Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

Form Status: Approved

Overall Rating:	Inadequate
Decision:	
Portfolio/Project Number:	00066300
Portfolio/Project Title:	Initial Implementation of Accelerated HCFC Phase Out
Portfolio/Project Date:	2012-04-16 / 2020-07-31

Strategic **Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

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

- ○ 3: The project team 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 substantive revision have been completed in 20 18 to address unforeseen political changes, followed the armed conflict unfolded in the Eastern Ukraine a nd a severe economic crisis which hit the country, th e project has only been able to partially implement t he planned Investment Programme and Demonstrati on Projects Component. Majority of previously propo sed technical assistance recipients were either physi cally located in the area of the military conflict and o vernight became inaccessible, or subject to bankrupt cy, which altogether released 80% of the budget for re-allocation to other eligible activities which was not possible to include given resource constraints at the original project design.
The purpose of substantive project revision was to s upport Ukraine meet its compliance obligation for H CFC phase-out by year 2020 under the Montreal Pr otocol. Substantive revisions were made primarily in response to major changes in the national context c aused by conflict in eastern areas consequent to ec onomic deterioration. The revision also envisaged e xtension of the duration covered by a project docum ent to take account of delays in implementing certain activities and therefore in producing results. The mai n goal of the project remained the same.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	ProDoc_27.11.2018_5336_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ProDoc_27.11.2018_5336_301.pdf)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	9/2/2021 2:31:00 PM
2	Govt_Reuqest_Extension_5336_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Govt_Reuqest_Extension_5336_301.pdf)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	3/22/2021 8:28:00 PM
3	Govement_request_extension_unofical_traslation_5336_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Govement_request_extension_unofical_traslation_5336_301.docx)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	3/22/2021 8:29:00 PM
4	REUkraineHCFCtemplatesforrequestingGEFprojectextension_5336_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/REUkraineHCFCtemplatesforrequestingGEFprojectextension_5336_301.msg)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	3/22/2021 9:00:00 PM
5	Minutes_ProjectBoard_2018_5336_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Minutes_ProjectBoard_2018_5336_301.pdf)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	9/2/2021 2:13:00 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 responded to the Sustainable development pathways by offering strong connections to issues of environmental sustainability through creating better conditions to find and scale-up inclusive market-based solutions to ensure fulfilment of Montreal Protocol through introduction of new non-ODS technologies.
Conversion of system houses (pilots) completed.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	FwdKhim_HOP_Safety_Audit_5336_302 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FwdKhim_HOP_Safety_Audit_5336_302.msg)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	3/22/2021 9:12:00 PM
2	Edvans_HOP_5336_302 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Edvans_HOP_5336_302.msg)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	3/22/2021 9:12:00 PM

Relevant **Quality Rating: 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 target groups have been involved through awar eness caring campaigns conducted within the projec t, while the main focus was on the conversion of the biggest system houses.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Report_worldozoneday_Ukraine2018_5336_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Report_worldozoneday_Ukraine2018_5336_303.pdf)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	3/22/2021 11:11:00 PM
2	OzoneProjectInfographic_5336_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/OzoneProjectInfographic_5336_303.pdf)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	3/22/2021 11:11:00 PM
3	OzoneDayReport_Ukraine2019_5336_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/OzoneDayReport_Ukraine2019_5336_303.pdf)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	3/22/2021 11:11:00 PM
4	infographicslaw1_5336_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/infographicslaw1_5336_303.png)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	3/22/2021 11:12:00 PM
5	infographicslaw2_5336_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/infographicslaw2_5336_303.png)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	3/22/2021 11:12:00 PM
6	FINALBlogpostozoneYS_5336_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FINALBlogpostozoneYS_5336_303.docx)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	3/22/2021 11:12:00 PM
7	Brochure_MontrealProtocol_UKR_5336_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Brochure_MontrealProtocol_UKR_5336_303.pdf)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	3/22/2021 11:12:00 PM
8	IMG_6434_5336_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/IMG_6434_5336_303.JPG)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	3/22/2021 11:12:00 PM
9	IMG_6395_5336_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/IMG_6395_5336_303.JPG)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	3/22/2021 11:12:00 PM

10	MENR_Vakarash_Letterofappreciation_2019-08-27_5336_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MENR_Vakarash_Letterofappreciation_2019-08-27_5336_303.pdf)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	9/2/2021 2:20:00 PM
11	Transl_DM_Vakarash_Letter_5336_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Transl_DM_Vakarash_Letter_5336_303.docx)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	9/2/2021 2:20:00 PM
12	LetterformDirectorofSpecializedLaboratoryforExpertiseandResearch_Custom_5336_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/LetterformDirectorofSpecializedLaboratoryforExpertiseandResearch_Custom_5336_303.pdf)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	9/2/2021 2:22:00 PM

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:

Lessons learned gained from the monitoring and evaluation of the implemented activities as well as those ones captured in the Midterm Review and Terminal Evaluations along with findings, conclusions and recommendations have been considered by the project and CO team, discussed in project board meeting, and as a result the implementation strategy has been revised. The revised implementation strategy allowed increase the likelihood of achievement of established targets.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Minutes_ProjectBoard_2018_5336_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Minutes_ProjectBoard_2018_5336_304.pdf)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	9/2/2021 2:24:00 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 beneficiaries to meaningfully co ntribute to development change. This is evidenced b y the fact that according to the project document, all pilot projects have to be implemented as well the St ate Customs Service has been fully equipped to ens ure the Montreal Protocol implementation in Ukrain e.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Annex1.ActofTransferoftheequipmenttotheStateFiscalServiceofUkraine_5336_305 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Annex1.ActofTransferoftheequipmenttotheStateFiscalServiceofUkraine_5336_305.pdf)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	3/22/2021 9:29:00 PM
2	Annex2LetterformDirectorofSpecializedLaboratoryforExpertiseandResearchonthe_5336_305 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Annex2LetterformDirectorofSpecializedLaboratoryforExpertiseandResearchonthe_5336_305.pdf)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	3/22/2021 9:29:00 PM
3	Expertreport_R_22_UKRMETESTSTANDART_5336_305 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Expertreport_R_22_UKRMETESTSTANDART_5336_305.pdf)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	3/22/2021 9:29:00 PM
4	Expertreport_R_141b_UKRMETESTSTANDART_5336_305 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Expertreport_R_141b_UKRMETESTSTANDART_5336_305.pdf)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	3/22/2021 9:30:00 PM
5	Expertreport_R_142b_UKRMETESTSTANDART_5336_305 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Expertreport_R_142b_UKRMETESTSTANDART_5336_305.pdf)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	3/22/2021 9:30:00 PM
6	Expertreport_R_406A_UKRMETESTSTANDART_5336_305 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Expertreport_R_406A_UKRMETESTSTANDART_5336_305.pdf)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	3/22/2021 9:30:00 PM
7	Law_Adoption_Ozone_5336_305 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Law_Adoption_Ozone_5336_305.html)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	3/22/2021 9:47:00 PM
8	UNDP_UkraineHCFC_FE_FinalReport_final_5336_305 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/UNDP_UkraineHCFC_FE_FinalReport_final_5336_305.pdf)	oleksandr.sushchenko@undp.org	9/6/2021 4:03:00 PM

Principled **Quality Rating: Needs Improvement**

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:

As the project faced challenges on identifying specific activities addressing gender inequalities and women empowerment as a part regional ODS project, the regional component has initiated an gender equality assignment and recently recruited a Russian-speaking consultant to conduct an initial assessment of the gender dimensions of the project (including gender statistics) and to provide a set of recommendations on gender and ODS, specifically to be considered for preparations of national phase 2, follow-up projects.
One specific example from Ukraine is that while the project implemented its investment component for the System Houses, special attention was devoted to educational component of the project to train female staff of the chemical laboratory of the companies, who were trained by the International Experts supervising the conversion of the enterprises an new formulations development.

Management Response:

For the transition project additional efforts will be conducted to include gender-related issues and indicators into the project proposal (with internal capacities) by December 2021.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	20171017_153909_5336_306 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/20171017_153909_5336_306.jpg)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	3/22/2021 9:50:00 PM
2	20171018_102108_5336_306 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/20171018_102108_5336_306.jpg)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	3/22/2021 9:50:00 PM
3	20171017_152647_5336_306 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/20171017_152647_5336_306.jpg)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	3/22/2021 9:50:00 PM
4	IMG_3550_5336_306 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/IMG_3550_5336_306.JPG)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	3/22/2021 9:51:00 PM

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 promotes ozone friendly technologies th at contributes to preservation ozone layer and conse quently contributes to climate change mitigation thro ugh introduction of the newest blowing agent with ze ro CO2 emission (HFO). The project pilots are not a ssociated with high environmental and social risks a nd don't contributed to depleting of ozone layer. Ne vertheless, potential risks were continuously monitor ed.

