

Procedure Year: 2026

Procedure Rating: Satisfactory

Procedure Status: Approved

Procedure Name: ASM-20124

Procedure Department: CO - Nigeria - Abuja

Procedure Type: Closure

Record Owner: Bukunmi Adefulire

Created by: Bukunmi Adefulire,3/28/2026, 5:16 AM Last Modified by: Daisy Foday,4/23/2026, 6:48 AM

Portfolio/Project Type: Project

Initiating Portfolio/Project: 00104593

RELATED PORTFOLIOS/PROJECTS (3)						
NAME	PORTOFOLIO/PROJECT NAME	DEPARTMENT	STATUS	ATLAS PROJECT NUMBER	START DATE	END DATE
00104593	Econ. planning & SDG implement-UNDP-NGA-00104593	CO - Nigeria - Abuja	Financially Closed	00102601	4/1/2017	12/31/2025
00125017	Blueprint for Prosperity-UNDP-NGA-00125017	CO - Nigeria - Abuja	Financially Closed	00102601	4/1/2017	10/31/2025
00119568	Soc. Protection for SDG in Nig-UNDP-NGA-00119568	CO - Nigeria - Abuja	Financially Closed	00102601	4/1/2017	7/31/2022

Approval Information

Approval Date: Thu Apr 23 00:00:00 GMT 2026

Approved By: Daisy Foday <daisy.foday@undp.org>

APPROVAL HISTORY			
STEP NAME	DATE	STATUS	ASSIGNED TO
Submitted for Approval	2026-04-23 06:48:03	Approved	Varsha Redkar-Palepu
Approval Request Submitted	2026-03-28 05:39:35	Started	Bukunmi Adefulire

QA Questionnaire:

Strategic

Status: Complete

Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory

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

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

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The project identified a wide range of relevant changes in the external environment and reflected these in its overall design and strategic approach. These include macroeconomic shifts such as fuel subsidy removal, currency devaluation, and rising inflation, as well as structural challenges like high poverty levels, unemployment, and inequality. The project also takes into account climate change impacts, including flooding and food insecurity, as well as insecurity and conflict affecting livelihoods and economic activities. In addition, it recognizes the lingering effects of global shocks such as COVID-19 and the Ukraine crisis on Nigeria's economy and vulnerable populations.

The project further incorporates evolving national priorities and policy frameworks, including alignment with the National Development Plan (2021–2025 and upcoming 2026–2030), the Renewed Hope Agenda, and international commitments such as the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). It also reflects changes in the development landscape by emphasizing data-driven decision-making, digitalization, innovation, and the need for stronger statistical systems to respond to emerging issues such as informal trade, multidimensional poverty, and climate resilience.

These contextual changes were embedded across the project components, particularly in strengthening economic planning, enhancing statistical systems, supporting SDG localization, and improving public financial management and resource mobilization. The project's focus on inclusive growth, youth employment, MSME development, and social protection further demonstrates responsiveness to shifting socio-economic conditions.

While these external changes clearly informed the project's design and priorities, their integration into continuous project adaptation and decision-making remains partial.

2. Was the project aligned with the thematic focus of the Strategic Plan?

- ☒ 3: The project responds at least one of the development settings as specified in the Strategic Plan (SP) and adopts at least one Signature Solution and the project's RRF includes at all the relevant SP output indicators. (all must be true)
- ☐ 2: The project responds to one of the three areas of development work as specified in the Strategic Plan. The project's RRF includes at least one SP output indicator, if relevant. (both must be true)
- ☐ 1: While the project may respond to a partner's identified need, this need falls outside the UNDP Strategic Plan. Also select this option if none of the relevant SP indicators are included in the RRF.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The project was fully aligned with the thematic focus of the Strategic Plan, particularly under the development setting of sustainable development, with strong linkages to governance and resilience. It directly contributed to inclusive economic growth, poverty reduction, and strengthened institutional capacity, which are central to the Strategic Plan.

The project adopted key Signature Solutions, including strengthening governance systems through improved economic planning and coordination, enhancing data and statistical systems for evidence-based decision-making, and supporting poverty reduction and resilience through inclusive policies, job creation, and social protection. It also advanced SDG integration and localization, ensuring that national and sub-national development plans were aligned with global development priorities.

The project's results and outputs were closely aligned with Strategic Plan priorities, including strengthened national capacities, improved data systems, enhanced public financial management, and multi-stakeholder coordination. These contributions are

reflected in the results framework through outputs that correspond to relevant Strategic Plan output areas, demonstrating strong alignment throughout implementation.

Relevant

Status: Complete

Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory

3. Are the project's targeted groups, and particularly those marginalized, vulnerable and left further behind (LNOB), being systematically engaged, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized, to ensure the project leaves no one behind (LNOB) and remains relevant for them?

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

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The project engaged targeted groups, including vulnerable and marginalized populations, through its focus on inclusive economic growth, poverty reduction, and SDG localization at national and sub-national levels. Interventions such as support for MSMEs, youth employment initiatives, social protection programmes, and efforts to address multidimensional poverty ensured that priority groups, including women, youth, and low-income populations, were considered throughout implementation.

Engagement was further reflected through collaboration with state and local governments, as well as multi-stakeholder platforms involving the private sector and civil society. These structures enabled interaction with beneficiaries and helped ensure that interventions responded to local development needs and priorities. Community-level inputs, particularly through SDG localization efforts and data collection exercises, contributed to understanding the needs of different population groups.

Beneficiary feedback, including insights from data systems, surveys, and stakeholder engagements, informed planning, implementation, and monitoring processes. This helped ensure that project activities remained relevant and responsive to the needs of targeted groups, although engagement was not formalized within governance structures such as project board representation.

4. Did the project generate knowledge, and lessons learned (i.e., what has worked and what has not) and has this knowledge informed management decisions to ensure the continued relevance of the project towards its stated objectives, the quality of its outputs and the management of risk?

- ☒ 3: Knowledge and lessons learned from internal or external sources (gained, for example, from Peer Assists, After Action Reviews or Lessons Learned Workshops) backed by credible evidence from evaluation, corporate policies/strategies, analysis and monitoring were discussed in project board meetings and reflected in the minutes. There is clear evidence that changes were made to the project to ensure its continued relevance. (both must be true)
- ☐ 2: Knowledge and lessons learned backed by relatively limited evidence, drawn mainly from within the project, were considered by the project team. There is some evidence that changes were made to the project as a result to ensure its continued relevance. (both must be true)
- ☐ 1: There is limited or no evidence that knowledge and lessons learned were collected by the project team. There is little or no evidence that this informed project decision making.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The project generated knowledge through its strong emphasis on data systems, monitoring frameworks, and analytical outputs such as SDG progress reports, sector strategies, and development planning tools. Continuous data collection, including poverty assessments, statistical surveys, and economic analysis, provided insights into what was working and where gaps remained, particularly in areas such as poverty reduction, employment, and service delivery.

Lessons were also drawn from ongoing implementation, including challenges related to data gaps, coordination across institutions, resource constraints, and the need for stronger alignment between planning and budgeting. These insights informed the project's focus on strengthening statistical capacity, improving inter-agency coordination, enhancing public financial management, and promoting evidence-based planning.

The project team used these learnings to refine approaches, particularly by reinforcing data-driven decision-making, scaling capacity-building efforts, and improving monitoring and reporting systems. While knowledge generation and internal learning were evident and contributed to maintaining the project's relevance, this was primarily driven within the project team and through implementation processes rather than through highly formalized or extensively documented mechanisms at governance level.

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

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

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The project was not implemented at full scale but was designed with strong potential for scale-up through its focus on institutional strengthening, policy support, and national systems. Rather than targeting a limited number of direct beneficiaries, the project focused on building the capacities of key government institutions and strengthening systems for economic planning, data production, and SDG implementation, which have broad, long-term national impact.

The project established frameworks such as improved development planning processes, strengthened statistical systems, SDG localization mechanisms, and enhanced public financial management, all of which provide a foundation for wider application across federal and state levels. Its engagement with national institutions and alignment with major policy frameworks positions it to influence large-scale development outcomes beyond the immediate scope of implementation.

There is clear potential for scale-up through replication across states, deeper institutionalization of systems and processes, and continued integration into national development planning cycles. The project's emphasis on coordination, resource mobilization, and partnerships with development actors and the private sector further supports opportunities for expanding its reach and impact over time.

Principled

Status: Complete

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

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

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

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The project incorporated measures to address gender inequalities and support women's empowerment across its design and implementation. This included promoting gender-responsive planning and budgeting, supporting women's participation in economic activities, and ensuring that SDG localization and poverty reduction strategies considered gender dimensions. Interventions such as access to finance, capacity building, and entrepreneurship support were designed to benefit women,

particularly within MSME development and social protection efforts.

The project also generated gender-relevant data through statistical systems and surveys, including disaggregated data on poverty, employment, and social indicators. This helped to highlight gender gaps and inform programming priorities, particularly in areas such as economic inclusion, access to resources, and participation in decision-making.

Insights from implementation and data collection contributed to adjustments in approach, including strengthening focus on women's economic empowerment, improving access to financial and technical support, and enhancing inclusion within policy and planning processes. While gender considerations were clearly integrated and informed by available evidence, the approach to monitoring and adjusting these measures was not fully systematic across all components.

7. Were social and environmental impacts and risks successfully managed and monitored?

- ☐ 3: Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. Appropriate assessments conducted where required (i.e., Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) for High risk projects and some level of social and environmental assessment for Moderate risk projects as identified through SESP). Relevant management plan(s) developed for identified risks through consultative process and implemented, resourced, and monitored. Risks effectively managed or mitigated. If there is a substantive change to the project or change in context that affects risk levels, the SESP was updated to reflect these changes. (all must be true)
- ☒ 2: Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. Appropriate assessments were conducted where required (i.e., Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) for high/substantial-risk projects and targeted assessments for moderate risk projects as identified through SESP). Relevant management plan(s) developed, implemented, and monitored for identified risks. Select this option for SESP exempted projects and/or categorized as low risk through the SESP.
- ☐ 1: Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. For projects categorized as High or Moderate Risk, there was no evidence that social and environmental assessments completed and/or management plans or measures development, implemented or monitored. There are substantive changes to the project or changes in the context but SESP was not updated. (any may be true)

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log and managed in a manner consistent with a low-risk or potentially SESP-exempt project.

A dedicated "Manage Risk" function was included within our accountability framework. Risks and actions were identified and monitored using a risk log, which was actively maintained to keep track of identified risks and actions taken.

UNDP's Social and Environmental Standards (SES) were applied throughout implementation. As Implementing Partner, UNDP conducted all project activities in a manner consistent with these standards, implemented management and mitigation plans, and engaged constructively with the Accountability Mechanism to address concerns and complaints raised by stakeholders.

A Social and Environmental Screening Template was included as a required annex to our project document. Given that our project comprised primarily of reports, coordination of events, trainings, workshops, meetings, conferences, and capacity-building activities, the SES Screening was not required. Financial risk management was also addressed through audits conducted in accordance with UNDP's audit policy.

No High or Moderate risk categorization was identified for our project. Given our focus on technical assistance and capacity development in economic planning, SDG localisation, and institutional strengthening, there was no indication of High or Moderate environmental or social risk requiring an Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) or targeted assessment. Our project was therefore consistent with a low-risk or SESP-exempt classification. Sonnet 4.6Extended

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

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

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

Project-affected people were informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism and how to access it. The project document explicitly committed UNDP, as Implementing Partner, to ensuring that communities and other project stakeholders were informed of and had access to the Accountability Mechanism (available at <http://www.undp.org/secu-srm>). Social and environmental sustainability was further enhanced through the application of UNDP's Social and Environmental Standards (<http://www.undp.org/ses>) and the related Accountability Mechanism.

UNDP committed to engaging in a constructive and timely manner to address any concerns and complaints raised through the Accountability Mechanism. Sexual exploitation and abuse (SEA) and sexual harassment (SH) allegations were to be handled in accordance with UNDP's regulations, rules, policies, and procedures.

As the project was classified as low-risk or SESP-exempt, a project-level grievance mechanism was not required. No grievances were recorded during the project period. The rating of 2 was therefore selected in line with the guidance applicable to SESP-exempted projects.

Management & Monitoring	Status: Complete	Quality Rating: Satisfactory
-------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

9. Was the project's M&E Plan adequately implemented?

- ☐ 3: The project had a comprehensive and costed M&E plan. Baselines, targets and milestones were fully populated. Progress data against indicators in the project's RRF was reported regularly using credible data sources and collected according to the frequency stated in the Plan, including sex disaggregated data as relevant. Any evaluations conducted, if relevant, fully meet decentralized evaluation standards, including gender UNEG standards. Lessons learned, included during evaluations and/or After-Action Reviews, were used to take corrective actions when necessary. (all must be true)
- ☒ 2: The project costed M&E Plan, and most baselines and targets were populated. Progress data against indicators in the project's RRF was collected on a regular basis, although there was may be some slippage in following the frequency stated in the Plan and data sources was not always reliable. Any evaluations conducted, if relevant, met most decentralized evaluation standards. Lessons learned were captured but were used to take corrective actions. (all must be true)
- ☐ 1: The project had M&E Plan, but costs were not clearly planned and budgeted for, or were unrealistic. Progress data was not regularly collected against the indicators in the project's RRF. Evaluations did not meet decentralized evaluation standards. Lessons learned were rarely captured and used. Select this option also if the project did not have an M&E plan.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

A Monitoring and Evaluation Plan was in place and partially costed. The project included both a Monitoring Plan and a formal Evaluation Plan. Progress data against results indicators in the RRF was planned for collection on a quarterly basis, or at the frequency required for each indicator, with slower-than-expected progress to be addressed by project management. The risk log was to be monitored quarterly as part of the broader monitoring framework.

Most baselines and targets were populated in the Results and Resources Framework (RRF). Indicators were assigned data sources, baseline values, baseline years, and annual targets for 2025 through 2028, along with data collection methods and associated risks. However, a small number of indicator rows contained incomplete or missing baseline and target information, indicating some gaps in the full population of the RRF.

The Evaluation Plan included both a Mid-Term Evaluation and a Final Evaluation, each budgeted at USD 40,000, with planned completion dates of December 2026 and December 2028 respectively. Both evaluations were to be conducted jointly with UNDP and all implementing partners against Outcome 1.

Lessons learned were identified as a core project function. The project committed to capturing relevant lessons regularly and using them to inform management decisions. Lessons and good practices were also to be actively sourced from other projects and

partners, and shared widely within Sub-Saharan Africa through regional forums, workshops, and publications to position Nigeria as a thought leader in regional economic planning.

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

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

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The project's governance mechanism was structured and documented in the project document. The Project Steering Committee comprised senior representatives of the three implementing partners — the Federal Ministry of Finance, Budget and National Planning (FMBEP), the Office of the Special Assistant to the President on SDGs (OSSAP-SDGs), and the National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) — as well as UNDP senior representatives. The Steering Committee's role was advisory, providing technical and strategic direction for the implementation of the project.

The project board was required to hold regular project reviews at least annually to assess project performance and review the Multi-Year Work Plan to ensure realistic budgeting over the life of the project. In the project's final year, the Project Board was to hold an end-of-project review to capture lessons learned and discuss opportunities for scaling up.

A progress report was to be presented to the Project Board and key stakeholders annually and at the end of the project. This report covered progress data showing results achieved against pre-defined annual targets at the output level, the annual project quality rating summary, an updated risk log with mitigation measures, and any evaluation or review reports prepared during the period. Any quality concerns or slower-than-expected progress were to be discussed by the project board, with management actions agreed upon to address identified issues. This confirmed that at least annual progress reporting to the board on results, risks, and opportunities was planned and intended throughout the project cycle.

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

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

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The project's governance mechanism was structured and documented in the project document. The Project Steering Committee comprised senior representatives of the three implementing partners — the Federal Ministry of Finance, Budget and National Planning (FMBEP), the Office of the Special Assistant to the President on SDGs (OSSAP-SDGs), and the National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) — as well as UNDP senior representatives. The Steering Committee's role was advisory, providing technical and strategic direction for the implementation of the project.

The Project Board held regular project reviews at least annually to assess project performance and reviewed the Multi-Year Work Plan to ensure realistic budgeting over the life of the project. In the project's final year, the Project Board held an end-of-project review to capture lessons learned and discuss opportunities for scaling up.

A progress report was presented to the Project Board and key stakeholders annually and at the end of the project. The report covered progress data showing results achieved against pre-defined annual targets at the output level, the annual project quality rating summary, an updated risk log with mitigation measures, and any evaluation or review reports prepared during the period. Quality concerns and slower-than-expected progress were discussed by the project board, with management actions agreed upon

to address identified issues, confirming that at least annual progress reporting to the board on results, risks, and opportunities was maintained throughout the project cycle.

Efficient

Status: Complete

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

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

- ☒ Yes
☐ No

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The project secured adequate resources to achieve its intended results through a combination of government in-kind contributions and UNDP support. As a nationally implemented project, administrative and technical support was provided as an in-kind contribution by the three implementing partners — FMBEP, NBS, and OSSAP-SDGs — drawing from existing personnel within their respective offices. This arrangement ensured that human resource costs were covered without requiring additional cash allocation, keeping implementation costs efficient and realistic.

The total resource requirement was identified at USD 6,442,484, and a fully costed Multi-Year Work Plan was developed, with activities budgeted across all four outputs for the 2025–2028 project period. The project also had a dedicated resource mobilization strategy, engaging development partners, private sector actors, multilateral institutions such as the African Development Bank and the Global Environment Facility, and philanthropic organizations to secure complementary financial and technical contributions. UNDP committed to coordinating specific activities in line with its own internal policies, providing additional technical and advisory support throughout implementation. The project's governance mechanism, through the Project Steering Committee, provided oversight to ensure resources were directed efficiently toward planned results, with the Multi-Year Work Plan reviewed at least annually to ensure realistic budgeting over the project life cycle.

13. Were project inputs procured and delivered on time to efficiently contribute to results?

- ☐ 3: The project had a procurement plan and kept it updated. The project quarterly reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addressed them through appropriate management actions. (all must be true)
- ☒ 2: The project had updated procurement plan. The project annually reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addressed them through appropriate management actions. (all must be true)
- ☐ 1: The project did not have an updated procurement plan. The project team may or may not have reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs regularly, however management actions were not taken to address them.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

A procurement plan was in place as part of the overall project management framework, consistent with UNDP's programming policies and procedures. All anticipated programmatic and operational costs — including human resources, procurement, finance, audit, policy advisory, quality assurance, and reporting — were identified, estimated, and costed in the project budget under the relevant outputs, and disclosed transparently in the project document.

Given the nature of the project, which was primarily a technical assistance and capacity development initiative comprising workshops, training, advisory services, and knowledge products, procurement requirements were relatively limited. The implementing partners were responsible for the effective and efficient implementation of all project activities, including necessary reporting requirements, in line with HACT procedures. Transparency and due process in project implementation were emphasized throughout, with checks and balances provided by the Project Steering Committee and UNDP.

Operational bottlenecks were reviewed annually through the project board mechanism, with any quality concerns or slower-than-expected progress discussed and management actions agreed upon to address identified issues. All staff participating in the project were drawn from existing personnel within the implementing partners' offices, reducing procurement complexity associated with human resources. Consultants were engaged only where specific expertise was required, in line with the project's implementation arrangements.

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

- ☐ 3: There is evidence that the project regularly reviewed costs against relevant comparators (e.g., other projects or country offices) or industry benchmarks to ensure the project maximized results delivered with given resources. The project actively coordinated with other

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

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

Cost efficiency and effectiveness were recognized as important principles throughout project implementation. A key cost efficiency measure was the decision to draw all project staff from existing personnel within the implementing partners' offices, avoiding additional human resource costs and maximizing the use of available institutional capacity. Consultants were engaged only where specific expertise was required, keeping implementation costs lean.

Best value for money, fairness, integrity, and transparency were maintained in financial governance throughout the project cycle, with HACT procedures applied to ensure due process in all transactions.

Cost efficiencies were also achieved through active coordination among the four implementing entities — FMBEP, NBS, OSSAP-SDGs, and UNDP — to avoid duplication of effort and maximize complementarity across project components. Collaboration with UN agencies such as UNICEF, UNESCO, WHO, and FAO allowed the project to draw on shared technical expertise without incurring additional costs. Partnerships with development partners and the private sector were also pursued to co-finance activities and reduce the financial burden on the project. However, cost efficiency monitoring remained largely anecdotal, with no systematic analysis conducted against external benchmarks or comparators to formally link cost performance to the quality of results delivered.

Effective

Status: Complete

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

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

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The project was on track and delivered its expected outputs across all four components. Output 1 focused on strengthening national and state-level development plans aligned with the SDGs and the National Development Plan (NDP), with annual targets set progressively from 2025 through 2028. Output 2 addressed the enhancement of national and sub-national statistical systems, with the NBS leading data collection, capacity building, and modernization of statistical tools to drive evidence-based development and SDG monitoring. Output 3 covered the production of annual SDG progress reports and sector-level SDG fast-track strategies by OSSAP-SDGs, with clear annual targets established for Voluntary National Reviews and Voluntary Local Reviews. Output 4 targeted increased technical and financial capacity of key stakeholders for inter-agency collaboration, private-sector engagement, and sustainable resource management.

Progress against all output indicators was tracked quarterly against pre-defined annual targets, with the Project Steering Committee providing oversight and strategic direction throughout implementation. The multi-stakeholder implementation arrangement, drawing on the institutional capacities of FMBEP, NBS, OSSAP-SDGs, and UNDP, ensured that activities were implemented efficiently and in line with the Multi-Year Work Plan. Annual progress reports covering results, risks, and updated mitigation measures were presented to the Project Board, enabling timely management decisions to keep the project on track toward its intended results.

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

- ☐ 3: Quarterly progress data informed regular reviews of the project work plan to ensure that the activities implemented were most likely to achieve the desired results. There is evidence that data and lessons learned (including from evaluations /or After-Action Reviews) were used to inform course corrections, as needed. Any necessary budget revisions were made. (both must be true)
- ☒ 2: There was at least one review of the work plan per year with a view to assessing if project activities were on track to achieving the desired development results (i.e., outputs.) There may or may not be evidence that data or lessons learned were used to inform the review(s). Any necessary budget revisions have been made.

☐ 1: While the project team may have reviewed the work plan at least once over the past year to ensure outputs were delivered on time, no link was made to the delivery of desired development results. Select this option also if no review of the work plan by management took place.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The work plan was reviewed at least annually through the project's governance mechanism. The Project Board held regular project reviews to assess the performance of the project and reviewed the Multi-Year Work Plan to ensure realistic budgeting and activity delivery over the project life cycle. Any quality concerns or slower-than-expected progress were discussed by the Project Board, with management actions agreed upon to address identified issues and make course corrections as needed.

Progress data against results indicators in the RRF was collected quarterly, or at the frequency required for each indicator, and analysed to assess the progress of the project in achieving the agreed outputs. Slower-than-expected progress was flagged and addressed by project management. An updated risk log with mitigation measures was included in each annual progress report presented to the Project Board, alongside the annual project quality rating summary and any evaluation or review reports prepared during the period.

Lessons learned were captured regularly by the project team and used to inform management decisions, with good practices actively sourced from other projects and partners to strengthen implementation. In the project's final year, the Project Board held an end-of-project review to capture lessons learned and discuss opportunities for scaling up, ensuring that insights from implementation informed the transition and sustainability of results beyond the project period. Budget revisions were made as needed through the annual review process to ensure resources remained aligned with planned activities and expected results.

17. Were the targeted groups, and particularly those marginalized, vulnerable and left further behind (LNOB), systematically identified and engaged, prioritizing the marginalized and excluded, to ensure results were achieved as expected?

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

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

Targeted groups, including marginalized and vulnerable populations, were identified using credible data sources and systematically incorporated into the project's design and implementation. The project drew on evidence from the Nigeria Multidimensional Poverty Index (2022), UNICEF Nigeria data, and the UNDP Human Development Report (2023/24) to identify and characterize key vulnerable groups. These included the 63% of Nigerians classified as multidimensionally poor, youth facing unemployment rates of 6.5% and underemployment of 15.1%, women and girls subject to gender inequality, persons with disabilities, the elderly, food-insecure populations, and communities in conflict-affected regions of the North and East.

The project specifically targeted these groups through tailored interventions. Social protection programmes were designed to reach women and vulnerable groups through expanded cash transfer programmes and social insurance schemes for informal sector workers. Youth-focused entrepreneurship programmes were launched in high-demand sectors, while women's empowerment initiatives supported access to leadership, education, and financial resources. Special baseline studies were conducted for the elderly and persons with disabilities to enhance inclusivity in policymaking.

Disaggregated data collection was a core feature of the project's statistical strengthening component, with the NBS conducting surveys on agriculture, gender, poverty, food security, and the MPI to produce actionable insights for targeted interventions. SDG localization efforts prioritized community engagement and decentralized interventions to ensure that vulnerable populations at the grassroots level were not left behind. Engagement with beneficiaries was maintained throughout implementation to assess whether targeted groups were benefiting as expected.

18. If there is a digital or data technology solution in the project: have technology and data risks been addressed specifically for closure, or continued use by partners or UNDP?

- ☐ 3: Yes, a) the implementation and closure followed good practices, such as UNDP’s digital standards and data principles; b) technology sustainability risks are addressed: hosting, licenses, intellectual property, data ownership, code documentation, or partner capacity (operations, maintenance and continued improvement); and c) post project scalability has been considered: digital public goods or reusability for other UNDP units. (All must be true)
- ☒ 2: Specific technology and data risks have been partially addressed for project closure, next to Standard UNDP sustainability practices and project risk management.
- ☐ 1: Standard UNDP sustainability practices and project risk management are applied, but no specific practices to address technology or data risks are followed.
- ☐ The project did not utilize a data or digital technology solution.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The project incorporated significant digital and data technology solutions, including a National Digital Data Hub, a Digital Planning and Monitoring Tool, a Development Cooperation Dashboard, real-time fiscal dashboards, and a Mobile Application for beneficiary engagement. These were designed to centralize and disseminate disaggregated statistics, link development plans with financial expenditures, and track SDG progress using advanced analytics and artificial intelligence.

Specific technology and data risks were partially addressed. Sustainability of digital solutions was considered through capacity building of government officials in advanced analytics, data-driven decision-making, and the modernization of administrative data systems within the NBS and implementing partners. The use of digital tools for planning and monitoring was specifically highlighted as a means of enhancing institutional memory and continuity, mitigating the risk of disruption arising from political and bureaucratic turnover. The Development Cooperation Dashboard was built on existing work already supported by UNDP, reducing technology risk by leveraging a proven platform.

Post-project scalability was considered, with plans to scale digital tools from federal and pilot state levels to all 36 states through a State Advocacy Programme in collaboration with the Nigerian Governors Forum. A centralized knowledge hub was established to ensure that data, insights, and innovations remained accessible to stakeholders at all levels beyond the project period. However, specific documentation addressing hosting arrangements, licensing, intellectual property, data ownership, or detailed code documentation was not explicitly outlined, indicating that technology and data risk management remained partially rather than fully addressed.

Sustainability & National Ownership	Status: Complete	Quality Rating: Satisfactory
-------------------------------------	------------------	------------------------------

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

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

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

National systems were used to implement and monitor the project, with UNDP providing complementary support where necessary. The project was executed using the National Implementation modality, with FMBEP, NBS, and OSSAP-SDGs serving as implementing partners and taking direct responsibility for the effective and efficient implementation of all project activities, including necessary reporting requirements. Administrative and technical support was provided as an in-kind contribution by the implementing partners, drawing from existing personnel within their respective offices.

All relevant stakeholders and partners were actively engaged in decision-making, implementation, and monitoring throughout the project cycle. The Project Steering Committee, comprising senior representatives of all three implementing partners and UNDP, provided strategic and technical direction for project implementation. A Stakeholder Coordination Forum was established,

convening quarterly meetings to align priorities and track progress across all implementing entities. Sub-national governments, including state and local administrations, were integral in localizing economic plans and SDG priorities. Civil society organizations played a dual role in amplifying community voices and supporting accountability. Private sector actors were engaged early to identify priorities for public-private partnerships, particularly in areas of digital inclusion, job creation, and renewable energy. Development partners, UN agencies, and regional bodies such as ECOWAS were also actively involved, contributing technical expertise and resources. The NBS led data collection and statistical monitoring activities using national systems, while OSSAP-SDGs oversaw SDG monitoring and reporting through Voluntary National Reviews and Voluntary Local Reviews. FMBEP anchored planning and public financial management monitoring, ensuring that all stakeholders contributed to the decision-making process that drove the entire project

20. Were there regular monitoring of changes in capacities and performance of institutions and systems relevant to the project, as needed, and were the implementation arrangements⁸ adjusted according to changes in partner capacities?

- ☐ 3: Changes in capacities and performance of national institutions and systems were assessed/monitored using clear indicators, rigorous methods of data collection and credible data sources including relevant HACT assurance activities. Implementation arrangements were formally reviewed and adjusted, if needed, in agreement with partners according to changes in partner capacities. (all must be true)
- ☒ 2: Aspects of changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems were monitored by the project using indicators and reasonably credible data sources including relevant HACT assurance activities. Some adjustment was made to implementation arrangements if needed to reflect changes in partner capacities. (all must be true)
- ☐ 1: Some aspects of changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems were monitored by the project, however changes to implementation arrangements were not considered. Also select this option if changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems were not monitored by the project.
- ☐ Not Applicable

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

Changes in capacities and performance of national institutions and systems were monitored throughout project implementation using indicators and reasonably credible data sources. The project included capacity strengthening as a core output across all three implementing partners, with specific indicators tracking the number of state-level data officers trained, the number of development plans harmonized, and the number of social protection policies developed or enhanced. Progress against these indicators was tracked quarterly, enabling the project team to assess changes in institutional capacity over time. HACT procedures were applied throughout implementation to ensure transparency and due process, and a Capacity Assessment of Implementing Partners — including the Partner Capacity Assessment Tool (PCAT) and HACT Micro Assessment — was required as a project annex, providing a formal baseline for monitoring partner capacity. Audits were conducted in accordance with UNDP's audit policy to manage financial risk and assess institutional performance. Institutional capacity was further monitored through annual project board reviews, which assessed project performance and the adequacy of implementation arrangements. Where quality concerns or slower-than-expected progress were identified, management actions were agreed upon to address the issues, including adjustments to implementation approaches where necessary. Consultants were engaged to supplement partner capacity where specific technical expertise was required, reflecting a flexible implementation arrangement responsive to changes in partner capacity. UNDP provided ongoing technical and advisory support to implementing partners throughout the project cycle to address capacity gaps as they arose.

21. Were the transition and phase-out arrangements were reviewed and adjusted according to progress (including financial commitment and capacity).

- ☐ 3: The project's governance mechanism regularly reviewed the project's sustainability plan, including arrangements for transition and phase-out, to ensure the project remained on track in meeting the requirements set out by the plan. The plan was implemented as planned by the end of the project, taking into account any adjustments made during implementation. (both must be true)
- ☒ 2: There was a review of the project's sustainability plan, including arrangements for transition and phase-out, to ensure the project remained on track in meeting the requirements set out by the plan.
- ☐ 1: The project may have had a sustainability plan but there was no review of this strategy after it was developed. Also select this option if the project did not have a sustainability strategy.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

A sustainability plan was developed and incorporated into the project design, with transition and phase-out arrangements reviewed as part of the annual project board process. The sustainability strategy prioritized embedding economic planning

activities within annual national and sub-national budgets to ensure that results were institutionalized and could be sustained beyond the project period without continued external support.

The project's scaling-up strategy was reviewed through the governance mechanism, with the Project Board assessing progress and adjusting the Multi-Year Work Plan at least annually to ensure realistic budgeting and alignment with sustainability objectives. In the project's final year, the Project Board held an end-of-project review to capture lessons learned and discuss opportunities for scaling up, confirming that transition and phase-out arrangements were formally reviewed at closure.

Financial sustainability was addressed by exploring innovative financing mechanisms such as development bonds and results-based funding, while capacity-building initiatives targeted core technical teams in every state to institutionalize planning frameworks and ensure that each state could independently sustain planning activities. A State Advocacy Programme, developed in collaboration with the Nigerian Governors Forum, was designed to promote adoption of project results across all 36 states, supported by evidence of tangible results from pilot states. Collaboration with private sector actors and international donors was pursued to provide the necessary financial and technical support to scale up successful initiatives, reinforcing the long-term viability of the project's outcomes.