ASM-13613 - Quality Assurance - Closure

Procedure Year: 2025

Procedure Rating: Satisfactory

Procedure Status: Approved

Procedure Name: ASM-13613

Procedure Department: CO - Maldives - Male

Procedure Type: Closure

Record Owner: Yasmeen Rasheed

Created by: Yasmeen Rasheed,1/20/2025, 2:08 PM

Last Modified by: Pek Chuan GAN,1/21/2025, 10:14 AM

Portofolio/Project Type: Project

RELATED PORTFOLIOS/PROJECTS (1)

NAME	PORTOFOLIO/PROJECT NAME	DEPARTMENT	STATUS	ATLAS PROJECT NUMBER	START DATE	END DATE
00131870	CHINA-UNDP Triangular Cooperat-UNDP-MDV-00131870	CO - Maldives - Male	Financially Closed	00143961	5/1/2022	12/31/2024

Approval Information

Approval Date: Tue Jan 21 00:00:00 GMT 2025

Approved By: Pek Chuan GAN <pek.chuan.gan@undp.org>

APPROVAL HISTORY

STEP NAME	DATE	STATUS	ASSIGNED TO
Submitted for Approval	2025-01-21 10:14:39	Approved	Pek Chuan GAN
Approval Request Submitted	2025-01-20 15:04:19	Started	Yasmeen Rasheed

QA Questionnaire:

Strategic | Status: Complete | Quality Rating: Satisfactory

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

- ○ 3: The project team 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 ensured that all equipment, installation and training under this project was needs based and had a sustainability focus, for eg: in procurement of equipment, the project ensured QA and shelf life as per health procurement standards. Where specifications were deemed incompatible with facilities locally available, changes were made pro-actively in consultation with the government. This project is a multi-country project - therefore, these changes are not evidenced through project boards.

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)

Uploaded project document highlighting the linkages with the UNDP Strategic Plan.

Relevant	Status: Complete	Quality Rating: 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)

Since this project is mainly on procurement of highly technical health supplies, the needs were identified through the health center workers were also consulted through the Ministry of Health, the feedback which then informed the needs for procurement planning for the project. In this sense, the Ministry as a target group was regularly and heavily consulted in the project implementation. Feedback had been collected from Ministry of Health through policy level engagements with the Ministry. To ensure the support reaches the most vulnerable in terms of access to health care the emergency lifesaving health supplies were distributed focusing on hospitals and health centers outside the capital city of Malé. (Evidence attached)

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)

It was a lesson learned by the project that UNDP must ensure that the government has the capacity to conduct proper handling and storage of the health equipment that are procured via UNDP. With this learning, UNDP on subsequent activities under this project, proactively prior to placing the order, checked and confirmed with the Government with regards to the storage facilities and locations to which the items were subsequently handed over to.

Additional challenges were faced during the project's execution, such as underestimating the economic viability of local PPE production due to limited consumption and high import costs, which rendered large scale production economically unsustainable. Securing a reliable source of raw materials also proved difficult, given the Maldives' limited manufacturing capability and dependence on imports. To address these issues, the project explored alternative approaches, including regional partnerships and adopting strategies for local innovation in reusable PPEs. The team also emphasized developing human capacity by advocating for constant training to upskill healthcare professionals and address expertise gaps.

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)

This project wasn't a full scale, however, other related partnerships have materialized and branched out through the success of this engagement. Namely, through this project and similar interventions on health procurement, UNDP had ventured into an extensive project and pipeline with the government on Health Procurement. Link: https://raajje.mv/136547

Sustainability plans, laid out by the Maldives Ministry of Health on such procurement collaborations, focus on integrating project lessons into national healthcare policies, enhancing infrastructure, and diversifying service delivery. The Ministry aims to leverage its partnerships with UNDP, World Bank, and other key players to bolster its national response capacity against future health crises.

The continued success of this collaboration in the Maldives will depend on leveraging partnerships and sharing effective practices across the region to reinforce health systems post-pandemic.

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)

Since this project was mainly on procurement of health supplies, data and evidence on gender inequalities and women's empowerment was limited by nature. However, the project team ensured that where applicable, for an instance in the training of health professionals on the usage of the equipment, there were measures put in place to ensure women health professionals also participate and obtain the required trainings. A total of 236 healthcare professionals (consisting of 166 nurses and 70 doctors) received training on the usage of the emergency lifesaving equipment spanning the entire length of the Maldives from south to north. This cohort included 163 females and 72 males, all of whom are now better equipped to respond to critical medical needs.

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)

This is a low-risk project as per the SES (attached). Identified risks were tracked and closely monitored, and necessary action to mitigate risks were taken proactively.

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)

Since this project was mainly on procurement of highly technical health supplies, the primary partner and beneficiary was the Ministry of Health. In this sense, the Ministry as a target group was regularly and heavily consulted in the project implementation and on any grievances from affected people. Additionally, health centers and health practitioners who would operate the equipment were also briefed and trained through the Ministry of Health on the grievance mechanisms.

Management & Monitoring	Status: Complete	Quality Rating: Exemplary

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

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

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

M&E plan attached.

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

- (selected) 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 is a Multi-country project with UNDP China managing the project oversight functions with the Donor along with the involved COs. Project Document and DrC attached.

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

- (selected) 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)

Yes, this is reflected in the Quarterly Progress Reports and other relevant reports pertaining to the Project. (attached)

Efficient	Status: Complete	Quality Rating: Exemplary

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

- (selected) Yes
- No

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

Yes, the project is fully funded through the China South South Triangular Cooperation, finance by the China Ministry of Commerce. The project document and funding approval has been attached in evidence.

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

- (selected) 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)

In order to enhance procurement efficiencies, the CO looked into possible delays of which a major risk was shipping delays attributed to geopolitical conflicts, which influences supply chain. Therefore, in collaboration with the Global Procurement Office, UNDP informed vendors to indicate in their proposals that they had identified manufacturers with ready stock, ensuring immediate dispatch capability. The risk treatment was kept a close watch on, in collaboration with the UNDP China Office, to manage and mitigate any potential delays effectively. Project had also broadened the call for bids, presenting them to a global list of long-term agreements (LTA) and past experienced vendors. This ensured an extensive pool of capable bidders, minimizing procurement delays.

2024 workplan and procurement plan attached along with Tracking Log.

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

- (selected) 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)

In consultation with the Global Procurement Unit of Copenhagen, the project team had looked into where cost-efficiencies could be drawn from during all cycles of the procurements related to this project. In doing so, top most priority is given to ensure that all equipment considered are cleared by UNDP Quality Assurance. A competitive bidding process reaching a wide range of vendors had been ensured, allowing access to favorable market rates. This action, conducted in cooperation with the UNDP China Office, helped mitigate financial pressures.

Effective	Status: Complete	Quality Rating: Satisfactory

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

- (selected) Yes
- No

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

Yes. The project was delivered, with 100% delivery rate, by the expected project end date in 2024.

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?

- (selected) 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)

Yes, 2024 workplan and procurement plan attached along with Tracking Log and relevant Project Reporting.

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)
- [x] 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)

Since this project was mainly on procurement of health supplies, data and evidence on gender inequalities and women's empowerment was limited by nature. However, the project team ensured that where applicable, for an instance in the training of health professionals on the usage of the equipment, there were measures put in place to ensure women health professionals also participate and obtain the required trainings. A total of 236 healthcare professionals (consisting of 166 nurses and 70 doctors) received training on the usage of the emergency lifesaving equipment spanning the entire length of the Maldives from south to north. This cohort included 163 females and 72 males, all of whom are now better equipped to respond to critical medical needs.

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)
- [x] 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 primary support through this project was that of medical/health equipment, which are electronic and produces digital data, which would then inform health diagnosis, testing and other practices. As part of the Quality Assurance process for procurement of Health Equipment, UNDP ensured that UNDP's digital standards and data principles were followed in the procurement process.

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)
- [x] 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)

Since this project was mainly on procurement of highly technical health supplies, the primary partner and beneficiary was the Ministry of Health. In this sense, the Ministry as a target group was regularly and heavily consulted in the project implementation and on any grievances from affected people. Additionally, health centers and health practitioners who would operate the equipment were also briefed and trained through the Ministry of Health on the grievance mechanisms.

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)

Attached Reports. Aspects of changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems - such as in the equipment capacities of health centers and hospitals, had been monitored by the project using indicators and credible data sources. Some adjustment were made to implementation arrangements where needed to reflect changes in partner capacities.

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)

During the recent reporting period, significant strides was made toward achieving the project's objectives, which were established to support the Maldives in coping with the impacts of COVID-19. The objective to provide PPE to frontline workers, safeguarding the wellbeing of both men and women, and helping to curb the spread of the virus was achieved through the provision of PPE. And the objective aimed at boosting capacities of local entities with the provision of life saving equipment and knowledge transfer pertinent to these technologies. Key lessons learned from the project include recognizing the economic non-viability of large-scale local PPE production due to high import costs and low demand, underscoring the need for alternative regional strategies and innovations such as reusable PPE. The importance of continuous healthcare workforce training was also emphasized as a critical component of long-term capability building and pprioritizing infrastructure upgrades, particularly in under-resourced atoll hospitals, to ensure they can support advanced healthcare services and storage solutions.

The projects way forward, according to the Ministry of Health, involves exploring further partnerships for resource allocation, and prioritizing human capacity development and infrastructure investments. These steps will support the ongoing goal of enhancing resilience against future health crises. Continuous risk management and strategic adjustments are planned by the Ministry to navigate potential supply chain issues in future. Plans to sustain the gains also involve integrating lessons and technological advances into the national healthcare system, and ensuring preparedness for future health shocks. This includes infrastructure upgrades, decentralizing health services, and enhancing transparency and accountability in resource management.