**UN-Habitat Project Quality at Entry Checklist**

**PAG Review at the *(please check appropriate box)*** **[ ]  Regional level [ ]  HQ level**

Programme/Project Title :

Submitting Office/**Branch/Region** :

Submitting Officer :

Names of Branch Peer Reviewers:

Total $ Value of the Project :

Project Duration :

**Six-point Scale Ranking System - 0-Highly Unsatisfactory (HU), 1: Unsatisfactory (U) 2: Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)3: Moderately Satisfactory (MS) 4: Satisfactory (S) 5: Highly Satisfactory (HS)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **CRITERIA** | **To be filled by Project Team Leader****or Project submitting staff**  | **Item Ranking Scale (0-5)** | **HQ PAG Secretariat REMARKS and Ranking Scale (0-5)** |
|  | **Section A: General Information**  | **(If your answer is Yes, tell us where in the ProDoc to find verifying info.)** |  |  |
|  | 1. Is the standard project template or format used?
 |  |  |  |
|  | 1. Are all sections of the project template in the PAAS completely filled-out?
 |  |  |  |
|  | 1. Have all relevant Units/Offices/Branches been specified and consulted/involved, (give name/s of person consulted)
 | **List the names of those consulted from Branches/regions, cross-cutting issue etc in the design of this project** |  |  |
|  | 1. Are all support documents to the project attached in the PAAS?
 | **PAG Minutes and income agreement?** |  |  |
|  | 1. Is/Are the proposed collaborative Branches the most appropriate for undertaking this project?
 |  |  |  |
|  | **Overall Ranking for Section A:** |  |  |  |
|  | **B: Project Justification** |  |  |  |
|  | 1. Is there sufficient evidence of support from the requesting entity (Government, donor/funding agent, counterpart, main implementing partner)?
 | ExampleYes, see Pg x of Prodoc ORSee Section X in the PoDoc |  |       |
|  | 1. Relevance of (to beneficiaries and identified problem)
 | Yes, see pg x |  |  |
|  | 1. Does the proposal fit within the corporate **(Strategic Plan)** and Expected Accomplishment (s)?
 |  |  |       |
|  | 1. Does the proposal contribute significantly to **Work program Outputs for the current biennial plan)?**
 |  |  |       |
|  | 1. Does the proposal show the alignment with the global, regional, national, or local priorities?
 |  |  |       |
|  | 1. Does the proposal have a clear purpose and mandate?
 |  |  |       |
|  | 1. Have all potential partners at the international, national, and local levels been **clearly identified** and their possible contribution/involvement taken into consideration?
 |  |  |       |
|  | 1. Does the proposal **generate value-adding opportunities** for UN-Habitat (what do we gain from the project and what we add)?
 |  |  |       |
|  | 1. Does the project strategy show clearly an integrated and synergetic multi-branch and partner approach to solving the identified problem?
 |  |  |  |
|  | 1. Does the **proposal contribute to building national ownership and capacity**, as well as government leadership in ensuring sustainable human development?
 |  |  |       |
|  | 1. Have **past experiences, lessons learned, and best practices** from similar initiatives informed the formulation of this project?
 | See page x |  |       |
|  | 1. Has any ongoing and previous similar activities supported by the client and stakeholders within the geographical area of coverage been reviewed, including partnership with UN-HABITAT?
 |  |  |       |
|  | 1. Does the proposal reflect clear development potential and is likely to attract financial support and technical cooperation with the development partners?
 |  |  |       |
|  | 1. Have opportunities for strategic partnerships/resource leverage been identified?
 |  |  |       |
|  | **Overall Ranking for Section B:** |  |  |  |
| **Section C: Project Definition** |  |  |  |
|  | 1. Is the **Goal and Expected Accomplishments** clearly defined and articulated in a measurable **results-focused manner?**
 |  |  |       |
|  | 1. Is the **implementation strategy** **for achieving EAs** and **Implementation arrangements/management structure** clearly described with roles of key players artand contribute to the harmonized approach of implementation?
 |  |  |       |
|  | 1. Are the target groups/population clearly identified? Were they involved/consulted in the proposal design?
 |  |  |       |
|  | 1. Do the activities, outputs and expected results appropriately address **the, problems, and gaps identified in the project.**
 |  |  |       |
|  | 1. Has the proposal been ranked at a **minimum of “1” by ALL the cross-cutting markers of gender, youth, climate change and human rights**, in the PAG and is there documentation to this effect?
 |  |  |       |
|  | 1. Is the **risk framework** appropriately done and **assumptions** clearly identified?
 |  |  |       |
|  | 1. Is there a high probability that the listed assumptions will hold true?
 |  |  |  |
|  | 1. Are the assumption specific and **are their validity verifiable** (can they be checked by calling the specified entities)
 |  |  |       |
|  | **Overall Ranking for Section C:** |  |  |  |
| **Section D: RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS** |  |  |  |
|  | 1. Are the resource requirements (financial, human, physical) adequate to deliver the expected results?
 |  |  |       |
|  | 1. Are the allocations of resources for each budget line/activity and support costs justified?
 |  |  |       |
|  | 1. Are the resources and inputs from the funding and implementing partners (e.g. in-kind and counterpart contribution) clearly identified?
 |  |  |       |
|  | 1. Is the **timeframe and work plan realistic for achieving the expected results?**
 |  |  |       |
|  | 1. Does the allocation/distribution of budget correspond with the all proposed activities?
 |  |  |       |
|  | 1. Is there budget allotted for monitoring?
 |  |  |       |
|  | 1. Is there budget allotted for evaluation? *Ref to Evaluation policy*
 |  |  |  |
|  | 1. Is there a budget for information services and advocacy?
 |  |  |       |
|  | **Overall Ranking for Section D:** |  |  |  |
|  | **Section E: ANNEXES** |  |  |  |
|  | 1. Is the **Logical Framework Matrix** properly filled-out and attached to the ProDoc?
 |  |  |       |
|  | 1. Will the Project Objective be achieved if the project Outcomes are realized? (*Watch out –sometimes the Objectives are too high and cannot be delivered by the achievement of the project Outcomes or EAs)*

  |  |  |  |
|  | 1. The **Outcomes and their indicators are specific measurable achievable and time bound** (SMART)
 |  |  |       |
|  | 1. Do the Outcomes/EAs clearly outline an area of work where the agency and its partners can have significant influence?
 |  |  |       |
|  | 1. Are Outcomes/EAs worded in such a way that they communicate what will c**hange,** for who, (if relevant) and by when. ( Outcomes should generally be achievable within 5 years
 |  |  |       |
|  | 1. Are Outcomes clearly address the interest and concerns of men , women and marginalized groups( if relevant )
 |  |  |       |
|  | 1. Do the Outcome have indicators that are **valid and reliable measures of accomplishment (EAs)?**
 |  |  |       |
|  | 1. Are the Outputs defined as deliverables over which UN-Habitat **and partner agencies have control** and can be held accountable for delivering?
 |  |  |       |
|  | 1. Are the Outputs defined necessary and **sufficient ingredients** for achieving the Outcomes?
 |  |  |       |
|  | 1. Are there indicators that measure both **services and products** bought with the project money?
 |  |  |       |
|  | **Overall Ranking for Section E:** |  |  |  |
|  | **F: PROJECT** **IMPLEMENTAION SCHEDULE** | **Ranking (0-5)** |  |  |
|  | 1. Is the Programme/Project Implementation Plan/Schedule **cost and time realistic in achieving the EAs?**
 |  |  |       |
|  | 1. Are there additional documents attached (e.g. Budget Sheet, Agreement, other legal instruments) in place ? Please specify.
 |  |  |       |
|  | **Overall Ranking for Section F:** |  |  |       |
|  | **Overall Project Quality Ranking** |  |  |       |
|  |  |  |  |  |

*This is to certify that I have reviewed the proposal entitled*       *and the following are/is my recommendations:*

[ ]  Approved.

[ ]  Deferred pending submission of additional information or revised version by

[ ]  Rejected

*Remarks / Additional Information by HQPAG secretary*

     Project submitting Team Leader Date:

(*Signature over printed name*)

      PAG Coordinator & Project Quality Assurance Date:

(*Signature over printed name*)

      Director, Program Division Date:

(*Signature over printed name*)

**\*\*\*\*\* Note**: Projects **Ranked below 4 (SATISFACTORY) by HQ PAG Secretariat**  will not be approved- that is entered into the financial system. However, a written rationale for the ranking will be communicated.