

Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

Form Status: Approved

Overall Rating:	Highly Satisfactory
Decision:	
Portfolio/Project Number:	00104894
Portfolio/Project Title:	Climate Change Education and Awareness - Climate Box
Portfolio/Project Date:	2017-09-01 / 2021-12-31

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:

The project team identified and reacted on the changes (both positive and negative) in the external environment, the new opportunities and challenges. For example, in 2019 the project mobilized additional resources from the RF TFD and expanded its outreach activities: produced Climate Box toolkits in Arabic, French and Spanish languages; developed new enhanced interactive learning web portal. In response to the recommendations shared during the regional education conferences, the project developed teachers' training module. During the project implementation, two new countries have joined the Climate Box community (Belarus and Serbia); Climate Box materials have been shared with a similar project in Turkey. In 2020, the project had to adapt to the new working environment due to COVID-19 pandemic. Most of the face to face national and regional events had to be cancelled and the project adapted by moving towards virtual activities, rescheduling some of the activities, focusing on the development of the web-portal. The Project Boards duly considered and approved proposed adjustments and project extension.

List of Uploaded Documents			
#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	MinutesProjectBoardClimateBox-Aug2018_8152_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MinutesProjectBoardClimateBox-Aug2018_8152_301.docx)	nataly.olofinskaya@undp.org	6/1/2021 10:37:00 PM
2	Minutes3ProjectBoardClimateBox-Aug2020_QA18820.docx_8152_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Minutes3ProjectBoardClimateBox-Aug2020_QA18820.docx_8152_301.pdf)	nataly.olofinskaya@undp.org	6/1/2021 10:38:00 PM
3	MinutesadhocProjectBoardreviewClimateBox-Jan2021.docx_8152_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MinutesadhocProjectBoardreviewClimateBox-Jan2021.docx_8152_301.pdf)	nataly.olofinskaya@undp.org	6/1/2021 10:39:00 PM
4	MinutesoftheVirtualProjectBoardReviewClimateBox9-16July2019_8152_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MinutesoftheVirtualProjectBoardReviewClimateBox9-16July2019_8152_301.pdf)	nataly.olofinskaya@undp.org	6/1/2021 10:41:00 PM

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 responds to, and supports efforts under Signature Solution 3 (Enhance national prevention and recovery capacities for resilient societies) and Outcome 1: Growth and development are inclusive and sustainable, incorporating productive capacities that create employment and livelihoods for the poor and excluded. And the project results contribute to the Outputs 1.4 (Scaled up action on climate change adaptation and mitigation across sectors funded and implemented) and 1.5 (Inclusive and sustainable solutions adopted to achieve increased energy efficiency and universal modern energy access)

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Projectdocument_RegionalClimateBoxafterLPACforsignatureAug2017_8152_302 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Projectdocument_RegionalClimateBoxafterLPACforsignatureAug2017_8152_302.doc)	nataly.olofinskaya@undp.org	6/1/2021 10:46:00 PM

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:

The project is targeted at children and youth by enhancing their knowledge on climate change issues and empowering the young people for action on climate change adaptation and mitigation.

Geographically, the project targets 8 countries in the ECIS region. The project is continuously receptive of main beneficiaries' feedback. Stakeholders' engagement was key for achieving the

expected results, as embedded in the project document. Primary stakeholders include: 1) school children and youth; 2) educational, awareness raising and youth organisations and their staff (teachers, educators (methodists), principals, education specialists, university and college professors) in urban and rural areas; 3) national government agencies responsible for education, youth and environment/climate change issues; 4) educational, art, cultural, organisations (e.g. libraries, museums, art and cultural centers for youth, rural clubs, etc.); 5) youth organisations; 6) non-governmental organisations (NGOs) focusing on environment protection, nature conservation, climate change, energy efficiency, renewable energy, sustainable development and related topics. NGOs usually have technical capacity, experience and willingness to build public awareness and capacity to address these issues; as well as 6) government authorities: ministries of environment, ministries of education and local educational authorities and institutions.

Secondary stakeholders are: 1) staff of international development organisations and aid programmes, in the ECIS region. Their engagement may be useful to enhance synergies between the various educational projects on climate change and sustainable development and to promote local versions of "Climate Box" in target and other countries through ongoing work; 2) international climate expert community, academic and professional institutions; 3) media, particularly youth and educational media; and 4) general public.

At the national level, UNDP Country Offices engage and conduct consultations with the relevant ministries of education, key and influential methodists and teachers, NGOs and experts, who are involved in the piloting of the toolkits. In each country, trainings have been organized for teachers and representatives of educational centers on application of the Climate Box. They, have further engaged children and youth in the project. The project conducted 2 regional educational conferences attended by the educational authorities and teachers from all beneficiary countries. The project also conducted youth/schools contest on climate change, children summer camp and numerous national level educational and awareness events targeting children and youth.

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:

The project generated and shared a lot of lessons and knowledge on promoting climate education and learning. Learning and knowledge management are the core objectives of the project. Active sharing of lessons and learning among the beneficiary countries have been ensured through the regional conferences and events, exchanges between teachers and educational experts. The project attended and actively shared its experience and resources with the international partners (UNFCCC ACE, UNITAR, etc,) and during the UNFCCC COPs.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	CB_Lessons-Learned_Report_May2021_8152_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CB_Lessons-Learned_Report_May2021_8152_304.docx)	nataly.olofinskaya@undp.org	6/1/2021 10:57:00 PM

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:

The project reached out a large number of beneficiaries, exceeding its RFF targets: over 60,000 school children and over 3000 teachers have been outreach ed directly. In addition, the project created on line tools (interactive learning web portal <http://climate-box.com>) and multilingual Climate Box toolkit translated into 14 languages, including 5 UN languages (Arabic, English, French, Russian and Spanish) which will allow dissemination across large international audience.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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:

The project has implemented several gender mainst reaming actions throughout the implementation period, For example, a session on gender has been included in the 1st regional climate education conference on Climate Box addressing teachers and educational specialists (Yerevan, 2018). The session relied on the materials of the new UN training module on gender and climate change.

As the project is targeting school teachers, women have been the main beneficiaries of the project’s capacity building and empowerment support. The majority of local trainees, participants of the regional and national training and knowledge exchange events were women.

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 is categorized as Low Risk. No new environmental or social risks have been triggered during the implementation period. Risk register have been updated.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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:

The project relies on the corporate grievance management mechanism. No grievances has been reported during the project implementation. This is a low risk project.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Management & Monitoring**Quality Rating: Highly 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 a comprehensive M&E Plan and RR F with a complete list of result indicators. The project followed the M&E plan and the donor's reporting requirements. A series of monitoring visits from IRH side to the participating countries have been conducted during the project implementation, mission reports have been documents. The project elaborated risk mitigation measures and adaptive management to prevent or address implementation difficulties that have been registered throughout the implementation period (explained largely under the Risks section). The M&E plan has been implemented adequately. Progress results are tracked every 6 months through detailed annual and mid-year reports. Lessons learned were captured mainly from within the project and generated and shared among the beneficiary countries through regional workshops and exchange of experience. Project reports were submitted to the Project Boards for review and corrective/adaptive actions are subsequently implemented (as necessary).

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	TFDannualreportRegionalClimateBox_2020finalcleanApr2021.docx_8152_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/TFDannualreportRegionalClimateBox_2020finalcleanApr2021.docx_8152_309.pdf)	nataly.olofinskaya@undp.org	6/1/2021 11:12:00 PM
2	Annualreport2019ClimateBox200212finalclean_8152_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Annualreport2019ClimateBox200212finalclean_8152_309.pdf)	nataly.olofinskaya@undp.org	6/1/2021 11:12:00 PM
3	midyearProgressReportJune2019ClimateBox190707_8152_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/midyearProgressReportJune2019ClimateBox190707_8152_309.docx)	nataly.olofinskaya@undp.org	6/1/2021 11:13:00 PM
4	ProjectNarrativeandFinancialProgressReport2018ClimateBox28Feb2019_8152_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ProjectNarrativeandFinancialProgressReport2018ClimateBox28Feb2019_8152_309.pdf)	nataly.olofinskaya@undp.org	6/1/2021 11:14:00 PM
5	ProjectNarrativeandFinancialProgressReport_ClimatBox_BoardreviewedAug2018_8152_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ProjectNarrativeandFinancialProgressReport_ClimatBox_BoardreviewedAug2018_8152_309.docx)	nataly.olofinskaya@undp.org	6/1/2021 11:15:00 PM
6	midyearProgressReportJune2020ClimateBox200628_upd_8152_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/midyearProgressReportJune2020ClimateBox200628_upd_8152_309.docx)	nataly.olofinskaya@undp.org	6/1/2021 11:15:00 PM

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's governance mechanism - Regional project Board - has been operating well. It has met in the agreed frequency stated in the project document and the minutes of the meetings are on file. There is regular progress reporting to the project board 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.

For the evidence, please refer to the supporting documents uploaded with the question 1 (minutes of the RPB meetings) and 9 (annual reports).

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 project has actively monitored several risks and devised mitigation measures as required:

(i) Lack of interest and capacities from the national governments to support Climate Box toolkit. The IRH project management had worked with UNDP COs and local experts in order to bring the legal and political arguments to the fore in order to increase political awareness on the importance of climate education in schools. Moreover, during the project preparatory phase, the political interest for the project has been assessed and it was a criteria for the selection of the countries under this current phase of the Climate Box project.

(ii) Lack of local expertise and data to prepare localized content for the toolkit- the mitigation of this particular risk was handled particularly by UNDP COs, who have actively searched the job market for knowledgeable professionals, who have been involved in Climate Box development or in similar climate awareness raising initiatives.

(iii) Teachers are not eager to use Climate Box- this risk has been monitored and during the several workshops conducted throughout the implementation period, teachers have been inspired and had the opportunity to get familiar with the Climate Box, understand the concept and modalities to deliver the trainings.

(iv) Failure to prepare high-quality projects for the youth contest, is a risk which has been monitored and the project has involved teachers and experts to provide guidance to the youth contest events

(v) project implementation delays, have been monitored and close cooperation with UNDP COs has been maintained in order to be mindful of the national circumstances (eg. administrative reform in Moldova which has delayed project inception) or any other shortcomings related for example to the language in which Climate Box content was delivered (the project has considered the budgets and time needed for the translation of the modules in local languages).

Atlas risk registry has been updated. COVID-19 pandemic related risks have been duly identified, registered and managed.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Efficient**Quality Rating: Highly 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:

Results based budgeting has been elaborated each year, based on close cooperation with UNDP COs. Additional resources for the project have been mobilized from the RF-UNDP TFD in 2019 for the new activities identified through new partnerships, adaptive management and screening of new opportunities for scaling up. At the national level additional parallel co-financing has been mobilized from the national governments (e.g. Kazakhstan) and partner projects (e.g. GEF and EU funded)

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	2dRPBannexabstractfromMinutesofthe11thSCmeetingsigned_8152_312 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2dRPBannexabstractfromMinutesofthe11thSCmeetingsigned_8152_312 .pdf)	nataly.olofinskaya@undp.org	6/1/2021 11:24:00 PM

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 procurement plans have been prepared and updated/revised; a no-cost project extension has been approved by the Regional Project Board to address delays in the procurement caused by COVID-19 pandemic in 2020.

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 has been actively searching for and utilized opportunities for cost efficiencies. Example of synergies resulting on cost efficiencies include: cooperation with the regional project on energy efficiency in the Customs Union on a joint organization of a summer camp and Climate Box master classes in May-June 2019; dissemination of the Climate Box best practices and lessons through regional and global events (eg. UNFCCC COPs, UNFCCC ACE Dialogue, etc.); cost efficient project management shared between the IRH and COs, etc.. With the relatively small budget, the project managed to outreach over 60,000 school children, 2000 schools and 3000 teachers with climate education and awareness activities.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Effective

Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory

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

- Yes
- No

Evidence:

Following the no-cost extension approved by the Regional Project Board in 2020, the project has fully delivered its intended outputs and targets.

