

# Implementation Stage Quality Assurance Report

---

**Form Status: Approved**

<b>Overall Rating:</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<b>Decision:</b>	Continue as planned: The project is of sufficient quality to continue as planned. All management actions must be addressed in a timely manner.
<b>Portfolio/Project Number:</b>	00129871
<b>Portfolio/Project Title:</b>	Lake Sevan ecosystem - EU4Sevan
<b>Portfolio/Project Date:</b>	2020-09-10 / 2024-10-01

**Strategic****Quality Rating: Exemplary**

1. Is the project pro-actively identifying changes to the external environment and incorporating 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:**

During the 1st year of implementation, Output 5.4 of the Project was revised based on a request from an d discussions with the Ministry of Environment and i n consultation with the EU Delegation and submitted to EU for formal approval. Formal approval was received from the EU in late September 2021.

Initially, this request came to consider the assessment of the Sotk mining abandoned tail. However, considering the recent geo-political situation and the security issues related to reaching and working at the area of the Sotk mining site, alternative actions were suggested by the MoEnv - to support with cleaning of the Lake's flooded areas to mitigate water pollution and with the planning of forest rehabilitation activities. Details of the Output were discussed and agreed with the Ministry and the EUD. The total budget envisaged for this sub-output is unchanged.

Official approval of this change was received from the donor in September 2021. Project Document revision is under way.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Addendum1toContributionAgreementsigned_12844_201">Addendum1toConrtibutionAgreemementsigned_12844_201</a> (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Addendum1toConrtibutionAgreemementsigned_12844_201.pdf)	lusine.sargsyan@undp.org	5/4/2022 2:46:00 PM

2. Is the project aligned with the UNDP Strategic Plan?

- 3: The project responds at least one of the [development settings](#)<sup>3</sup> as specified in the Strategic Plan (SP) and adopts at least one [Signature Solution](#)<sup>4</sup> 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<sup>1</sup> 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:**

The project address structural transformation for sustainable development aspects through introduction of new systemic approach in basin planning and management. Gender-responsive legal and regulatory frameworks, policies and institutions will be strengthened, sustainable solutions demonstrated to address conservation, sustainable use and equitable benefit sharing of natural resources.

The action is fully in line with Armenia Development Strategy 2014-2025 adopted in March 2014 and currently under revision, which highlights numerous measures to reduce the pollution of water resources. In September 2015, the Government of Armenia signed on to Agenda 2030 and its 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDG). This intervention contributes primarily to the progressive achievement of Sustainable Development Goal 6: Clean water and sanitation. It also supports achieving SDGs 15 (Life on land), 13 (Climate protection), as well as SDG 1 (Poverty reduction), and takes account of interactions between the various dimensions and/or SDG sub-targets.

Project results are in line with UNDAF Outcome 5 “Ecosystems are managed sustainably, and people benefit from participatory and resilient development and climate-smart solutions,” as well as fit to CPD Output 2.3 “Improved national and local governments capacities to introduce environmentally sound management practices for ecosystems, waste, and chemicals.”

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

**Relevant**

**Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

3. Are the project’s targeted groups being systematically engaged, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized, to ensure the project remains relevant for them?

- 3: Systematic and structured feedback has been collected over the past two years 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 are 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 have been engaged in implementation and monitoring, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized. Beneficiary feedback, which may be anecdotal, has been collected over the past year to ensure the project is addressing local priorities. This information has been used to inform project decision making. (all must be true)
- 1: Some beneficiary feedback may have been collected over the past year, but this information has not been used to inform project decision making. This option is also selected if no beneficiary feedback has been collected.
- Not Applicable

**Evidence:**

See ProDoc page 5, para 15 and p 11, para 43. Regular consultations are held with different stakeholder groups during different processes. Stakeholder mapping is also reviewed for each process, to ensure respective stakeholders consideration.

<b>List of Uploaded Documents</b>			
#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Prodoc_EU4SEVAN_UNDP_Final_Signed_12844_203 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Prodoc_EU4SEVAN_UNDP_Final_Signed_12844_203.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Prodoc_EU4SEVAN_UNDP_Final_Signed_12844_203.pdf</a> )	lusine.sargsyan@undp.org	5/4/2022 3:03:00 PM

4. Is the project generating 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 have been 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, have been 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 have been collected by the project team. There is little or no evidence that this has informed project decision making.

**Evidence:**

The project conducts active stakeholder consultation s and discussions with the beneficiaries. The monitoring mechanisms of the project allow to document the knowledge and lessons learned throughout implementation, which are incorporated in the progress reports and inform the project implementation. See Project Monitoring report attached. Also see ProDoc p p 9-10, paras 39-41.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	COMONITORINGREPORTEU4Sevan2021-final_12844_204 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/COMONITORINGREPORTEU4Sevan2021-final_12844_204.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/COMONITORINGREPORTEU4Sevan2021-final_12844_204.pdf</a> )	lusine.sargsyan@undp.org	5/4/2022 2:58:00 PM

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

- 3: There is credible evidence that the project is reaching a 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 is currently not 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 is not at scale, and there are no plans currently to scale up the project in the future.

**Evidence:**

UNDP is currently carrying out the PPG stage of a prospective project on Lake Sevan funded by GEF the main objective of which will be Conservation and sustainable management of land resources and high value ecosystems in the Lake Sevan basin for multiple benefits. It will build upon the results of the EU4 Sevan Project and recommendations for policy and institutional amendments to improve the enabling environment for Lake Sevan management. The proposed project will coordinate its efforts with EU4Sevan project, and will support the implementation of the Management Plan for Sevan National Park that is currently being developed by EU4Sevan. The proposed GEF project will support Sevan National Park’s capacities for the implementation of the Park’s management plan and with the promotion of biodiversity friendly agriculture practices and alternative livelihoods in the PAs buffer zones.

It will also build on the results of the EU4Sevan project and coordinate with the UNDP and GIZ to assess if there are any information gaps that needs to be bridged in terms of additional inventories of key species and habitats and support to promote sustainable biodiversity use in the buffer areas.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
---	-----------	-------------	-------------

No documents available.

**Principled**

**Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory**

6. Are the project’s measures (through outputs, activities, indicators) to address gender inequalities and empower women relevant and producing the intended effect? If not, evidence-based adjustments and changes have been 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 has 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 has 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:**

See Monitoring report, pp 7-8, and ProDoc p 5 and p 10.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

7. Are social and environmental impacts and risks being successfully managed and monitored?

- 3: *Social and environmental risks are tracked in the risk log. Appropriate assessments conducted where required (i.e., Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) for Substantial and 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 has been a substantive change to the project or change in context that affects risk levels, the SESP is updated to reflect these changes. (all must be true)*
- 2: Social and environmental risks are tracked in the risk log. Appropriate assessments conducted where required (i.e., Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) for Substantial and 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 is categorized as Low risk through the SESP.
- 1: Social and environmental risks have not been tracked in the risk log. For projects categorized as High, Substantial, and Moderate Risk there is no evidence that social and environmental assessments have been completed and/or management plans or measures development, implemented or monitored. There have been substantive changes to the project or changes in the context but SESP has not been updated. (any may be true)



**Evidence:**

Project is categorized as Low risk through the SES  
P. SESP is attached.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	SESP_finalesigned_12844_207 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SESP_finalesigned_12844_207.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SESP_finalesigned_12844_207.pdf</a> )	lusine.sargsyan@undp.org	5/5/2022 8:11:00 AM

8. Are grievance mechanisms available to project-affected people and are grievances (if any) addressed to ensure any perceived harm is effectively mitigated?

- 3: Project-affected people have been actively informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism (SRM/SECU) and how to access it. If the project is categorized as High, Substantial, or Moderate Risk through the SESP, a project-level grievance mechanism is in place and project affected people informed. If grievances have been received, they are 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 Substantial or 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.*
- 1: Project-affected people not informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism. If grievances have been received they are not responded to. (any may be true)

**Evidence:**

The project stakeholders have been informed about grievance mechanisms. By the regular consultations and written feedbacks on shared plans and outputs, they have possibility to address any grievance. Procedure for handling the grievances will be set up upon necessity. So far, the project has not faced any social and environmental issues or grievances through the project implementation.

### List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

### Management & Monitoring

Quality Rating: **Exemplary**

9. Is the project's M&E Plan sufficient and adequately implemented?

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

#### Evidence:

The project has a Monitoring and evaluation plan, as well as a Results Framework. The required monitoring actions are conducted in the M&E plan. A primary tool of M&E is the use of Monitoring reports which are formulated every year, as well as annual donor reports. Lessons learned are used to take corrective actions when necessary. RRF baselines, targets and milestones are fully populated, and progress is tracked. For evidence please see the RRF in ProDoc pp14-16 and the M&E plan in the ProDoc, pp 17-18.

List of Uploaded Documents			
#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

10. Is project’s governance mechanism (i.e., the project board or equivalent) functioning as intended?

- 3: *The project’s governance mechanism is operating well, and is a model for other projects. It has met in the agreed frequency stated in the project document and the minutes of the meetings are on file. There is 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 reviews and uses 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 has met in the agreed frequency and the minutes of the meeting are on file. A project progress report has been submitted to the project board or equivalent at least once in the past year, covering results, risks and opportunities. (both must be true to select this option)
- 1: The project’s governance mechanism has not met in the frequency stated in the project document over the past year and/or the project board or equivalent is not functioning as a decision-making body for the project as intended.

**Evidence:**

The project’s governance mechanism operates smoothly. Regular board meetings are held as required (twice a year). Due to the COVID-19 pandemic meetings were held mainly via Zoom in 2021. For evidence please see the project board minutes attached.

List of Uploaded Documents			
#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/EU4Sevan-MeetingMinutes-23February2021_12844_210.pdf">EU4Sevan-MeetingMinutes-23February2021_12844_210 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/EU4Sevan-MeetingMinutes-23February2021_12844_210.pdf)</a>	lusine.sargsyan@undp.org	5/5/2022 8:32:00 AM
2	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SCM_Minutes_EU4Sevan12-2021_12844_210.pdf">SCM_Minutes_EU4Sevan12-2021_12844_210 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SCM_Minutes_EU4Sevan12-2021_12844_210.pdf)</a>	lusine.sargsyan@undp.org	5/5/2022 8:32:00 AM

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

- 3: *The project has actively monitored risks every quarter including consulting with key stakeholders, including security advisors, to identify continuing and emerging risks and to assess if the main assumptions remain valid. There is clear evidence that relevant management plans and mitigating measures are being fully implemented to address each key project risk, and have been updated to reflect the latest risk assessment. (all must be true)*
- 2: The project has monitored risks every year, as evidenced by an updated risk log. Some updates have been made to management plans and mitigation measures.
- 1: The risk log has not been updated as required. There may be some evidence that the project has monitored risks (including security risks or incidents) that may affect the project’s achievement of results, but there is no explicit evidence that management actions have been taken to mitigate risks. In the case of a deteriorating security environment, no consultation has occurred with the UNDP Security Office on appropriate measures.

**Evidence:**

Risks to the project are monitored on a quarterly basis, and managed according to the project risk management framework. For evidence, please see the updated risk log in the SPR and in ATLAS.

<b>List of Uploaded Documents</b>			
#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

**Efficient**

**Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory**

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

- Yes
- No

**Evidence:**

The project was launched with all the resources adequately mobilized to achieve the results in the RRF.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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

- 3: The project has an updated procurement plan. Implementation of the plan is on or ahead of schedule. The project quarterly reviews operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addresses them through appropriate management actions. (all must be true)
- 2: *The project has an updated procurement plan. The project annually reviews operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addresses them through appropriate management actions. (all must be true)*
- 1: The project does not have an updated procurement plan. The project may or may not have reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner, however management actions have not been taken to address them.

**Evidence:**

The project has a regularly updated procurement plan. The overall implementation of the plan is on track. Bottlenecks are reviewed regularly and senior management is kept informed in order to take corrective action.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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

- 3: *There is evidence that the project regularly reviews costs against relevant comparators (e.g., other projects or country offices) or industry benchmarks to ensure the project maximizes results that can be delivered with given resources. The project actively coordinates with other relevant ongoing projects and initiatives (UNDP or other) to ensure complementarity and seek efficiencies wherever possible (e.g. joint activities.) (both must be true)*
- 2: The project monitors its own costs and gives anecdotal examples of cost efficiencies (e.g., spending less to get the same result,) but there is no systematic analysis of costs and no link to the expected quality of results delivered. The project coordinates activities with other projects to achieve cost efficiency gains.
- 1: There is little or no evidence that the project monitors its own costs and is considering ways to save money beyond following standard procurement rules.

**Evidence:**

The project applies the rules and regulations of competitive procurement for supplying all the goods and services required for project implementation. Each offer is analyzed against the available market price locally and internationally. Joint monitoring missions with the project co-implementer (GIZ) are organized to increase effectiveness. Wider engagement of local consultants and contractual services is ensured at the extent possible to reduce service and transaction cost. The project also synergizes the efforts with other UNDP Development projects, in order to minimize costs (such as joint assessment of assessment of incentives for secondary water use, with NAP project).

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

**Effective**

**Quality Rating: Exemplary**

15. Is the project is on track to deliver its expected outputs?

- Yes
- No

**Evidence:**

The Project is on track and has so far delivered all the outputs planned for the past 1.5 years. In some cases, the Project has achieved and surpassed the plan (for evidence, please see the 2021 Monitoring report).

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

16. Have there been regular reviews of the work plan to ensure that the project is on track to achieve the desired results, and to inform course corrections if needed?

- 3: *Quarterly progress data has informed regular reviews of the project work plan to ensure that the activities implemented are most likely to achieve the desired results. There is evidence that data and lessons learned (including from evaluations and/or After Action Reviews) have been used to inform course corrections, as needed. Any necessary budget revisions have been made. (both must be true)*
- 2: There has been at least one review of the work plan per year to assess if project activities are on track to achieving the desired development results (i.e., outputs.) There may or may not be evidence that data or lessons learned has been 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 are delivered on time, no link has been made to the delivery of desired development results. Select this option also if no review of the work plan by management has taken place over the past year.

**Evidence:**

Reference to the annual work plan 2021.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/EU4Sevan00123402Multi-yearbudget_12844_216.pdf">EU4Sevan00123402Multi-yearbudget_12844_216 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/EU4Sevan00123402Multi-yearbudget_12844_216.pdf)</a>	lusine.sargsyan@undp.org	5/5/2022 8:53:00 AM

17. Are targeted groups being systematically identified and engaged, prioritizing the marginalized and excluded, to ensure results are achieved as expected?

- 3: *The project is targeting 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 are being reached as intended. The project has engaged regularly with targeted groups over the past year to assess whether they are benefiting as expected and adjustments were made if necessary to refine targeting. (all must be true)*
- 2: The project is targeting 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 has been some engagement with beneficiaries in the past year to assess whether they are benefiting as expected. (all must be true)
- 1: The project does not report on specific targeted groups. There is no evidence to confirm that project beneficiaries are deprived and/or excluded from development opportunities relevant to the project area of work. There may have been some engagement with beneficiaries to assess whether they are benefiting as expected, but it has been limited or has not occurred in the past year.
- Not Applicable

**Evidence:**

The project targets the specific zone of Lake Sevan and its basin, contributing to the improvement of the governance of the Lake ecosystem. Lake Sevan issues directly impact local economic development; thus, improvement of the governance framework will have a positive impact on low-income communities. Regular consultations are held with different stakeholder groups during different processes. Stakeholder mapping is also reviewed for each process, to ensure full participation.

<b>List of Uploaded Documents</b>			
#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

**Sustainability & National Ownership**

**Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

18. Are 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.) are used to fully implement and monitor the project. All relevant stakeholders and partners are 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.) are used to implement and monitor the project, but other support (such as country office support or project systems) may also be used if necessary. All relevant stakeholders and partners are fully and actively engaged in the process, playing an active role in project decision-making, implementation and monitoring. (both must be true)
- 1: There is relatively limited or no engagement with national stakeholders and partners in the decision-making, implementation and/or monitoring of the project.
- Not Applicable

**Evidence:**

National partners and stakeholders are engaged in all the levels of project planning and implementation. The main involved partners of the project are the Ministry of Environment, Ministry of Economy, Ministry of Territorial Administration and Infrastructure, representatives of which are included in the Project Steering Committee. Representatives of the Governor's office are also included in the PSC. For evidence, see page 23 of the Project Document, as well as Minutes of the 2 previous PSC meetings.

The line Ministries as well as the Governor's office, the local self-government bodies of the target areas, and the Sevan national park SCNO, actively participate in project implementation, receive project plans, and provide feedback.

<b>List of Uploaded Documents</b>			
#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

19. There is regular monitoring of changes in capacities and performance of institutions and systems relevant to the project, as needed. The [implementation arrangements](#)<sup>5</sup> have been adjusted according to changes in partner capacities.

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

**Evidence:**

Monitoring is conducted regularly according to the project document. The project team is dealing with political instability and ongoing changes in the relevant national institutions and adapting to the changes as required.

<b>List of Uploaded Documents</b>			
#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

20. The transition and phase-out arrangements are reviewed regularly and adjusted according to progress (including financial commitments and capacity).

- 3: The project’s governance mechanism has reviewed the project’s sustainability plan, including arrangements for transition and phase-out, to ensure the project is on track in meeting the requirements set out by the plan. The plan has been adjusted according to progress as needed. (both must be true)
- 2: *There has been a review of the project’s sustainability plan, including arrangements for transition and phase-out, to ensure the project is on track in meeting the requirements set out by the plan.*
- 1: The project may have a sustainability plan, but there has not been a review of this strategy since it was developed. Also select this option if the project does not have a sustainability strategy.

**Evidence:**

The phase out arrangements will be discussed during the Project Steering Committee and the Final Workshop.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

**QA Summary/Project Board Comments**

The Project is in line with Armenia Development Strategy 2014-2025 and responds to the urgent needs of the country. Contributing to Outcome (UNDAF/CPD 5/2): Ecosystems are managed sustainably, and people benefit from participatory and resilient development and climate-smart solutions. The Project interventions contribute primarily to the progressive achievement of Sustainable Development Goal 6: Clean water and sanitation. It also supports achieving SDGs 15 (Life on land), 13 (Climate protection), as well as SDG 1 (Poverty reduction), and takes into account the interactions between various dimensions and/or SDG sub-targets.

The Project implementation is on track and has so far delivered all the outputs planned for the past 1.5 years, although its execution started with a delay for a revision. During the first year of the implementation, Output 4 of the Project was revised based on a request from and discussions with the Ministry of Environment and in consultation with the EU Delegation. Formal approval was received from the EU in late September 2021.

The Monitoring and Evaluation plan and the Results Framework are in place, with the Procurement Plan updated regularly. The Project has a Steering Board that meets twice a year, and an Advisory Board consisting of experts that meets per demand. Close coordination and cooperation with respective partners and stakeholders ensure communicating the results of the project on a regular basis.