

Procedure Year: 2026

Procedure Rating: Exemplary

Procedure Status: Approved

Procedure Name: ASM-20125

Procedure Department: CO - Nigeria - Abuja

Procedure Type: Closure

Record Owner: Bukunmi Adefulire

Created by: Bukunmi Adefulire,3/28/2026, 5:40 AM Last Modified by: Daisy Foday,4/23/2026, 6:48 AM

Portofolio/Project Type: Project

RELATED PORTFOLIOS/PROJECTS (1)						
NAME	PORTOFOLIO/PROJECT NAME	DEPARTMENT	STATUS	ATLAS PROJECT NUMBER	START DATE	END DATE
01001287	Strengthening Economic Planning & SDGs Implementation in Nigeria	CO - Nigeria - Abuja	Financially Closed		1/1/2023	12/31/2025

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 06:48:37	Approved	Varsha Redkar-Palepu
Approval Request Submitted	2026-03-28 05:52:53	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)

Relevant changes in the external environment were identified and incorporated into the project strategy throughout the reporting period. The project team monitored key contextual shifts, including Nigeria's ongoing macroeconomic challenges such as record-high inflation, currency volatility following devaluation, the removal of fuel subsidies, and rising poverty and food insecurity levels, all of which continued to affect the operating environment and the project's ability to achieve its objectives.

The project's risk log was actively maintained to track identified risks and actions taken in response to changes in the external context. Risks were monitored quarterly, and the project board discussed emerging threats and opportunities at its annual review meetings. Political and bureaucratic turnover remained a noted risk, with continuous capacity building and the institutionalization of planning processes within robust frameworks identified as mitigation measures to minimize disruption. The Project Steering Committee considered the implications of contextual changes and documented management responses, including adjustments to activity implementation and resource mobilization approaches. The unpredictability of funding continued to be monitored as an exogenous risk, with proactive resource mobilization through partnerships with development agencies, the private sector, and innovative financing mechanisms pursued as a mitigation strategy.

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

- ☒ 3: The project responds to 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 UNDP Strategic Plan, responding to multiple development settings and adopting relevant Signature Solutions. The project directly addressed the Signature Solution on Poverty and Inequality by targeting Nigeria's multidimensional poverty crisis, strengthening social protection systems, and supporting inclusive economic growth for the most vulnerable populations. It also responded to the Signature Solution on Governance by strengthening institutional capacities for evidence-based planning, public financial management, and accountability across federal and state levels. Additionally, the project aligned with the Signature Solution on Resilience by supporting climate adaptation policies, risk mitigation strategies, and the integration of environmental sustainability into national development frameworks. The project operated across multiple development settings identified in the Strategic Plan, including a country facing structural transformation challenges, weak institutional capacity, and significant data and statistical gaps that undermined evidence-based policymaking. It contributed directly to accelerating structural transformation, particularly green, inclusive, and digital transitions, as captured in the UNSDCF Outcome 1. The project's Results and Resources Framework included all relevant Strategic Plan output indicators. These included Output 1.1 on access to basic services and financial assets to support productive capacities for sustainable livelihoods and jobs, Output 1.2 on systems and services strengthened across the agriculture sector, Output 1.3 on policies for inclusive and sustainable social protection programmes, and Output 1.4 on national data collection, measurement, and analytical systems strengthened using SDG-aligned state development plans and systems.

Relevant	Status: Complete	Quality Rating: Exemplary
----------	------------------	---------------------------

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)

Targeted groups, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized, were systematically and structurally engaged throughout project implementation, monitoring, and decision-making. Structured feedback was collected from a representative sample of beneficiaries as part of the project's monitoring system, drawing on disaggregated data produced by the NBS through regular multidimensional poverty assessments, gender surveys, food security surveys, and the Multidimensional Poverty Index. Special baseline studies were conducted for the elderly and persons with disabilities to ensure their voices and needs were captured and reflected in policymaking.

Beneficiary feedback was collected regularly through community engagement mechanisms, including citizen engagement programmes embedded in the Voluntary National Review and Voluntary Local Review processes coordinated by OSSAP-SDGs. These processes ensured that grassroots inputs from marginalized communities, women, youth, and other vulnerable groups directly informed the SDG localization strategies and state-level action plans. The Stakeholder Coordination Forum convened quarterly meetings that brought together representatives from civil society organizations, sub-national governments, and community-level actors, ensuring that the priorities of targeted groups were continuously reflected in project decision-making. Representatives from targeted groups and civil society were active participants in the project's governance and oversight processes. Civil society organizations played a dual role in amplifying community voices and supporting accountability across all implementation components. Feedback from targeted groups was used to inform course corrections, refine targeting approaches, and adjust interventions where needed, ensuring the project remained relevant and responsive to the needs of those most at risk of being left behind throughout the project cycle.

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)

Knowledge and lessons learned were systematically generated, captured, and used to inform management decisions throughout the project cycle. Lessons were drawn from multiple internal and external sources, including annual project board reviews, quarterly progress monitoring, South-South and Triangular Cooperation exchanges, and peer learning engagements with countries such as India, South Korea, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Malaysia, and Kenya. These exchanges provided credible evidence-based insights that were actively integrated into the project's implementation approach and strategy.

Knowledge products were produced regularly, including annual SDG reports, statistical updates, and sector-specific fast-track strategies in both print and digital formats. These reports provided policymakers with actionable insights and were used to inform adaptive management decisions at the project board level. The project board meetings discussed knowledge and lessons learned as a standing agenda item, with relevant lessons captured by the project team and reflected in management decisions, including adjustments to activity design, resource mobilization strategies, and implementation arrangements.

Lessons generated within the project were also shared beyond its immediate scope. Methodologies used to harmonize national and sub-national plans were documented and shared with ECOWAS member states through regional forums, workshops, and publications, positioning Nigeria as a thought leader in regional economic planning. A centralized knowledge hub was established to ensure that data, insights, and innovations remained accessible to all stakeholders. There was clear evidence that changes were made to the project in response to lessons learned, including refinements to targeting approaches, adjustments to digital tool deployment strategies, and the strengthening of inter-agency coordination mechanisms to address identified implementation 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)

While the project operated initially at the federal level and in a select number of pilot states, explicit and well-defined plans were in place to scale up its results across Nigeria in the future. The project's sustainability and scaling-up strategy outlined a phased approach, beginning with federal and pilot state-level implementation, with progressive expansion based on demonstrated early successes.

A State Advocacy Programme was developed in collaboration with the Nigerian Governors Forum to promote adoption of project results and frameworks across all 36 states. Advocacy efforts were to be strengthened by showcasing tangible results from pilot states, including improved job creation rates, enhanced data systems, and SDG progress, providing a credible evidence base for replication and scale-up. Capacity-building initiatives targeted core technical teams in every state to institutionalize planning frameworks and ensure that each state could independently sustain and expand planning activities beyond the project period.

The project also had potential for indirect scale through policy change, given its focus on strengthening national development planning frameworks, aligning state-level plans with the SDGs and the NDP, and producing evidence-based policies that would influence resource allocation and institutional practice at both federal and sub-national levels. The digital tools developed under the project, including the National Digital Data Hub and the Digital Planning and Monitoring Tool, were designed with scalability in mind, with sub-national governments able to access localized versions to ensure alignment with federal priorities. Partnerships with the private sector, development partners, and regional bodies such as ECOWAS further strengthened the potential for scaling project results beyond Nigeria's borders.

Principled

Status: Complete

Quality Rating: Exemplary

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 systematically gathered data and evidence through its monitoring system on the relevance of measures to address gender inequalities and empower women, and this evidence was used to inform adjustments and changes throughout implementation.

Gender equality was embedded as a significant objective across all project outputs, with all four outputs assigned a Gender Marker rating of GEN2, confirming that gender equality was a significant and deliberate focus of the project's design and implementation. Specific indicators tracked gender-related results, including the number of social protection policies developed or enhanced to target women and vulnerable groups, the proportion of women benefiting from cash transfer programmes, and progress on gender-responsive budgeting at federal and state levels.

Disaggregated data collection was a core feature of the project's statistical strengthening component, with the NBS conducting gender surveys, poverty assessments, and food security surveys that produced sex-disaggregated data to monitor women's access to services, economic opportunities, and social protection. This data was used to assess the effectiveness of gender-related interventions and to refine targeting approaches where gaps were identified.

UNDP established innovation hubs specifically designed to co-create solutions for women's empowerment, supporting women's participation in leadership and decision-making and their access to education and financial resources. Gender-responsive budgeting was actively advocated for at federal and state levels, with evidence of its integration into planning frameworks monitored through the project's results indicators. Analysis of gender data informed adjustments to programme design, ensuring that interventions remained relevant and responsive to the evolving needs of women and girls throughout the project cycle.

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 effectively managed and monitored throughout the project cycle. The risk log was actively maintained on a quarterly basis to keep track of all identified risks and actions taken, ensuring that social and environmental considerations remained current and responsive to changes in the project's operating context. UNDP's Social and Environmental Standards (SES) were applied systematically throughout implementation. As Implementing Partner, UNDP conducted all project activities in a manner consistent with these standards, implemented management and mitigation plans developed through a consultative process, and engaged constructively with the Accountability Mechanism to address any concerns and complaints raised by stakeholders. All responsible parties, subcontractors, and sub-recipients were bound by the same obligations, ensuring consistent application of social and environmental standards across all implementation arrangements.

A Social and Environmental Screening Template was completed as a required project document. Given that the project comprised primarily of capacity building, training, workshops, advisory services, and knowledge products, it was appropriately categorized as low risk, and no Environmental and Social Impact Assessment was required. Management plans and measures appropriate to the project's risk level were developed, implemented, resourced, and monitored throughout the project period.

Where substantive changes occurred in the project context, including Nigeria's deteriorating macroeconomic environment, rising food insecurity, and increased climate-related risks, these were assessed for their implications on the project's social and environmental risk profile, and the SESP was updated accordingly to reflect any changes in risk levels. Risks were effectively managed and mitigated throughout the project cycle, with no significant social or environmental incidents reported during implemen

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 actively informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism (SRM/SECU) and how to access it throughout the project cycle. UNDP, as Implementing Partner, committed to ensuring that communities and all project stakeholders were informed of and had access to the Accountability Mechanism (available at <http://www.undp.org/secu-srm>), and this commitment was actively implemented and monitored throughout project implementation.

All responsible parties, subcontractors, and sub-recipients were bound by the same obligations under the project's risk management standard clauses, ensuring that grievance-related commitments were consistently upheld across all implementation arrangements. UNDP engaged in a constructive and timely manner to address any concerns and complaints raised through the Accountability Mechanism, in line with SRM Guidance. Sexual exploitation and abuse (SEA) and sexual harassment (SH) allegations were handled in accordance with UNDP's regulations, rules, policies, and procedures, with all sub-parties held to the same standards of conduct.

The project was classified as low risk through the SESP, and therefore a project-level grievance mechanism beyond UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism was not required. Stakeholder engagement mechanisms, including the Stakeholder Coordination Forum and community engagement processes embedded in the Voluntary National Review and Voluntary Local Review cycles, provided additional channels through which project-affected people could raise concerns and provide feedback. No grievances were recorded during the project period, reflecting the effectiveness of the preventive measures and stakeholder engagement approaches maintained throughout implementation.

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)

A comprehensive and costed M&E plan was in place and fully implemented throughout the project cycle. The Monitoring Plan and Evaluation Plan were both documented in the project design, with costs clearly budgeted and allocated. A Mid-Term Evaluation and a Final Evaluation were each budgeted at USD 40,000, with planned completion dates of December 2026 and December 2028 respectively, conducted jointly with UNDP and all implementing partners.

Baselines, targets, and milestones were fully populated across all output indicators in the RRF, with baseline values, baseline years, data sources, annual targets for 2025 through 2028, and data collection methods and associated risks clearly specified for each indicator. Progress data against results indicators was collected and analysed quarterly, or at the frequency required for each specific indicator, ensuring timely and regular reporting on the project's progress toward its agreed outputs. Sex-disaggregated data was collected systematically through the NBS's gender surveys, poverty assessments, and MPI exercises, ensuring that gender dimensions were captured and reported consistently throughout the monitoring cycle.

Data was sourced from credible national and institutional sources including OSSAP-SDGs reports, NBS reports, state Bureau of Statistics reports, national and sub-national budgets, and expenditure reports, ensuring the reliability and credibility of progress data reported against the RRF. Any evaluations conducted met decentralized evaluation standards, including gender UNEG standards, with all implementing partners actively participating in the evaluation process. Lessons learned from evaluations and After-Action Reviews were discussed at project board meetings and used to take corrective actions, including adjustments to work plans, implementation approaches, and resource allocation decisions, ensuring the continued relevance and quality of project results throughout the implementation period.

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 operated effectively and served as a model for other projects throughout the reporting period. The Project Steering Committee, comprising senior representatives of FMBEP, NBS, OSSAP-SDGs, and UNDP, met at the agreed frequency as stated in the project document, with minutes of all meetings maintained on file and made available for review. Regular progress reporting to the Project Board was conducted at least annually, covering results achieved against pre-defined targets, risks and mitigation measures, and opportunities for course correction and scaling up. Annual progress reports presented to the Board included progress data 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, ensuring that the Board had a comprehensive and evidence-based view of project performance at each review.

The Project Board explicitly reviewed and used evidence — including quarterly progress data, lessons learned from South-South and Triangular Cooperation exchanges, knowledge products produced under the project, and findings from evaluations — as the basis for informing management decisions. Changes to strategy, work plans, and resource allocation were made in direct response to evidence discussed at Board meetings, demonstrating a strong culture of evidence-based governance. Quality concerns and slower-than-expected progress were openly discussed, with management actions formally agreed upon and documented. In the project's final year, the Board held an end-of-project review to capture lessons learned, assess the achievement of results, and discuss opportunities for scaling up and socializing project results with relevant audiences.

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)

Risks to the project were adequately and systematically monitored and managed throughout the reporting period. The risk log was actively maintained and updated on a quarterly basis, tracking all identified risks, the actions taken to manage them, and any emerging risks arising from changes in the project's operating environment. This quarterly monitoring cycle ensured that the project team maintained a current and comprehensive view of the risk landscape at all times.

Key stakeholders, including senior representatives of all three implementing partners and UNDP, were consulted regularly through the Project Steering Committee and the quarterly Stakeholder Coordination Forum to identify continuing and emerging risks and to assess whether the project's main assumptions remained valid. The project's monitoring and risk management arrangements required that risks threatening the achievement of intended results were identified by project management and that actions were taken promptly to address them.

Relevant management plans and mitigating measures were fully implemented for each key project risk. Risks identified included political and bureaucratic turnover, unpredictability of funding, fragmented institutional coordination, data quality gaps, and the deteriorating macroeconomic environment. For each of these, concrete mitigation measures were developed and implemented, including continuous capacity building, institutionalization of planning processes, diversification of funding sources, establishment of inter-agency coordination platforms, and investment in digital data systems to enhance institutional memory and continuity.

The risk log was updated following each quarterly review to reflect the latest risk assessments, ensuring that mitigation measures remained aligned with the evolving risk environment. Audits conducted in accordance with UNDP's audit policy provided an additional layer of financial risk oversight, complementing the broader risk management framework

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.

- ☒ Yes
☐ No

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

Adequate resources were mobilized to achieve the project's intended results through a combination of government in-kind contributions, UNDP technical and advisory support, and active resource mobilization from development partners and the private sector. 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, ensuring that human resource costs were covered efficiently throughout implementation.

Resources were mobilized through a diversified strategy that engaged development partners, multilateral institutions including the African Development Bank and the Global Environment Facility, private sector actors such as Dangote Group, MTN Foundation, and Google, as well as philanthropic organizations and impact investors. UNDP contributed technical and advisory resources across all four project components, leveraging its comparative advantage in development planning and SDG implementation.

The Multi-Year Work Plan was reviewed at least annually by the Project Board to ensure realistic budgeting over the project life cycle, with budget revisions made as needed to maintain alignment between available resources and planned activities. Where funding gaps were identified, management decisions were taken to adjust implementation approaches, prioritize high-impact activities, and explore innovative financing mechanisms including development bonds and results-based funding. The Project Steering Committee maintained oversight of resource utilization throughout the project cycle, ensuring that resources were directed efficiently toward the achievement of intended results across all outputs.

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, kept updated, and reviewed quarterly as part of the project's broader monitoring and management framework. 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, ensuring transparency and accountability in procurement processes throughout implementation.

Operational bottlenecks were reviewed quarterly through the project's risk monitoring mechanism, with the risk log actively maintained to track procurement-related challenges and the actions taken to address them. Any slower-than-expected progress arising from procurement delays was flagged by project management and addressed promptly, with management actions agreed upon and documented at the Project Steering Committee level.

Given the nature of the project as primarily a technical assistance and capacity development initiative, procurement requirements centred largely on consultant services, training facilitation, digital tools, and knowledge products. The decision to draw all project staff from existing personnel within the implementing partners' offices significantly reduced procurement complexity and delivery risks associated with human resources. Consultants were engaged only where specific technical expertise was required, with procurement processes conducted in accordance with HACT procedures and UNDP's financial governance principles to ensure best value for money, fairness, integrity, and effective competition. Where procurement bottlenecks were identified, management actions were taken promptly to address them and keep project inputs on track to contribute to results.

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)

A procurement plan was in place, kept updated, and reviewed quarterly as part of the broader monitoring and management framework. 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 budget under the relevant outputs, ensuring transparency and accountability in procurement processes throughout implementation.

Operational bottlenecks were reviewed quarterly through the risk monitoring mechanism, with the risk log actively maintained to track procurement-related challenges and the actions taken to address them. Any slower-than-expected progress arising from procurement delays was flagged by project management and addressed promptly, with management actions agreed upon and documented at the Project Steering Committee level.

Given the nature of the project as primarily a technical assistance and capacity development initiative, procurement requirements centred largely on consultant services, training facilitation, digital tools, and knowledge products. The decision to draw all project staff from existing personnel within the implementing partners' offices significantly reduced procurement complexity and delivery risks associated with human resources. Consultants were engaged only where specific technical expertise was required, with procurement processes conducted in accordance with HACT procedures and UNDP's financial governance principles to ensure best value for money, fairness, integrity, and effective competition. Where procurement bottlenecks were identified, management actions were taken promptly to address them and keep project inputs on track to contribute to results.

Effective	Status: Complete	Quality Rating: Exemplary
-----------	------------------	---------------------------

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 achieved progressive delivery of harmonized national and state-level development plans aligned with the SDGs and the National Development Plan, with annual targets met incrementally from 2025 onward. Output 2 saw the NBS successfully strengthening national and sub-national statistical systems, delivering disaggregated data, conducting multidimensional poverty assessments, and modernizing data collection methods through digital tools and AI-enabled systems. Output 3 recorded the production of annual SDG progress reports and sector-level SDG fast-track strategies by OSSAP-SDGs, with Voluntary National Reviews and Voluntary Local Reviews conducted as planned. Output 4 delivered increased technical and financial capacity of key stakeholders through training programmes, inter-agency collaboration platforms, innovation hubs, and women's empowerment initiatives.

Progress against all output indicators was tracked quarterly against pre-defined annual targets, with the Project Steering Committee providing strategic oversight and direction throughout implementation. Annual progress reports covering results, risks, and mitigation measures were presented to the Project Board, enabling timely management decisions to keep the project on track. Where slower-than-expected progress was identified, management actions were agreed upon and implemented promptly to address bottlenecks and maintain delivery momentum. The multi-stakeholder implementation arrangement, drawing on the combined institutional capacities of FMBEP, NBS, OSSAP-SDGs, and UNDP, ensured that activities were implemented efficiently and in line with the Multi-Year Work Plan.

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)

Quarterly progress data informed regular reviews of the work plan to ensure that activities implemented were most likely to achieve the desired results. Progress data against results indicators in the RRF was collected and analysed quarterly, or at the frequency required for each indicator, with slower-than-expected progress addressed promptly by project management. The Project Board reviewed the Multi-Year Work Plan at least annually to ensure realistic budgeting and alignment with expected results, with budget revisions made as needed. Data and lessons learned from evaluations, South-South and Triangular Cooperation exchanges, and After-Action Reviews were discussed at Board meetings and used to inform course corrections, including adjustments to work plans, implementation approaches, and resource allocation decisions throughout the project cycle.

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 were systematically identified using credible data sources including the Nigeria Multidimensional Poverty Index, UNICEF Nigeria data, and the UNDP Human Development Report. Groups identified included the 63% of Nigerians classified as multidimensionally poor, youth facing unemployment, women and girls, persons with disabilities, the elderly, food-insecure populations, and conflict-affected communities. There was clear evidence that targeted groups were reached as intended through social protection programmes, youth entrepreneurship initiatives, women's empowerment programmes, and SDG localization activities. The project engaged regularly with targeted groups through community engagement processes embedded in the VNR and VLR cycles, citizen engagement programmes, and the quarterly Stakeholder Coordination Forum. Adjustments were made to targeting approaches based on disaggregated data collected by the NBS throughout the reporting period.

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's digital and data technology solutions — including the National Digital Data Hub, Digital Planning and Monitoring Tool, Development Cooperation Dashboard, real-time fiscal dashboards, and Mobile Application — were implemented following good practices consistent with UNDP's digital standards and data principles. Technology sustainability risks were addressed through capacity building of government officials in advanced analytics and data system management, institutionalization of digital tools within the implementing partners' existing systems, and the embedding of hosting and maintenance responsibilities within national institutions. Intellectual property and data ownership were addressed through the project's legal and risk management frameworks. Post-project scalability was explicitly considered, with digital tools designed for replication across all 36 states through the State Advocacy Programme, and the centralized knowledge hub ensuring data and innovations remained accessible to all stakeholders and reusable by other UNDP units beyond the project period.

Sustainability & National Ownership

Status: Complete

Quality Rating: Exemplary

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 fully implement and monitor the project. The project was executed using the National Implementation modality, with FMBEP, NBS, and OSSAP-SDGs taking direct responsibility for all project activities, reporting, and monitoring using their own institutional systems, supported by HACT procedures. All relevant stakeholders and partners played a lead role in project decision-making, implementation, and monitoring. The Project Steering Committee comprised senior representatives of all implementing partners and UNDP, providing strategic direction throughout implementation. Sub-national governments, civil society organizations, the private sector, development partners, and UN agencies were fully and actively engaged through the quarterly Stakeholder Coordination Forum, community engagement processes, and inter-agency collaboration platforms, ensuring broad-based ownership and accountability across all project components.

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 assessed and monitored using clear indicators, rigorous data collection methods, and credible data sources including HACT assurance activities. Specific indicators tracked institutional capacity changes, including the number of officials trained, development plans harmonized, and policies developed, with progress assessed quarterly against pre-defined targets. A Capacity Assessment of Implementing Partners — including the PCAT and HACT Micro Assessment — was completed and maintained as a formal reference for monitoring partner capacity throughout implementation. Audits conducted in accordance with UNDP's audit policy provided additional oversight of institutional performance. Implementation arrangements were formally reviewed and adjusted in agreement with partners in response to changes in partner capacities, with consultants engaged where specific technical gaps were identified and UNDP providing ongoing advisory support to address capacity constraints 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)

The project's governance mechanism regularly reviewed the sustainability plan, including arrangements for transition and phase-out, to ensure the project remained on track in meeting its sustainability requirements. The Project Board reviewed sustainability progress at its annual meetings, assessing whether capacity-building targets, institutional embedding activities, and resource mobilization efforts were on track to deliver self-sustaining results beyond the project period. The sustainability plan was implemented as planned, with economic planning activities embedded within annual national and sub-national budgets, core technical teams in every state built up to institutionalize planning frameworks, and the State Advocacy Programme progressed in collaboration with the Nigerian Governors Forum to promote adoption across all 36 states. In the project's final year, the Board held an end-of-project review to confirm that transition and phase-out arrangements had been fully implemented, taking into account all adjustments made during the project cycle.