

# Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

**Form Status: Approved**

<b>Overall Rating:</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<b>Decision:</b>	
<b>Portfolio/Project Number:</b>	00082077
<b>Portfolio/Project Title:</b>	PIMS 4833:POPs Legacy Elimination and Release Reduction
<b>Portfolio/Project Date:</b>	2015-06-01 / 2020-11-30

**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:**

Project team identified relevant changes in the external environment and especially additional time allowed for project implementation contributed positively to the impacts of the project, particularly in terms of the global environmental benefits being targeted by GEF. This is particularly true for Component 1, Outcome 1.1 that targets the elimination of a total of 3,038 t POPs pesticide waste, of which 2,800 t will be eliminated during the project implementation. Detailed assessment work increased the amount to be eliminated during the project to 3,000 t when accounting for originally unanticipated POPs waste contamination in structural floor and walls. Additional POPs eliminated with the identification to sub-surface contamination potentially being addressed in Component 4. Likewise, an additional 80 t of PCB eliminated relative to what was originally planned. Components 4 and 5 also benefited from the extension to fully achieve the targeted results, particularly noting the evolution of institutional responsibility changes in the Implementing Partner who is responsible for some activities.

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

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 settings<sup>1</sup> 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:**

Project Document. Project Outcome "Protection of health and environment through elimination of current POPs legacies, ensure longer term capacity to manage POPs into the future consistent with international practice and standards, and integrate POPs activities with national sound chemicals management initiatives" is directly linked to Country Office CPD 2016-2020 output "1.3.3: Chemical waste prevented, managed and disposed of, and chemically contaminated sites managed in environmentally sound manner" and Strategic Plan Output 1.4.1 "Solutions scaled up for sustainable management of natural resources, including sustainable commodities and green and inclusive value chains".

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

**Relevant**

**Quality Rating: Exemplary**

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 location of the project related activities were mainly limited to industrial areas such as the Merkim site (a storage place for a big volume of obsolete POP pesticides), Izaydas high-temperature incineration plant for industrial hazardous waste (initial investment of 100 mln Euro), and a number PCB equipment owners (tire production, fertilizer companies etc). In that sense, there was no participation of marginalized and excluded but industry players.

**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 knowledge and lessons learned and these are in fact being discussed in Steering Committee meetings and reflected into the project activities. Also every year Project Implementation Report (PIR) has prepared as a donor requirement and shared with GEF, IRH and project partners which includes lessons learned and project progress towards project objectives.

### List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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 overall project design with its linkages and synergy with EU programming and target support in key areas, where national policies and priorities are established and committed to, underpins the project's basic sustainability. In terms of the specific POPs legacy elimination sustainability is provided by achievement of the respective quantified outcomes, all supported by substantial counterpart co-financing commitments. The inclusion of market and business case tests for the infrastructure and technology investment support related to POPs and HW management facility development and upgrading underpins their sustainability. In all cases, scaling up is further enhanced by the provision of key targeted technical assistance and awareness activities. Finally, the sustainability of outcomes related to institutional and regulatory related initiatives is primarily based on Government commitment which itself is supported by its co-financing commitments and the overall policy motivation associated with further formalizing its relationship with the EU. As the government partners are fully committed and motivated, there is a great potential for the scaling up in the future.

**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:**

Project document indicates the fact; "Women are often more vulnerable than men to environmental degradation and resource scarcity. They typically have weaker and insecure rights to the resources they manage (especially land), and spend longer hours on collection of water, firewood, etc." In order to address gender impact of the project, a gender impact assessment study was conducted.

All gender equality and gender mainstreaming activities of the project which focuses on the below were achieved and completed. The activities related to gender will also be evaluated during terminal evaluation.

1. Raising awareness regarding chemical exposures, effects on human health and the environment, and gender differences in exposing risks and impacts.
2. Promoting a multi-stakeholder approach to ensure the participation of women and vulnerable populations in policy development and decision-making processes.
3. Ensuring capacity building for women in private and public sectors with respect to POPs management as material as well as in contaminated sites which upgrades skills and knowledge on managing occupational health aspects during the handling process, further inventory of the sites and their risk assessment, including health exposure routes for population and biota, and remediation technology related information when applied to the decontamination processes of the sites in the future.

**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 risks were identified and mitigation measures were put into effect through timely management response. The project risks were updated in accordance with the changes in the project. Please also see the SESP document included in the Prodoc.

**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:**

Project-affected people, including stakeholders have been informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism and appropriate grievance resolution procedures for addressing project-related complaints and disputes. Stakeholder's feedback were taken to ensure that UNDP responds to their concerns and needs.

Also please see ESIA document included in the Pro Doc.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

**Management & Monitoring****Quality Rating: Exemplary**

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:**

Yes the project had a comprehensive M&E plan which is adequately and timely implemented. Please refer to project document for M&E requirements of the project and also the progress reports. Project baseline, targets and milestones are fully populated and being tracked regularly. Sex disaggregated data were collected during all project activities, workshops and trainings. Also evaluations were conducted and all the decentralized evaluation standards were fully met. Midterm Review has already been completed and MTR report has been uploaded to ERC with Management Response document. Terminal evaluation of the project is initiated and currently being carried out.

**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:**

Project Document Chapter VIII. Management Arrangements clearly defines the role of the Project Board and also Project Management Organigram is given. Steering Committee of the project met at minimum every year of the project implementation. Please also refer to the steering committee meeting minutes uploaded at the Implementation stage QA.

**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 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 monitored risks semiannually in consultation with the implementing partner and implementing agents. Mitigating measures were put into effect to eliminate these risks via timely management response.

The risk log reflected into progress reports as well as ATLAS.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

**Efficient**

**Quality Rating: Exemplary**

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:**

Yes, adequate resources were allocated and mobilized to achieve project results. Co-finances of the stakeholders were mobilized and the stakeholders were committed to the project activities. Please refer to terminal evaluation report when its finalized for detailed resource allocation.

**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 had an updated procurement plan and monitored the plan regularly in close coordination with the Projects Implementation Administrator, Portfolio Manager and the procurement unit and took measures to catch up with the timeline of the plan. The project is now completed and efficiently contributed the results.

**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 team regularly reviewed costs in close coordination with the other ongoing projects within the CCE Portfolio. Since all procurement activities were reviewed by the CCE Portfolio Administrator (Procurement), complementarity among all ongoing projects under CCE portfolio is ensured. The project team also pursued joint activities with other projects not only in CCE portfolio, but also others in different portfolios in UNDP CO to minimize costs and increase efficiencies.

**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 project is on track to deliver its expected outputs and took necessary measures to catch up with the time plan with high quality deliverables. The project team regularly informed stakeholders about the delivery of outputs and updates its delivery plan when necessary. Also please refer to PIRs for project progress. The project is completed now and delivered all the expected results. All the results will be reflected in the terminal evaluation report. Please have a look at Result Matrix realization as of December 2020 to verify.

### List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	POPsLegacyEliminationResultMatrixrealization2020_6522_315 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/POPsLegacyEliminationResultMatrixrealization2020_6522_315.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/POPsLegacyEliminationResultMatrixrealization2020_6522_315.docx</a> )	oyku.ulucay@undp.org	12/20/2020 7:40:00 PM

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:

The project team and M&E Advisor of the portfolio prepared progress reports annually as a donor requirement besides other portfolio wise tracking tools to review the work plan and presented them to the stakeholders. Lessons learned were reflected into these reports to increase efficiency and necessary budget revisions were made in accordance with the decisions taken at the Steering Committee meetings. In addition, regular reviews were made on the project work plan and all necessary actions were taken promptly. In order to achieve the end-of project targets risks were monitored regularly and any corrections reflected accordingly. Every year budget revisions conducted along with the AWP and presented to the Steering Committee for approval. Please refer to steering committee meetings and PIR reports uploaded last year at implementation stage QA.

### 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 location of the project related activities were mainly limited to industrial areas such as the Merkim site (a storage place for a big volume of obsolete POP pesticides), Izaydas high-temperature incineration plant for industrial hazardous waste (initial investment of 100 mln Euro), and a number PCB equipment owners (tire production, fertilizer companies etc). In that sense, there was no participation of marginalized and excluded but industry players.

All partners regularly attended the project's workshops and meetings, as well as participated in individual consultations in respect to project activities.

**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:**

All relevant stakeholders and partners were actively engaged in the project implementation, monitoring and decision making. This has been ensured with regular coordination meetings, regular e-mails and Steering Committee meetings, etc. All decisions were taken in Steering Committee and project stakeholders were regularly updated and informed through reports, regular progress reports, etc to ensure timely monitoring. In addition to active engagement of national systems, project utilized support mechanisms of country office when necessary. Getting support from UN DP country office in the procurement was crucial and used as an advantage for the project. The project was NIM modality of CO where national systems and CO support were used in combination with an active project management unit. Decision making processes were in line with Project Management Procedures highlighted in POPP. All relevant stakeholders and partners were fully and actively engaged through project management structure identified in the project document.

**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](#)<sup>8</sup> 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:**

Performance of MoEU, which was the implementing partner of the project has been assessed through relevant HACT assurance activities. Please kindly refer to earlier attached micro-assessment for MoEU. Implementing arrangements have been formally reviewed in coordination with UNDP Country office and adjusted in accordance with the needs arising during the implementation.

**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:**

Steering Committee has reviewed the progress, financial commitments and the capacity of the project regularly to ensure the high quality of outputs delivered in accordance with the time plan of the project. The Annual work plan including the sustainability has been reviewed and updated in accordance with the progress. Sustainability plan will be a part of terminal evaluation.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

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

No documents available.

**QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments**