

Procedure Year: 2023

Overall Project Risk Categorization: ● Satisfactory

Procedure Status: Approved

Procedure Name: ASM-00807

Procedure Department: CO - Libya - Tripoli

Procedure Type: Closure

Decision:

QA Summary/Project Board Comments:

RELATED PROJECTS(2)					
NAME	DEPARTMENT	STATUS	ATLAS PROJECT NUMBER	START DATE	END DATE
00129361	CO - Libya - Tripoli	Operationally Closed	00101889	11/1/2021	8/31/2023
00104136	CO - Libya - Tripoli	On Going	00101889	9/1/2017	1/31/2023

APPROVAL HISTORY			
STEP NAME	DATE	STATUS	ASSIGNED TO
Submitted for Approval	2023-10-02 03:40:58	Approved	Esam Garbaa
Approval Request Submitted	2023-10-02 02:20:44	Started	Eman Elmasri

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)

Yes, PUNOs consulted with then-government officials during the planning stage. As a result, the EU (donor) and PUNOs designed and signed the project document. However, by the time the Government of National Unity took office. Representatives from relevant ministries in the new government have expressed reservations about the project document. For the finalization of the project document, PUNOs have been consulting with government partners. Attached are the draft minutes of the Preparatory Steering Committee. Also, the project board has carefully considered the implications and documented any necessary changes to the project in response.

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)

Yes, the projects aligned with the thematic focus of the strategic plan. OUTCOME 2: No one left behind, centering on equitable access to opportunities and a rights-based approach to human agency and human development; OUTCOME 3: Resilience built to respond to systemic uncertainty and risk. Evidence attached.

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)

Yes, the project's targeted groups, especially those marginalized, vulnerable, and left further behind (LNOB), are being systematically engaged, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized individuals. The project ensured that all relevant parties, including the government, civil society organizations (CSOs), and experts, were engaged in a systematic manner. This approach aimed to ensure that the project leaves no one behind (LNOB) and remains relevant for the targeted groups. By actively involving these stakeholders, the project sought to address the specific needs and challenges faced by marginalized and vulnerable populations, promoting inclusivity and equity in its implementation. Yes, the project ensured the engagement of all stakeholders by conducting regular surveys to collect feedback. These surveys provided an opportunity for stakeholders, including the targeted groups, to share their perspectives, experiences, and suggestions related to the project. By actively seeking feedback through surveys, the project aimed to incorporate the voices and opinions of stakeholders, including marginalized and vulnerable individuals, to enhance the relevance and effectiveness of its interventions. This approach helped to ensure that the project remained responsive to the needs and aspirations of the communities it was designed to serve. Final report is 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)

Yes. The project has a lesson learned report which covered the entire project period. Lessons learnt is attached.

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 is the initial period for the project cycle and has scope for further scaling up in next phases. During the reporting period, the perception and sensitivity of PVE as a subject became all too apparent, specifically during the launch of the EU funded SUSC-PVE report (3rd October 2022). Due to issues raised in the report the LCTC and the relevant line ministries insisted that these are removed before moving forward with any PVE related activity. This caused the postponement of the schedule 5-day PVE workshop, which was slated to take place in Tripoli, Libya in late October 2022. Moving forward and assessing the recommendations from the PVE conference (from 10th to 12th October 2022 in Tunis, Tunisia), there are some thematic areas that donors can support, however, these activities should not be labelled 'PVE' as such. The issue of PVE can be covered essentially through peacebuilding, economic development, youth empowerment, social cohesion and related activities that can help reduce and prevent violent extremism.

Principled

Status: Complete

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

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

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

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

The project aimed to address inequalities, woman empowerment, and human rights in Libya, focusing on the impact of organized crime and PVE on women, particularly in the southern borderlands. It examined localized dynamics of VE recruitment, including push and pull factors, and the role of Libya's governance vacuum in facilitating violent extremist recruitment and transregional crime networks. 13 recruitment strategies focused on vulnerable women, such as those struggling financially, widows, and divorced women. Vulnerable women are most at risk of 'spinsterhood', which is particularly challenging in Libya. A national PVE strategy in Libya focuses on peacebuilding, improving respect for gender equality and human rights, providing technical assistance for democratic development, and promoting conflict resolution techniques. The strategy also seeks to address the underlying conditions that lead to the spread of violent extremism by focusing on approaches that respect human rights for all and the rule of law. A core part of the principles of developing a national PVE strategy relies on a human rights-based approach, the rule of law, and sustainable economic development to enhance community cohesion and resilience at the local level.

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 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, implemented and monitored for identified risks. OR project was 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)

Relevant management plans were developed for the identified risks through a consultative process, ensuring that stakeholders were involved in the decision-making and implementation process. These management plans were properly resourced and monitored to ensure their effective implementation. Risks were effectively managed or mitigated, indicating a proactive approach to addressing social and environmental impacts. Attached Project Document has a risk assessment section and has also been updated in ATLAS module

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 informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism and how to access it. If the project was categorized as High Risk through the SESP, a project -level grievance mechanism was in place and project affected people informed. If grievances were received, they were responded to but faced challenges in arriving at a resolution.
- 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)

Yes, grievance mechanisms were available to project-affected people, and any grievances that arose were addressed to ensure that perceived harm was effectively mitigated. The project aimed to mitigate the risks of preventing violent extremism (PVE) through the implementation of a national-level PVE framework. As part of this framework, mechanisms were put in place to receive and address grievances from individuals or communities affected by the

project. These grievance mechanisms provided a platform for project-affected people to raise concerns, provide feedback, or seek resolution for any perceived harm or negative impacts. The project team took the necessary steps to address these grievances and ensure that appropriate measures were taken to mitigate any adverse effects.

Management & Monitoring

Status: Complete

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

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

- 3: The project had a comprehensive and costed M&E plan. Baselines, targets and milestones were fully populated. Progress data against indicators in the project's RRF was reported regularly using credible data sources and collected according to the frequency stated in the Plan, including sex disaggregated data as relevant. Any evaluations conducted, if relevant, fully meet decentralized evaluation standards, including gender UNEG standards. Lessons learned, included during evaluations and/or After-Action Reviews, were used to take corrective actions when necessary. (all must be true)
- 2: The project costed M&E Plan, and most baselines and targets were populated. Progress data against indicators in the project's RRF was collected on a regular basis, although there 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)

the project's M&E (Monitoring and Evaluation) Plan was adequately implemented. The monitoring and evaluation activities outlined in the plan were carried out as intended, allowing for systematic tracking of project progress, performance, and outcomes. The plan ensured that data was collected, analyzed, and utilized to inform decision-making, measure the project's effectiveness, and make any necessary adjustments. By implementing the M&E Plan, the project was able to effectively monitor its activities and evaluate its overall impact. The final evaluation report is attached. Additionally, this joint programme is being implemented by UNDP, UNICEF and UNODC and has a M&E section. In addition, UNDP has prepared its 2022 M&E plan attached.

10. Was 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)

Yes. met on a regular basis to provide oversight, guidance, and strategic direction to the project. The board members actively participated in discussions, reviewed progress reports, and made informed decisions to ensure the project's successful implementation.

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)

Yes. All mentioned risks were monitored and effectively managed.

Efficient

Status: Complete

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

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

- Yes
- No

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

The final report attached showing all the results.

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)

Project inputs were procured and delivered on time to efficiently contribute to results. However, it is important to note that the project faced challenges that required adjustments to some timelines in order to align with the government's needs. Despite these challenges, efforts were made to ensure that the necessary inputs were procured and delivered in a timely manner, aiming to support the project's overall efficiency and the achievement of desired results. The final report attached.

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)

Yes, regular monitoring and recording of cost efficiencies were conducted, taking into account the expected quality of results. The evaluation of procurement of services was regularly conducted to ensure cost effectiveness and efficiency. This process allowed for the assessment of costs associated with various activities, services, and resources utilized in the project, while also considering the desired level of quality in the achieved results. By monitoring and

recording cost efficiencies, the project aimed to optimize resource allocation and maximize the value obtained from the project's expenditures. Also, PUNOs during planning stage have consulted with the then government authorities. Accordingly, the project document was designed and signed by the EU (donor) and PUNOs.

Effective

Status: Complete

Quality Rating: Needs Improvement

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)

During the launch of the EU funded PVE report in Tripoli, Libya, several ministries expressed objections to the report's findings, including discrimination, racism, non-issuance of IDs to certain communities, and gender equality. Despite UNDP Libya providing a written endorsement of the report, the LCTC leadership claimed they were unaware of the information and called for its removal. The planned five-day workshop was postponed until further notice. The project team attended meetings with the GoL PVE focal points to understand the unexpected reactions and inform future cooperation areas. The joint program implementation is delayed due to concerns raised by relevant ministries under the changed government. The project document was designed and signed by the EU and PUNOs, but by the time the Government of National Unity came in power, representatives of relevant ministries raised concerns. PUNOs are consulting with government partners for finalization, and activities was not implemented.

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)

Yes, regular reviews of the work plan were conducted to ensure that the project was on track to achieve the desired results. These reviews served the purpose of assessing progress, identifying any deviations or challenges, and making course corrections if necessary.

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)

Yes, the targeted groups, including marginalized, vulnerable, and those left further behind (LNOB), were systematically identified and engaged in the project. There was a priority placed on including the marginalized and excluded populations to ensure that the expected results were achieved. Moreover, in addressing the issue of preventing violent extremism (PVE), efforts were made to address women's empowerment and human rights, thereby ensuring a comprehensive approach that prioritized the needs and inclusion of these groups.

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)

Based on the project report, technology and data risks associated with the digital or data technology solution in the project have not been specifically addressed for closure or continued use by partners or UNDP. The report does not mention any specific measures taken to identify and mitigate potential risks related to technology and data.

Sustainability & National Ownership

Status: Complete

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

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

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

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

Yes, stakeholders and national partners were fully engaged in the decision-making, implementation, and monitoring of the project. The Libyan Counter Terrorism Centre (LCTC) received support from UNDP and the Dutch funded PVE project. Additionally, the EU funded Stability, Unity, and Social Cohesion – Prevention of Violent Extremism (SUSC-PVE) project supported the implementation of three pilot projects in the seven targeted municipalities. These pilot projects were spearheaded by seven local Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) such as Life Makers, Alomobadr, TAVAT

Cultural Media Foundation, Dialogue and Debate Association (DDA), Aman Organization, Libyan Centre for Democracy and Human Rights (LCDHR), and Dialogue and Debate Organization (DDO). The involvement of these stakeholders and partners indicates their active participation in decision-making, implementation, and monitoring processes throughout the project.

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

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

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

N/A

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)

Yes, the transition and phase-out arrangements were reviewed and adjusted according to the progress of the project, including financial commitment and capacity considerations. This ensured that the project's transition and phase-out were aligned with the achieved progress and the available resources. Regular assessments were conducted to evaluate the project's status and make any necessary adjustments to the transition and phase-out plans to ensure a smooth and effective conclusion of the project.