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:

No such mechanism is currently avaliable.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Management & Monitoring **Quality Rating: Needs Improvement**

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:

Evidence: Project was annually updating M&E plan. Implementation of M&E plan was being discussed d uring the development of Annual Work Plans and at the Mid-Year Reviews of AWP. Progress in achieve ment of targets under the established indicators wer e reported regularly in UNDP-GEF Project Implemen tation Reviews. Based on results of M&E project imp lementation strategy has been revised, types of sup ported projects diversified, assistance to beneficiarie s intensified.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	PIR-2016-GEFID4102-PIMS4309_5336_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PIR-2016-GEFID4102-PIMS4309_5336_309.docx)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	3/22/2021 10:07:00 PM
2	2017_PIR_4309at22Aug2017_AT_5336_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2017_PIR_4309at22Aug2017_AT_5336_309.docx)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	3/22/2021 10:06:00 PM
3	2019-GEF-PIR-PIMS4309-GEFID41022_5336_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2019-GEF-PIR-PIMS4309-GEFID41022_5336_309.docx)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	3/22/2021 10:05:00 PM
4	2018-GEF-PIR-PIMS4309-GEFID41022_5336_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2018-GEF-PIR-PIMS4309-GEFID41022_5336_309.docx)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	3/22/2021 10:05:00 PM
5	PIR-2015-GEFID4102-PIMS4309_5336_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PIR-2015-GEFID4102-PIMS4309_5336_309.docx)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	3/22/2021 10:07:00 PM
6	PIR-2014-GEFID4102-PIMS4309_5336_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PIR-2014-GEFID4102-PIMS4309_5336_309.docx)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	3/22/2021 10:07:00 PM
7	UNDP_UkraineHCFC_FE_FinalReport_final_5336_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/UNDP_UkraineHCFC_FE_FinalReport_final_5336_309.pdf)	oleksandr.sushchenko@undp.org	9/6/2021 4:01:00 PM
8	TerminalEvaluation_ReportRegional_CEITRevised_Sep18_5336_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/TerminalEvaluation_ReportRegional_CEITRevised_Sep18_5336_309.pdf)	oleksandr.sushchenko@undp.org	9/6/2021 4:01:00 PM
9	FinalMTRReportUNDP-GEFProjectInitialImplementationofAcceleratedHCFCPhaseOutintheCEITRegionv4_5336_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FinalMTRReportUNDP-GEFProjectInitialImplementationofAcceleratedHCFCPhaseOutintheCEITRegionv4_5336_309.pdf)	oleksandr.sushchenko@undp.org	9/6/2021 4:01:00 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:

Evidence: The project board duly meets once a yea r.

Management Response:

An evaluation mission will be orginized to interview t he colleagues at Customs Services, evaluate and u nderstand the extent to which the project helped to deal with HCFC issues

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 monitored the key institutional, political a nd financial risk to certain extend, but were not fully addressed.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Risk_Log_Ozoneproject_2019_5336_311 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Risk_Log_Ozoneproject_2019_5336_311.doc)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	9/2/2021 2:39:00 PM

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:

The project resources have fully covered all activitie s outlined in the Project Document. In overall , the b udget reflected the main objective of the as main sp ending have been in providing the much-needed co nversion, as well as support and capacity building of the beneficiaries.

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 the PP only for 2019.

Management Response:

The procurement plans for the current projects are b eing updated on the Sharepoint to ensure that all th e items are planned and recorded properly.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	PP_5336_313 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PP_5336_313.xlsx)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	9/2/2021 3:07:00 PM

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 monitored its own costs and tried to achi eve the cost efficiencies as a follow up to substantiv e revision. The quality of provided TA was satisfacto ry. This is evidenced by the fact that comprehensive conversion of biggest system houses have been co mpleted and new non ODS formulations have been i ntroduced to Ukrainian market.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Contract_Advance_5336_314 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Contract_Advance_5336_314.pdf)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	9/2/2021 3:01:00 PM
2	Khimpostachalnyhk_Contract_March_2019_5336_314 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Khimpostachalnyhk_Contract_March_2019_5336_314.pdf)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	9/2/2021 3:02:00 PM
3	UNDP-POLYFOAMCONTRACT_5336_314 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/UNDP-POLYFOAMCONTRACT_5336_314.PDF)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	9/2/2021 3:03:00 PM

Effective **Quality Rating:** **Needs Improvement**

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

- ○ Yes
- ◉ *No*

Evidence:

The project has significant delay in early stage of its implementation given unforeseen political changes, followed the armed conflict unfolded in the Eastern Ukraine and a severe economic crisis which hit the country, the project has only been able to partially implement the planned Investment Programme and Demonstration Projects Component. Majority of previously proposed technical assistance recipients were either physically located in the area of the military conflict and overnight became inaccessible, or subject to bankruptcy, which altogether released 80% of the budget for re-allocation to other eligible activities which was not possible to include given resource constraints at the original project design.

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:

The project implementation plan and updated strategy developed was discussed in with Senior management, within the Energy and Environment Portfolio, then discussed and approved during the Project Board Meetings. The project budget revisions have been initiated as needed (including after the MTR and TE, after the project extension).

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	PIPOzone2018_5336_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PIPOzone2018_5336_316.xlsx)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	9/2/2021 3:36:00 PM
2	PIPOzone2019_5336_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PIPOzone2019_5336_316.xlsx)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	9/2/2021 3:36:00 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:

The project was systematically engaging with key Project beneficiaries and recipients. Respective MOUs have been signed and the Project Board minutes reflect such communication with the main target groups.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	MOU_Ministry_Ozone_5336_317 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MOU_Ministry_Ozone_5336_317.pdf)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	3/22/2021 11:03:00 PM
2	Minutes_ProjectBoard_2018_5336_304_5336_317 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Minutes_ProjectBoard_2018_5336_304_5336_317.pdf)	oleksandr.sushchenko@undp.org	9/6/2021 2:14:00 PM

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

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:

This project is being implemented under the Direct I mplementation Modality, Ministry of Ecology and Nat ural Resources was registered as the project benefic iary and a key partner. The Ministry have been enga ged in he project decision making (including selecti on of the pilot projects – on a “no objection” basis).

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	MENR_Vakarash_Letterofappreciation_2019-08-27_5336_318 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MENR_Vakarash_Letterofappreciation_2019-08-27_5336_318.pdf)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	3/22/2021 10:47:00 PM
2	Transl_DM_Vakarash_Letter_5336_318 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Transl_DM_Vakarash_Letter_5336_318.docx)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	3/22/2021 10:47:00 PM

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 evaluation of the capacities is available at the tim e when the QA is being prepared and submitted for approval.

Management Response:

A separate evaluation of the project efficiency will be organised by CO to collect the feedbacks from the s takeholders and formulate the lessons learned for th e next projects.

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:

Management Response:

Complete HCFC Phase-Out in Ukraine through Pro motion of zero ODS, low GWP, Energy-Efficient Tec hnologies ahs been submitted to the Ministry of Ecol ogy and Natural Resources, but was not either supp orted, neither rejected given the merge with the Mini stry of Energy.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	концепціяпроекту_5336_320 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/концепціяпроекту_5336_320.msg)	alla.tynkevych@undp.org	3/22/2021 10:51:00 PM

QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments

The project extension has enabled Ukraine to achieve a majority of its intended outputs, and some of its impacts, su ch as the adoption of a Law on Ozone Depleting substances, the implementation of three major contracts for ODS c onversion, and the supply of equipment for ODS detection training and increased awareness among its stakeholder s. At the same time, some actions require extra steps to be taken to reach full completion, the lack of country owners hip and leadership, a highly bureaucratic implementation environment and a lack of engagement of all stakeholders means that progress towards impact. Also, an additional efficiency evaluation fo the actions under this particular proj ect is needed and the CO will take the necessary steps to collect the feedbacks from the stakeholders on the groun d. This will allow to understand how to improve activities of the GEF-funded projects in the future.