Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

Form Status: Approved	

Overall Rating:	Satisfactory
Decision:	
Portfolio/Project Number:	00105447
Portfolio/Project Title:	Resilience Building via Increased Livelihoods Opportunit
Portfolio/Project Date:	2018-04-15 / 2019-03-31

Strategic	**Quality Rating: Exemplary**

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

- ⦿ *3: The project team identified relevant changes in the external environment that may present new opportunities or threats to the project's ability to achieve its objectives, assumptions were tested to determine if the project's strategy was valid. There is some evidence that the project board considered the implications, and documented the changes needed to the project in response. (all must be true)*
- ◯ 2: The project team 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 did not fully integrate in the project. (both must be true)
- ◯ 1: The project team considered relevant changes in the external environment since implementation began, but there is no evidence that the project team considered these changes to the project as a result.

Evidence:

Due to prolonged approval period related to who to designate as implementing partner as well as delayed start of a need assessment study before procurement processes for the Şanlıurfa Technopark, there was a challenge that the project team will not be able to achieve its objectives within initially planned period. As a result, the team proactively identified relevant changes and submitted a no-cost extension request two times to extend the end date of the project to end of July 2019. Following changes and agreement between parties are well documented in the progress report as well as uploaded.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	JapanPhaseII_ProgressReport_April2019_2 18_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/Projec tQA/QAFormDocuments/JapanPhaseII_Prog ressReport_April2019_218_301.pdf)	gahhyun.uhm@undp.org	7/15/2019 10:09:00 AM
2	Extension1_CoverLetter_218_301 (https://int ranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDoc uments/Extension1_CoverLetter_218_301.p df)	gahhyun.uhm@undp.org	7/15/2019 9:58:00 AM
3	Ext2_CoverLetter_June2019_218_301 (http s://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFor mDocuments/Ext2_CoverLetter_June2019_2 18_301.pdf)	gahhyun.uhm@undp.org	7/15/2019 9:58:00 AM

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

⦿ *3: The project responded to at least one of the development settings as specified in the Strategic Plan (SP) and adopted at least one Signature Solution .The project's RRF included all the relevant SP output indicators. (all must be true)*

○ 2: The project responded to at least one of the developments settings1 as specified in the Strategic Plan. The project's RRF included at least one SP output indicator, if relevant. (both must be true)

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

Evidence:

> The project responded to 2 of the development setti ngs under the SP (poverty eradication and strengthe n resilience). Project's RRF includes the number of Syrian and host community members employed, an d enterprises receiving business development servic es which are relevant to SP output indicators (1.1.2 and 3.1.1)

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On

No documents available.

Relevant   **Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory**

3. Were the project's targeted groups systematically identified and engaged, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized, to ensure the project remained 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:

> Under the project's RRF, indicator 1.1 reflect the number of Syrian and host community members that received on the job trainings (100 persons in total). This means that the vulnerable group was continuously engaged in the implementation process to achieve the project's target. PD of Agriculture and Forestry did matching of on the job trainees with enterprises and if there was a mismatch (which was very few,3-4 cases in total) they were immediately matched with other employers. The trainees were supposed to work for at least three months (April-June 2019).
> Another input/feedback from on the job trainees was that they did not want formal employment due to fear of losing the state assistance. Hence, the project team refrained from finding them formal employment even though that was an additional goal envisaged. This also shows that the project team respected the opinions of the beneficiaries.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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:

> Knowledge and lessons learned from monitoring of the different activities (see attached doc) within the project were discussed in SC meetings and reflected in the minutes (minutes are included in the progress report). Changes were made accordingly to results, risks, and opportunities that were shared.
>
> 1.One lesson learned from the project is that even after trainings and matching, Syrians may not look for formal employment due to fear of losing the state assistance which is something UN strives under normal circumstances. Hence, formal employment issue is tied to state assistance policy which should be tackled separately if providing decent jobs for Syrians is an objective.
>
> 2. Another bottleneck of the project was getting endorsement for the preparation of a strategic plan by a university from the Ministry. Since such endorsements are sometimes sensitive, it can seriously delay project execution if the Ministry is hesitant. Another way to do it is going for an open tender where such delays can be avoided.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Ext2_SupportingDoc_ProjectActivities_May2019_218_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Ext2_SupportingDoc_ProjectActivities_May2019_218_304.pdf)	gahhyun.uhm@undp.org	7/15/2019 10:17:00 AM
2	JapanPhaseII_ProgressReport_April2019_218_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/JapanPhaseII_ProgressReport_April2019_218_304.pdf)	gahhyun.uhm@undp.org	7/18/2019 8:54:00 AM

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:

Some activities (such as use of Gazelle Innovation a
nd Entrepreneurship Program- GIGAP) under the pr
oject will be carried out even after the end date of th
e project, ensuring sustainability of the project. Gaze
lle Innovation and Research Program (GIGAP) was
developed by Şanlıurfa Teknopark. METU gave offici
al guidance to Şanlıurfa Teknopark during the projec
t for the preparation of Şanlıurfa Teknopark Strategic
Plan which will be the guiding document for the Tekn
opark in the years to come. The Teknopark has also
started getting GAP Administration Implementation o
f mentorship support and trainings and the use of GI
GAP as an incubation area for would be entreprene
urs.There will be an atelier of GIGAP where 3D print
ers, macbooks and other high technology devices ar
e refurbished for the use of entrepreneurs, it will ope
rate as a common use area.
Since the strategic plan of Şanlıurfa Technopark ma
kes an explicit reference to supporting Şanlıurfa entr
epreneurs, the project will contribute to development
change even after the project ends and at a larger s
cale than envisaged by the project targets. Attached
is the draft strategic plan of Şanlıurfa Technopark, o
nly available in Turkish.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	SanliurfaTechnopark_StrategicPlan_DraftFin al_218_305 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/P rojectQA/QAFormDocuments/SanliurfaTechn opark_StrategicPlan_DraftFinal_218_305.pd f)	gahhyun.uhm@undp.org	7/29/2019 10:14:00 AM

Principled   **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 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:

> Indicator 1.1.1 (number of Syrian and HC women employed) guaranteed that there is half proportion of women as beneficiaries of the project. In order to track progress of the project under its RRF, number of women participating in job trainings, and women entrepreneurs that have received business development services were recorded.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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:

> The project was categorized as Low risk through the SESP, as provided in the prodoc. There were only two risks identified:
> 1.There is a risk that duty-bearers do not have the capacity to meet their obligations in the Project
> 2. There is a risk that rights-holders do not have the capacity to claim their rights
> But these risks did not materialize. All the trainees were matched successfully and duty-bearers were committed to meet their obligations.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	JAPANIISESP_218_307 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/JAPANIISESP_218_307.docx)	gahhyun.uhm@undp.org	7/16/2019 10:03:00 AM

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:

> Project-affected people were not informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism and how to access it. However, the project was categorized as Low Risk through the SESP, and even so, the requests of beneficiaries were evaluated and an effective remedy was sought.
> Service buses were provided to participants of training sessions, as there were requests from participants who were slate due to transportation issues.
> Mismatch issues between job seekers of on-the-job training were also addressed and new jobs were provided.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Management & Monitoring   **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:

> The project had costed M&E plan, with baselines and targets populated. Progress data against indicators in RRF was collected on a regular basis to track progress and make changes according to the progress. An evulation has yet been conducted.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

---

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:

The Project Steering Committee includes UNDP, MFAL, MoD, Embassy of Japan and partnering UN Agencies.The LPAC meeting, Steering Committee meeting took place and the minutes of the meetings are recorded in the progress report that was prepared and submitted this year. In addition, joint meetings were held with MoIT and KOSGEB to share information regarding progress, and discussions have been used as basis for management decisions.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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:

The risk log was not updated.

Management Response:

Risk log was not updated since this was a low risk project and the team did not encounter big changes through project execution.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Efficient   **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:

> 800,000 USD of total resources required to achieve intended results have been allocated to UNDP by the Government of Japan.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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:

> The project has kept updated its procurement plan. When the approval process of the project document was prolonged, UNDP submitted a three month no-cost extension to ensure implementation and procurement within proposed term. In addition, the needs assessment study prior to procurement of equipments to Şanlıurfa Technopark was delayed, so the team requested for an additional one month no-cost extension to make sure procurement processes are finalized before July 2019.

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

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:

> The project continued to add on to the progress made under Japan Phase I. Coordination among similar project that is funded by the EU (component 1 of TRP) that is going on within the Syrian Resilience Portfolio took place. The procurement team of MADAD project also worked for this project. One IC of MADAD was also used for this project to develop ToR of Incubation Center. Also UNDP's role as leading coordinator of the Livelihood sector under 3RP ensured efficient data management and establishing linkages with other partners. UNDP project team executed several meetings with ILO and required employment expenses of Syrians was be covered within the scope of ILO's "Opportunities for Lives Project".

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Effective   **Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

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

◉ *Yes*
○ No

Evidence:

> The prolonged approval process and the completion of the need assessment study prior to procurement to Şanlıurfa Technopark, was compensated by the 4 months no-cost extension that was approved by the Government of Japan, and all targets under the two outputs were met within term of the project.
> The project has reached all its targets under RRF, which will be reflected in the final report that is in preparation (as project ends July 2019), and some activities (such as use of Gazelle Innovation and Entrepreneurship Program) under the project will be carried out even after the end date of the project, ensuring sustainability of the project.The project exceeded its target of reaching 20 entrepreneurs and reached almost 60 entrepreneurs. Mentorship to enterprises support exceeded expectations (20 targeted, 30 reached). On the job trainees also reached the estimated target of 100.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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:

> Uploaded work plans show the work plan has been updated twice, to ensure outputs were delivered on time.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Extension1_Attachment3_218_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Extension1_Attachment3_218_316.pdf)	gahhyun.uhm@undp.org	7/15/2019 12:29:00 PM
2	Ext2_Project_Implementation_Plan_GanttChart_218_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Ext2_Project_Implementation_Plan_GanttChart_218_316.pdf)	gahhyun.uhm@undp.org	7/15/2019 12:29:00 PM

17. Were the targeted groups 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:

> Şanlıurfa Technopark is the main institutional benefi
> ciary of the project. Also, firms and entrepreneurs ar
> e among the main beneficiaries. Although Syrian an
> d Turkish men and women are the eventual benefici
> aries, there is no evidence to confirm that project be
> neficiaries are populations that have capacity needs
> or are deprived from development opportunities. As
> some infrastructures and programs created under th
> e project will be sustained after the project timeline,
> services such as business development services, wil
> l have potential to reach a broader group of entrepre
> neurs, Syrians and host community members in a lo
> ng run.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Sustainability & National Ownership   Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory

18. 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:

> National stakeholders including the Ministry of Agric
> ulture and Forestry (MoAF), Şanlıurfa Technopark a
> nd METU Technopark were actively engaged in impl
> ementation of the activities under the project. As me
> mber of PSC, MoAF and GoJ had a role in project d
> ecision making, as evidenced in the SC meeting min
> utes in the progress report.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

19. Were there regular monitoring of changes in capacities and performance of institutions and systems relevant to the project, as needed, and were the implementation arrangements[8] 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 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:

> No micro-assessment was needed for this project.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

20. 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:

The project's sustainability plan were reviewed during the LPAC and Steering Committee meeting. Some activities (such as use of Gazelle Innovation and Entrepreneurship Program- GIGAP) under the project will be carried out even after the end date of the project, ensuring sustainability of the project. An Incubation programme named Gazelle Innovation and Research Program (GIGAP) was developed by Şanlıurfa Teknopark. METU gave official guidance to Şanlıurfa Teknopark during the project for the preparation of Şanlıurfa Teknopark Strategic Plan which will be the guiding document for the Teknopark in the years to come. The Teknopark has also started getting GAP Administration Implementation of mentorship support and trainings and the use of GIGAP as an incubation area for would be entrepreneurs.There will be an atelier of GIGAP where 3D printers, macbooks and other high technology devices are refurbished for the use of entrepreneurs, it will operate as a common use area.
Since the strategic plan of Şanlıurfa Teknopark makes an explicit reference to supporting Şanlıurfa entrepreneurs, the project will contribute to development change even after the project ends and at a larger scale than envisaged by the project targets.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments