ASM-06597 - Quality Assurance - Closure

Procedure Year: 2023

Overall Project Risk Categorization: Satisfactory

Procedure Status: Approved

Procedure Name: ASM-06597

Procedure Department: HQ - Reg Centre - Istanbul

Procedure Type: Closure

Record Owner: Rayza Oblitas

Created by: Rayza Oblitas,4/18/2024, 6:10 AM

Last Modified by: Abusabeeb Elsadig,4/25/2024, 10:44 PM

Decision:

QA Summary/Project Board Comments:

RELATED PROJECTS(4)

NAME	DEPARTMENT	STATUS	ATLAS PROJECT NUMBER	START DATE	END DATE
00117911	HQ - Reg Centre - Istanbul	On Going	00119164	5/15/2019	12/31/2023
00118444	HQ - Reg Centre - Istanbul	On Going	00119164	5/15/2019	12/31/2023
00115706	HQ - Reg Centre - Istanbul	On Going	00119164	5/15/2019	12/31/2023
00117910	HQ - Reg Centre - Istanbul	On Going	00119164	5/15/2019	12/31/2023

Approval History

Approval Date: Fri Apr 26 00:00:00 GMT 2024

Approved By: Abusabeeb Elsadig <abusabeeb.elsadig@undp.org>

Reassess Closed Procedure History:

APPROVAL HISTORY

STEP NAME	DATE	STATUS	ASSIGNED TO
Submitted for Approval	2024-04-25 22:44:22	Approved	Abusabeeb Elsadig
Approval Request Submitted	2024-04-25 08:05:12	Started	Stanislav Kim

QA Questionnaire:

Strategic Status: Complete Quality Rating: Satisfactory

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

○ 3: The project team has identified relevant changes in the external environment that may present new opportunities or threats to the project's ability to achieve its objectives and the assumptions have been tested to determine if the project's strategy is still valid. There is evidence that the project board has considered the implications, and documented any changes needed to the project in response. (all must be true)

◉ 2: The project team has identified relevant changes in the external environment that may present new opportunities or threats to the project's ability to achieve its objectives. There is some evidence that the project board discussed this, but relevant changes may not have been fully integrated in the project. (both must be true)

1: The project team may have considered relevant changes in the external environment since implementation began, but there is no evidence that the project team has considered changes to the project as a result.

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

The project closely engaged with uranium communities, national partners and international community on the uranium remediation related regional initiatives, platforms, programmes and projects in Central Asia, implemented by UNECE, IAEA, WISUTEC, and EBRD. New opportunities have been incorporated into the project strategy, resulting in ongoing discussions with the European Commission and national governments regarding the next phase of the project which highlights a crucial aspect of its sustainability. The project regularly updated its risk and mitigation measures as outlined in the final report, Section 7.

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

3: The project responds at least one of the development settings as specified in the Strategic Plan (SP) and adopts at least one Signature Solution and the project's RRF includes at all the relevant SP output indicators. (all must be true)

2: The project responds to one of the three areas of development work as specified in the Strategic Plan. The project's RRF includes at least one SP output indicator, if relevant. (both must be true)

1: While the project may respond to a partner's identified need, this need falls outside the UNDP Strategic Plan. Also select this option if none of the relevant SP indicators are included in the RRF.

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

The project contributed significantly to the implementation of UNDP IRH RPD (Regional programme document) Outcome 3. “Building resilience to shocks and crises through enhanced prevention and risk-informed development” or more specifically to RP Output 3.1. “Evidence-based assessment and innovative planning tools and capacities developed regionally for use by countries to enable implementation of gender-sensitive, risk-informed prevention and preparedness to limit the impact of natural hazards, pandemics and conflict”. Activities under the project Outcome 1 and Outcome 2 contributed to the strengthening of local authorities and local population capacity and equipped them with the tools and knowledge on how to be involved in the process of uranium waste management. Activities under the project Outcome 3 served to set up the local measures that would help local communities develop alternative livelihoods and reduce the likelihood of exposure to contaminated toxic materials. Please refer to the attached report, section 2.

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)

The project included a profound consultation with national and local stakeholders and beneficiaries to ensure that most vulnerable and marginalized communities have access to project benefits. These measures have been devised through participatory approaches and multi-stakeholder consultations in beneficiary countries (led by the respective COs), targeted groups being systematically engaged in the project implementation. For example, the project closely worked with the Public Environment Information Centers (PEICs) and national decision-makers, focusing on stakeholder engagement for mitigating risk from uranium legacy sites in the pilot countries. Throughout the project, 132 consultations were organized focusing on radioactive safety with participation of the local population from MinKush, Shekaftar and MailuuSuu (in Kyrgyzstan), Istiqlol and Goziyon (in Tajikistan) and Yangiabad and Charkesar (in Uzbekistan), including active participation of the managers of PEICs and local NGOs. As a result of these consultations, more than 2,500 people were informed about radioactive safety measures, public access to environmental information and planned remediation works in the legacy sites. Please refer to the attached report for details across output activities.

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)

Over the course of implementation, the project actively collected lessons learned by engaging UNDP COs, OSCE as well as government partners through various consultations, working-level and high-level meetings. Key lessons learned were outlined in the final report, section 8.

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

( ) 3: There was credible evidence that the project reached sufficient number of beneficiaries (either directly through significant coverage of target groups, or indirectly, through policy change) to meaningfully contribute to development change.

(●) 2: While the project was not considered at scale, there are explicit plans in place to scale up the project in the future (e.g. by extending its coverage or using project results to advocate for policy change).

( ) 1: The project was not at scale, and there are no plans to scale up the project in the future.

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

The project's commitment to sustainability is actualized through development of a new phase (Phase 3) which is yet to be signed by the EC. Please refer to the section 4 of the attached report.

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 supported efforts to address gender inequalities in the region, ensuring both women and men would benefit from the initiatives planned for implementation in the pilot areas. In Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan, special attention was given to gender mainstreaming during the selection of pilot business projects, aiming to empower women, enhance their skills, and create job opportunities in these regions. Additionally, community engagement activities were inclusive of all groups, including the most vulnerable such as women, the elderly, youth, and people with disabilities. Please refer to the section 5 of the attached report.

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)

The project was categorized as low risk, an no issues encountered regarding SES. Please refer to the attached SESP.

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)

The project was rated as low risk, and no issues encountered. Please refer to the attached SESP.

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

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

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

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

The project followed the M&E plan and the donor's reporting requirements. The M&E plan was implemented adequately. Progress results were tracked on a regular basis, and risks were monitored through corporate tools, while undertaking regular coordination calls between the beneficiary countries. Please refer to the annex 1 of the attached report.

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)

The project’s governance mechanism - Regional project Board – was functioning sufficiently during the project implementation. The regional project board demonstrated a strong ownership over the project; it explicitly reviewed and used project reports and progress data as a basis for informing management decisions (e.g., changes in implementation approach, work plan, extension, etc.). Please refer to the attached report for details.

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

- 3: The project monitored risks every quarter and consulted with the key stakeholders, security advisors, to identify continuing and emerging risks to assess if the main assumptions remained valid. There is clear evidence that relevant management plans and mitigating measures were fully implemented to address each key project risk and were updated to reflect the latest risk assessment. (all must be true)
- 2: The project monitored risks every year, as evidenced by an updated risk log. Some updates were made to management plans and mitigation measures.

1: The risk log was not updated as required. There was may be some evidence that the project monitored risks that may affected the project's achievement of results, but there is no explicit evidence that management actions were taken to mitigate risks.

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

The project regularly monitored risks every year and activated counteractive measures as clearly outlined in the final project report (Section 7).

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)

Resources allocated for the project implementation are sufficient to achieve all the targets as originally planned. Please refer to the annex 2 of the attached report for an overview of the achieved 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)

The project had a procurement plan for procurement activities managed by IRH. However, the majority of activities were delivered directly by the beneficiary COs and thus the COs were responsible for managing procurement plans for activities "owned" by them.

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)

The project was designed and managed in a way to maximize cost efficiency especially while implementing socio-economic pilot projects. To maximize impact in the pilot communities, the project ensured to identify the most cost-effective and practical socio-economic pilot interventions, in consultation with the project partners. Please refer to the results under output 3 of the attached report especially for 3.1.3.

Effective | Status: Complete | Quality Rating: Satisfactory

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

Yes
No

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

The project was on track and delivered on its expected outputs as per the ProDoc. Please refer to the annex 2 of the attached report.

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)

There were regular reviews of the AWPs and necessary revisions introduced to achieve indicators of the projects. Decisions on substantive or strategic matters were submitted to the Board within the implementation. Please refer to the annex 1 of the attached report, especially the section for project board.

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 project continuously engaged with intended beneficiary groups, including uranium communities, to assess their needs and identify appropriate socio-economic pilot projects. This ensured the development of positive impacts on the ground, improving livelihoods. Please refer to the project's output results/activities in the attached report.

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 majority of activities were delivered directly by the beneficiary COs for implementing socio-economic pilot projects. Therefore, COs followed and applied relevant corporate practices to address technology or data risks while selecting pilots. However, it is important to note that digital or technological data solutions/markers were not part of the ProDoc requirements. Please refer to the attached Prodoc and the addendum #2 for the extended period.

Sustainability & National Ownership Status: Complete Quality Rating: Satisfactory

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

- 3: Only national systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) were used to fully implement and monitor the project. All relevant stakeholders and partners were fully and actively engaged in the process, playing a lead role in project decision-making, implementation and monitoring. (both must be true)

(●) 2: National systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) were used to implement and monitor the project (such as country office support or project systems) were also used, if necessary. All relevant stakeholders and partners were actively engaged in the process, playing an active role in project decision-making, implementation and monitoring. (both must be true)

( ) 1: There was relatively limited or no engagement with national stakeholders and partners in the decision-making, implementation and/or monitoring of the project.

( ) Not Applicable

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

National stakeholders were fully involved in the project implementation. The project was executed by IRH through DIM modality. Please refer to the attached Prodoc and the addendum #2 for the extended period.

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. DIM project. Please refer to the attached Prodoc and the addendum #2 for the extended period.

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 ongoing discussions with the European Commission and national governments regarding the next phase of the project highlight a crucial aspect of its sustainability. This continuation underscores the project's commitment to long-term sustainability, ensuring that efforts to address the legacy of uranium mining in Central Asia remain durable, effective, and beneficial to the environment, while bringing social and economic benefits to the communities involved. The new phase (Phase 3) will build on the outcomes and impacts of the preceding two phases, moving away from ad-hoc capacity building activities towards establishing and strengthening an institutional base for long-term ownership of ULSs in the three participating countries, which will contribute to the sustainability of project results. UNDP team is at the stage of developing ProDoc for the new phase. Please refer to the section 4 of the attached report.