) reflected in the programme or project design? |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the project/programme include a mechanism for identifying, documenting and sharing best practice and lessons learned? |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the project/programme takes into consideration relevant analysis and recommendations published in national (or regional and sub-national) human development reports? |  |  |  |
| ***B. STAKEHOLDER PARTICIPATION AND PARTNERSHIP-BUILDING*** |  |  |  |
| 1. Have all the relevant stakeholders been identified, including government and civil society organizations, women’s groups, local communities, vulnerable groups (defined by rural-urban and geographic location, ethnicity, religion, age, physical and mental ability, etc.), other beneficiaries, donors and private sector? |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the programme/project ensure continued participation by all relevant stakeholders, including marginalized groups? |  |  |  |
| 1. Did the main stakeholders of the programme or project participate in the identification and design stages? |  |  |  |
| 1. Have the programme/project considered and factored in the different positions and needs of the different stakeholders in the design? |  |  |  |
| ***C. NATIONAL OWNERSHIP*** |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the programme or project contribute to national ownership and government leadership in the country’s development? |  |  |  |
| 1. Are programme or project partners exercising leadership over the program or project? |  |  |  |
| 1. Are the programme or project outcomes relevant to United Nations conference agreements and to the goals of the global and regional conventions to which the country is a signatory? |  |  |  |
| ***D. DEVELOPMENT EFFECTIVENESS*** |  |  |  |
| 1. Is the programme or project reported to the Ministry of Finance/Treasury so it can be recorded in the country budget? |  |  |  |
| 1. Have efforts been made to strengthen national capacities and avoid the establishment of parallel Project Implementation Units (PIUs)? |  |  |  |
| 1. Is the program or project part of a programme-based approach with other UN agencies, Bretton Woods Institutions and/or bilateral donors? |  |  |  |
| 1. Have there been joint analytic work, joint missions or other actions in the formulation of the programme or project? |  |  |  |
| 1. Are the country programme or project outcomes fully aligned to the national priorities identified in a national development plan, sector plan or a similar document? |  |  |  |
| 1. Is the project/programme linked to national coordination and monitoring mechanisms to review progress and dialogue on results?? |  |  |  |
| 1. Does this project or programme use the results, targets and indicators defined in a national M&E plan? |  |  |  |
| 1. Do you undertake M&E of this project or programme as part of monitoring of the national M&E plan? |  |  |  |
| 1. Do you use the national forms for reporting on this programme or project? |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **CROSS-CUTTING AREAS** |  |  |  |
| 1. ***CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT AS THE OVERARCHING CONTRIBUTION OF UNDP*** |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the intervention contribute to capacity development, by which individuals, groups, organizations, and communities develop their abilities to perform functions, solve problems, and set and achieve outcomes? |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the programme or project provide opportunities for UNDP to work closely with the UN Development system and other partners to support capacity development efforts through: (a) stakeholder engagement, (b) capacity assessments, (c) formulation of capacity development responses, (d) implementation of capacity development response, and (d) evaluation of capacity development? See the following resources: [A Systemic Capacity Assessment Tool ; Capacity Assessment Practice Note ; Capacity Development Practice Note](http://www.undp.org/capacity/) at <http://www.undp.org/capacity/> |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the programme or project support the strengthening of national capacity to implement a human rights-based approach to national development programmes and policies? |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the intervention engage with national systems and improve the performance of (existing) national processes? |  |  |  |
| 1. Have the different dimensions of capacity at the enabling environment, organizational and individual levels been examined in defining the most promising operational strategy? |  |  |  |
| 1. Is the choice of implementation modality adequately justified in terms of capacity of the national agencies and/or CO concerned? |  |  |  |
| 1. Have programme or project management capacities been reviewed, and can capacity development measures for management be improved? |  |  |  |
| 1. Do elements crucial to ensuring the sustainability of the programme or project results exist, for example:   Enabling policies;   * 1. Exit strategies;   2. Financial support and mechanisms;   3. Individual and institutional capacities to carry on;   4. Sustainable resource management. |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the programme or project document build national capacity in one or more of UNDP’s practice areas? |  |  |  |
| 1. Is national capacity to manage, monitor and evaluate being built? (Cross refer to M&E section) |  |  |  |
| 1. ***GENDER EQUALITY AND EMPOWERMENT OF WOMEN*** |  |  |  |
| 1. Has the project/programme included gender analysis in its design, implementation and management? |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the programme or project include specific, measurable outcomes, outputs, activities and indicators related to gender equality and women’s empowerment? |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the project/programme include age and sex-disaggregated data and gender statistics for the programme/project development and implementation? |  |  |  |
| 1. Has the project/programme facilitated participatory processes that involve women equitably, and include their needs and contributions in all the steps of the programme and/or project cycle? |  |  |  |
| 1. Have gender experts been involved in all the steps of programme/or project cycle? |  |  |  |
| 1. Have all the projects been rated with the Gender Marker? |  |  |  |
| 1. Has a proportion of core and non-core funds allocated to gender equality and/or the empowerment women been clearly indicated? |  |  |  |
| 1. Have all possible steps been taken to ensure gender parity in the recruitment of project staff, consultants and/or vendors? |  |  |  |
| 1. ***SOUTH-SOUTH COOPERATION*** |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the programme or project support South-South cooperation – i.e. in making a valuable contribution to development progress and partnerships across regions? |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| * 1. **CONSIDERATIONS TO TAKE INTO ACCOUNT AS RELEVANT TO THE FOCUS AREA(S) OF THE PROGRAMME/PROJECT AND TO ENSURE INTEGRATED SOLUTIONS TO DEVELOPMENT CHALLENGES** |  |  |  |
| **POVERTY REDUCTION AND THE ACHIEVEMENT OF THE MDGs** |  |  |  |
| 1. Is UNDP’s poverty reduction focus reflected in the programme or project? Have the poor been identified? |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the programme or project contribute to poverty reduction, and at a minimum, not make poor women and men worse off than before? |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the programme or project address the multidimensional nature of poverty at one or more levels: (i) macro-economic policy; (ii) institutional change; (iii) micro-level interventions? |  |  |  |
| 1. Will the intervention create an enabling environment for pro-poor economic growth? |  |  |  |
| 1. Are employment opportunities and jobs being created for women and men? |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the programme or project build on the assets and strengths of the target population and contribute to strengthening their livelihoods through access to productive assets? |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the programme or project address links between HIV/AIDS and poverty, and HIV and other MDGs? Does it take account of differentiated impacts of the epidemic by gender or population group? |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the programme or project take account of factors that may influence susceptibility to HIV of beneficiaries or other population groups? |  |  |  |
| 1. How are the most vulnerable groups being considered? What difference will the UNDP intervention make with and for vulnerable groups by end of programme/project period? |  |  |  |
| **DEMOCRATIC GOVERNANCE** |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the programme or project improve democratic governance in the country? |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the programme or project take into account the policy environment and interrelationships between the institutions of Government, civil society and the private sector that underpin sustainability and achievement of outcomes? |  |  |  |
| 1. Are governing institutions being strengthened for people-centered development – i.e. to better serve the needs of poor women and men? |  |  |  |
| 1. Is decentralization being promoted to support local governance and to empower communities and local institutions? |  |  |  |
| 1. Is an efficient and accountable public sector that serves all citizens being promoted? |  |  |  |
| **CRISIS PREVENTION AND RECOVERY** |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the programme or project have a crisis prevention and recovery component? |  |  |  |
| 1. If so, does the programme or project emphasize gender empowerment throughout its activities? |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the programme or project include the establishment of norms and guidelines; provision of assessment and programming tools to support country level recovery processes; and advocacy support to boost funding for recovery efforts: |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the programme or project include the establishment of norms and guidelines for recovery; provision of assessment and programming tools to support country level recovery processes; and advocacy support to boost funding for recovery efforts? |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the programme or project support the implementation of disaster risk reduction, outlined in the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA), 2005-2015 on behalf of the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (ISDR) system? |  |  |  |
| **ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT** |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the programme or project build on an adequate understanding of the relevant baseline biophysical dimensions, ecosystems conditions, and other environment-related issues in the programme or project area? |  |  |  |
| 1. Is the management of land, forest, water, and biological resources being improved in ways that ensure their protection and sustainable use? |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the programme or project improve the physical, social and economic access to food, water, ecosystem and energy services by impoverished women and men in rural and urban areas? |  |  |  |
| 1. Have appropriate environment management guidelines and standards been applied and is the proposed intervention environmentally sustainable? |  |  |  |
| 1. Are environmental cost and benefits considered? |  |  |  |
| 1. What existing green or sustainable best practices are available, relevant and appropriate to the proposed project? |  |  |  |
| 1. If the project poses potential adverse impacts and risks to the environment, have reasonable alternatives to the project (or to its riskier components) been considered? If not, have measures to avoid, minimize or mitigate the anticipated environmental impacts and manage environmental risks of the project been specified? (refer to [Guidance Note for Environmental Screening and EIA)](http://content.undp.org/go/prescriptive/Project-Management---Prescriptive-Content-Documents/download/?d_id=1873106) |  |  |  |
| 1. How can environment related opportunities and capacities of implementing partners, beneficiaries, local communities and other project stakeholders be strengthened through the proposed project? |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the programme or project target areas or sectors currently affected by climatic variability, or which could be affected by future changes in climatic conditions? Are elements of the programme or project likely to amplify the adverse impacts of climate change on key resources? Is climate change associated with any potentially beneficial changes that might be exploited to deliver developmental benefits? What changes do stakeholders believe would reduce their vulnerability to climate change related hazards and increase their capacity to adapt? (refer to [UNDP Quality Standards for the Integration of Adaptation to Climate Change into Development Planning](http://unfccc.int/5467) and/or [Stocktaking of Tools and Guidelines to Mainstream Climate Change Adaptation](http://content.undp.org/go/cms-service/download/publication/?version=live&id=2386693)) |  |  |  |
| 1. Is the programme or project producing or expected to produce significant quantities of greenhouse gases (GHGs)? Are there technically feasible and cost-effective options to reduce or offset project-related GHG emissions? |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS** |  |  |  |
| ***RBM-Feasibility and Technical Soundness:*** |  |  |  |
| 1. Is there a clear logical relationship between inputs, outputs, and outcomes? |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the programme or project build on correct assumptions? |  |  |  |
| 1. Are there clear logical linkages with the UNDAF results framework and is UNDP’s contribution clear? |  |  |  |
| 1. Are the outcomes clear, precise and measurable? |  |  |  |
| 1. Are indicators SMART? In particular, are means of verification identified? |  |  |  |
| 1. Are baseline data available to allow monitoring of progress and results? |  |  |  |
| 1. Have risks and other external factors been properly identified, including the potential for economic crisis, natural disasters, conflict, civil strife and threats such as HIV/AIDS? |  |  |  |
| 1. Have necessary safeguards been incorporated into the design? If so, have the necessary safeguards been incorporated into the design to address these risks and concerns? |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the intervention allow adequate flexibility for redefinition and improvement of programme or project components or strategy to respond to complex and changing realities? |  |  |  |
| ***Accountability:*** |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the programme or project include clearly defined accountabilities for the management of resources and results? |  |  |  |
| ***Audit:*** |  |  |  |
| 1. Are relevant findings, observations, recommendations and lessons from audits (including those commissioned by government agencies, donors and other UN agencies on UNDP assistance) reflected in the programme or project design? (This can come in all three sections). |  |  |  |
| 1. Has a macro assessment under HACT been carried out? (For CPD/CPAP) |  |  |  |
| 1. Has a micro assessment of the Implementing Partner been carried out in accordance with HACT? (For projects) |  |  |  |
| ***Risk Management:*** |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the programme or project use Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) to proactively and systematically identify, mitigate and, if necessary, escalate risks? |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the programme or project provide for security risk management, including an effective and timely security response mechanism for emergencies? |  |  |  |
| ***Resources and Inputs:*** |  |  |  |
| 1. Do the envisaged benefits justify the resources to be spent? |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the budget adequately cover the envisaged activities and are the respective inputs by the Government, UNDP and other partners defined? |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the programme or project document raise any corporate policy issues? |  |  |  |
| 1. If the programme or project is to be partly or wholly funded by a contribution from the private sector, have adequate steps been taken to ensure that the association of UNDP with the private entity will be legal and beneficial? |  |  |  |
| 1. Have the procedures for financial management and reporting been described in the programme or project document? |  |  |  |
| 1. Does the project have a large procurement component? If so, does the project include sufficient measures to develop national procurement capacities to enable national authorities to take over this responsibility from UNDP? |  |  |  |
| **MONITORING, EVALUATION (M&E) AND REPORTING** |  |  |  |
| 1. Is it clear who is responsible for achieving the different results? |  |  |  |
| 1. Are there sound plans and mechanisms for monitoring that ensure timely collection of reliable data and enhance readiness for evaluation? |  |  |  |
| 1. Are the roles and responsibilities in M&E clearly defined and understood among all relevant stakeholders? |  |  |  |
| 1. Is national capacity to manage, monitor and evaluate being built? (cross-refer to Capacity Development) |  |  |  |
| 1. Is it clear how M&E activities are going to be financed? Have adequate human and financial resources for M&E been allocated? |  |  |  |
| **MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS** |  |  |  |
| 1. How effective are the proposed management arrangements? |  |  |  |
| 1. Is the choice of implementing modality adequately justified in terms of capacity of the national agencies and/or CO concerned? *Cross-reference to question # 2 under Development Effectiveness* |  |  |  |
| 1. If national institutions or NGOs are designated as implementing partners or responsible party without competitive bidding, has the justification for waiving competitive bidding been documented? |  |  |  |
| 1. If a management support unit is to be set up, has adequate justification and an exit strategy been provided? |  |  |  |
| 1. Has its cost-effectiveness as well as its impact on sustainability and capacity development been documented? |  |  |  |
| 1. Where country office support is proposed, have cost-effectiveness, capacity development measures and an exit strategy been documented? |  |  |  |
| 1. Are the implementation arrangements adequate and prior obligations and respective responsibilities, roles and relations between funding, implementing and executing agencies clearly defined? |  |  |  |
| 1. Have reporting guidelines/ requirements been clearly articulated? |  |  |  |

1. It is recommended that projects use output indicators from the Strategic Plan, as relevant, in addition to project-specific results indicators [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Optional, if needed [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. 1. Sustainable development pathways; 2. Inclusive and effective democratic governance; 3. Resilience building [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. sustainable production technologies, access to modern energy services and energy efficiency, natural resources management, extractive industries, urbanization, citizen security, social protection, and risk management for resilience [↑](#footnote-ref-4)