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:

There have been bi-annual reviews (annual and mid-year) of the work plan implementation and achievement of results. Regular updates on the progress are provided to the donor (RF TFD). Budget revisions have been made as required. Please refer to the supporting documents uploaded under question 9 for evidence.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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:

The project was targeted at school children and youth by enhancing their knowledge on climate change issues and empowering the young people for action on climate change adaptation and mitigation. Another key target group is teachers and educational authorities/experts in the beneficiary countries. Geographically, the project targets 8 countries in the ECIS region. The project is continuously receptive of main beneficiaries' feedback. Stakeholders' engagement was key for achieving the expected results, as embedded in the project document. The project has engaged regularly with targeted groups over the past year and came up with the new ways to effectively engage with the target groups (e.g. the 1st international school contest of climate projects was piloted in 2019 followed with the 2d regional education conference and international school contest on climate change; Climate Box master classes organized during summer camp; engagement with UNFCCC ACE).

List of Uploaded Documents

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

No documents available.

Sustainability & National Ownership**Quality Rating: Exemplary**

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:

All relevant stakeholders and partners (ministries of education and environment, teachers, schools) are fully and actively engaged in the process, playing a lead role in project decision-making, implementation and monitoring. This is DIM project, procurement is managed by UNDP.

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:

This is a DIM project, UNDP IRH and COs implemented 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 Regional Project Board regularly reviewed the project progress reports, including recommendations and arrangements for sustainability. The following foundations for the project sustainability have been secured:

Synergies are being built with the UNDP's flagship Climate Promise initiative implemented by UNDP in 1

15 countries globally, including all UNDP programme countries in ECIS. The Climate Promise supports countries to enhance their Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) under the Paris Agreement. Delivered in collaboration with a wide variety of partners, it is the world's largest offer of support for the enhancement of climate pledges. Climate education work under the Climate Box project contributes to Climate Promise Service Line on Building political will and societal ownership for climate action at national and subnational levels. In the framework of the Climate Promise UNDP is financing replication of the CB in Serbia.

Beneficiary UNDP COs have built and continue to consolidate partnerships and synergies for the project implementation in their respective countries. In all countries, partnerships have been built with the national educational authorities, as well as the focal points for the climate change topic. In Kyrgyzstan the project has been aligned with the UNDP-GEF project "Strengthening of institutional and legal capacities to enable improvement of the national monitoring system and management of environmental information" as part of the comprehensive program addressing public awareness on the global Rio conventions.

In Armenia the project is aligned with the on-going UNDP-GEF project "Generate global environmental benefits through environmental education and raising awareness of stakeholders". In Uzbekistan and Turkmenistan, the CB project is implemented in coordination with two on-going climate change adaptation projects addressing climate resilience of rural communities. This would allow the project to outreach rural schools and municipalities as initially recommended by the RF TFD Board. In Belarus, the project is aligned with the EU-funded project on environmental education.

Three UNDP projects, being implemented in Kazakhstan in the area of climate change and resource conservation, as well as one of the largest associations of environmental organizations are cooperating to widely disseminate information about the forthcoming CB contest among environmental projects. The projects and the associations, engaged in the partnership, will act as co-organizers of the contest, that will provide wide coverage and increase the award budget. In Tajikistan, the project has been partnering and relying on the support from the Ministry of Education and Science and is integrated in activities of the country under the International Decade for Action "Water for Sustainable Development" 2018 – 2028. Later, the project was included in the

In Serbia and Belarus, UNDP Climate Box project is

also integrated into ongoing initiatives and UNDP projects. For instance, UNDP CO Serbia supports the initiative “Karavan za klimu” (Climate Caravan) implemented by French Embassy and EUD in Serbia, and Climate box will be promoted during the Climate Caravan as well.

All the above-mentioned activities have provided a solid foundation for the project sustainability through engaging directly local and national institutional partners (e.g. departments of education, ministries of education and ministries of environment) in participating countries.

Countries are actively looking for additional financial support for wider dissemination of Climate Box tools and integration of climate education into national formal and informal education, to be able to scale-up the initial activities supported from the UNDP-Russia Trust Fund for Development. Kazakhstan has been setting an example where successful implementation of the Climate Box project brought together national stakeholders and catalysed development of a national state-finance project for the promotion of environment and climate education.

The new on-line Climate Box interactive learning portal launched in 2021 provides another foundation for the project's sustainability as it will provide access to all project materials and resources in multiple languages. Maintenance of the portal is secured for 3 years after the closure of the project.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments