

# Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

**Form Status: Approved**

<b>Overall Rating:</b>	Exemplary
<b>Decision:</b>	
<b>Portfolio/Project Number:</b>	00080810
<b>Portfolio/Project Title:</b>	Sustainable Management of Water Resources in Rural Areas
<b>Portfolio/Project Date:</b>	2016-01-01 / 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 measurement of change has been conducted via an evaluation of annual progress reports, considering an actual project start in June 2016. In 2018, a midterm report has been submitted to the UNDP, covering the period January 2016 to December 2017. The report conducted an assessment of the Component 2 activities, describing its early implementation including activities and training during reviewed years. This included the commissioning of the consortium as well as kick-off meetings, nominating advisory board members, preparation of internal rules for the component as well as collaboration with the 1st and 3rd components, update on actual training sessions, etc. The midterm report assessed the intermediate results like the following: "Overall the project is successfully implemented, running after an initial delay in time and definitively in a highly efficient way. All interviewed stakeholders underline a strong appreciation of the project activities and reveal great enthusiasm". This has been confirmed by the final evaluation.

The project was further evaluated to understand the project processes. It describes initial problems that caused the delay in the project initiating processes such as logistic problems and hiring process struggles. The problems were identified and procedures were improved during the further implementation of the project, highlighting the ability of the project partners to adjust and improve processes. Further evaluation of changes included an overview in regards to the stated activity results.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	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 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:

One of the major interventions alongside the project was signing a national resolution "about measures for increase in efficiency of use of water resources", dated July 2, 2018. The project has also coped with the "Concept for the Development of the Water Economy of the Republic of Uzbekistan for 2020-2030", which was developed in pursuance of the Resolutions of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan No. PP-3437 dated December 18, 2017 "On the introduction of a new procedure for the formation and financing of state development programs of the Republic of Uzbekistan", No. PP- 3672 of April 17, 2018 "On measures to organize the activities of the Ministry of Water Resources of the Republic of Uzbekistan" and Decrees of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan No. UP-4947 of February 7, 2017 "On the strategy of actions for the further development of the Republic of Uzbekistan", No. UP-5742 of June 17, 2019 "On measures for the efficient use of land and water resources in agriculture", Resolution of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan No. PP-4486 dated October 9, 2019 "On measures to further improve the water management system", as well as "Strategy for the development of agriculture of the Republic Uzbekistan for 2020-2030 ", adopted in accordance with the Presidential Decree NTA of the Republic of Uzbekistan No. UP-5853 October 23, 2019.

In 2020, the project prepared a final draft of the capacity-building programme and a draft government resolution on measures to establish a system of training of water professionals and managers that was adopted by the Government by its resolution #150, dated March 19, 2021.

The project directly contributed to two Country Program Outputs in the part of "Reform of information and ensuring freedom of speech/information" and "Promoting mechanisms / instruments of effective use of natural resources" through Output 1: Strengthened institutional capacities for integrated strategic planning. (Indicator 1.a: Availability of roadmaps for policy coherence, planning, resource management, and operational coordination for equitable service delivery.) and Output 2. Water supply/efficiency of water resou

Water resource management improved at national / basin / farm levels. (Indicator 2.a: Integrated water resource management plans. Indicator 2.b: Water consumption per hectare of cultivated land using improved mechanisms / innovative technologies.

Thus, the project responded to Development setting "Accelerate structural transformation for sustainable development " and Signature solution " Promote nature based solution for a sustainable planet". The relates indicator- Natural resources that are managed under a sustainable use, conservation, access and benefit-sharing regime

**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:**

Considering that the most vulnerable categories in terms of access to water are small farmers and rural households (mainly women and children as they are responsible for ensuring water to home), the project planned its pilot program to support this particular category. This was also due to the fact that this particular category of water consumers produces over 70% of food products and therefore makes a decisive contribution to food safety. The project reports to the project board included results of pilot intervention towards improving wellbeing of mentioned category through their improved access to water

**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 brings a meaningful social effect/contribution, and as such is a good practice example for implementation of similar approaches in other areas with similar conditions.

While the project improved the gender equality situation in the country by promoting women’s participation and engagement in the water sector, the project overall did not achieve the target of 30% of women involvement in technical capacity building - though a few organisations reported the required involvement numbers. The majority of organizations stated that the number of qualified women in technical roles is not enough in the sector, and that gender equality stays a target to be fulfilled in the future and will need long term commitment for promoting and conducting relevant education for women. It has been observed that the percentage of women in roles like accounting and finance in the water institutions is higher than the percentage in technical roles, which may be subject to classic role profiles, but may also be a result of specific working requirements that are conflicting with women's other responsibilities.

As approved by stakeholders, the project impact and outcomes are sustainable and long-lasting. Improved technical capacity is expected to remain for decades. However, local stakeholders are concerned regarding the increase of costs due to the implementation of water pumps with electricity consumption.

**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 project has a great impact on both social and political environments. The project outcomes are sustainable and significantly contribute to lasting benefits. The project achieved two crucial sustainability results. First, it greatly improved the water availability of the farms and rural population in Uzbekistan, resulted in improved water supply on 13,000 ha lands and allowing thousands of people to have easy access to safe drinking water. The Ministry of Water Resources expressed their will for continuity of project activities in the project area by, first of all, expressing the interest in maintaining achieved results; and secondly by accepting further interventions of implementing similar projects for improvement. Second, the project improved the gender equality situation in the country by promoting women's participation and engagement. Further, the project provides an effective development concept, an efficient model for implementation, and a result-based action model. 14 international standards adopted by the national Agency for Standardization, Metrology and Certification (Uzstandart) that will help to improve the system of water metering and accounting and control over the use of water resources. Regulations governing contractual relations between water users and water consumers have been developed and adopted by the Government. Normative documents have been developed for adapting irrigation canals to drip irrigation systems. Normative documents on the drip irrigation of agricultural crops have been developed. A national system for testing and calibration of water metering equipment has been created. Based on assessments, extensive training program and pilot interventions results within the project, a national capacity building system is created to ensure unified and systematic approach to enhancing knowledge and skills of water specialist and managers (adopted by the Government decree #150 on March 19, 2021). Source: Final evaluation report.

### List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Evaluationreport210516clean_final_9051_305 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Evaluationreport210516clean_final_9051_305.docx)	ulugbek.islamov@undp.org	7/24/2021 10:33:00 AM

### Principled

Quality Rating: **Exemplary**

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 conducted assessments of institutions responsible for training provision, training modules, and water management organizations based on gender principles. The assessment of the project showed a significant awareness on increasing the number of female experts, managers, household members, and farmers as had been planned within activities. The project has put additional effort into motivating female participants to engage in the offered activities by the project (ref.: Survey).

### List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Eng_UNDP_CapacityandNeedsAssesmentof WaterManagementOrganisations_FinalReportbyNBT_9051_306 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Eng_UNDP_CapacityandNeedsAssesmentofWaterManagementOrganisations_FinalReportbyNBT_9051_306.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Eng_UNDP_CapacityandNeedsAssesmentofWaterManagementOrganisations_FinalReportbyNBT_9051_306.pdf</a> )	ulugbek.islamov@undp.org	7/24/2021 10:38:00 AM
2	Eng_UNDP_CapacityandNeedsAssesment_FinalreportbySICICWC_9051_306 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Eng_UNDP_CapacityandNeedsAssesment_FinalreportbySICICWC_9051_306.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Eng_UNDP_CapacityandNeedsAssesment_FinalreportbySICICWC_9051_306.pdf</a> )	ulugbek.islamov@undp.org	7/24/2021 10:40:00 AM

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 successful implementation of the project requires a commitment to the program by the participants and stakeholders, significant logistics, efficient financial management, and sufficient numbers of trainers and trainees. According to assessment, the project has assessed the risks at every step of development concerning the changing environment and the risks were recorded in risk log. Neither the MTR nor annual progress reports showed significant delays or unavailability to reach a target. According to the stakeholders' responses, the project has implemented several innovative international practices, which had been planned in advance. The pilot program in the regions not only did not worsen, but significantly improved the state of aquatic ecosystems by reducing the withdrawal of water from sources by reducing losses in irrigation canals.

Source: Final evaluation report.

**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 any grievances were received, all stakeholders were informed of the respective mechanisms

**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:**

The project implemented comprehensive monitoring plan. Regular visits of project sites were organized with participation of UNDP CO, the Donor (EU) and national partners. The monitoring data has been properly stored and used. This was confirmed by the mid-term and final evaluations.

**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:**

Strong involvement of national partners in the program and project design ensured full alignment of targeted impacts and outcomes with a national development framework, as well as project logic and coherence on the level of impact and outcomes. Design at the local level was successfully adjusted to local needs during the inception stage, as well as by efficient locally-based operational planning. Customization of project design ensured the logic and coherence on the resulting level. The design aimed to ensure strong cooperation between all parties, especially the remote ones in rural areas. local partners succeeded to provide sufficient inputs for operational planning and implementation management. The project board have provided strategic guidance during entire implementation of the project through regular meetings.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/RBMMMinutes_9051_310.zip">RBMMMinutes_9051_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/RBMMMinutes_9051_310.zip)</a>	ulugbek.islamov@undp.org	7/26/2021 8:50:00 AM

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:**

Most of the risks have been regularly updated, properly considered, consulted, recorded and managed. However, due to the unpredictable appearance of COVID-19, the project faced some limitations, which had been managed in time.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Monitoring_9051_311.zip">Monitoring_9051_311 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Monitoring_9051_311.zip)</a>	ulugbek.islamov@undp.org	7/26/2021 1:51:00 PM

**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:**

The project funded by the EU and UNDP. The total amount of funds from the EU is 5,0 mln, Euro.

**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 procurement team used best practices to procure goods and services rapidly and competitively. Project plans were developed and implemented in ways that allowed for flexibility.

**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:**

Yes. according to budget reports and final financial reports, the budget has been remaining positive for the whole project duration. The financial expenditures of the project were in accordance with the project documents and efficiently used.

Source: Final Evaluation report

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Evaluationreport210516clean_final_9051_314 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QA/FormDocuments/Evaluationreport210516clean_final_9051_314.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QA/FormDocuments/Evaluationreport210516clean_final_9051_314.docx</a> )	ulugbek.islamov@undp.org	7/24/2021 10:51:00 AM

**Effective**

**Quality Rating: Exemplary**

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

- Yes
- No

**Evidence:**

List of Uploaded Documents			
#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	PBmin11dec2020_eng_final_9051_315 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PBmin11dec2020_eng_final_9051_315.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PBmin11dec2020_eng_final_9051_315.pdf</a> )	ulugbek.islamov@undp.org	7/24/2021 10:53:00 AM

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 was accurately on track in its implementation, and the progress reports were provided annually. The project was well on track according to the milestones and deliverables that had been proposed. Given the delayed start at the beginning of the project and the extra amount of effort to adapt to the reorganization from MAWR to MWR, the project duration has been extended till Dec. 31, 2020, with further evaluation in Jan-April, 2021.

List of Uploaded Documents			
#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Progressreports_9051_316 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Progressreports_9051_316.rar">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Progressreports_9051_316.rar</a> )	ulugbek.islamov@undp.org	7/26/2021 1:49:00 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:**

Considering that the most vulnerable categories in terms of access to water are small farmers and rural households, the project planned its pilot program to support this particular category. This was also due to the fact that this particular category of water consumers produces over 70% of food products and therefore makes a decisive contribution to food safety. The project focuses mainly on women's participation in the development of community plans and it involves mainly women residents in all communities in the formulation of community development activities and active participation in water management activities within the pilot communities in all 6 pilot regions of the project.

Implementing the infrastructure for drinking water supply allowed all populations in remote areas to access safe drinking water. That especially targeted the women in the villages, who always had a lack of access to drinking water in households. All women benefited from this supply system and now they have access to safe drinking water and got released from the water carrying activities.

The report of the project to the council included the improvement of the living conditions of this category of water users through improved access to water.

### 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:

Yes, the project was nationwide and included all partners and participants, who expressed their interest, in all regions of Uzbekistan. The participating parties reported a high level of collaboration between the UNDP and stakeholders. Local authorities reported taking responsibility for project implementation and sorting out issues appearing in the controlled districts. Both stakeholders and observing parties reported a high level of coordination and collaboration throughout the project duration. The coordination was direct and convenient as well as the methodology and design narrowly targeted the community needs. The cooperation included joint oversight and M&E activities

**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:**

The project carried out three large-scale assessments:

- 1) Baseline assessment of existing and past training modules and tools;
- 2) Capacity and needs assessment of water management players and improved advisory mechanisms, and;
- 3) Capacity and needs assessment of institutions responsible for training provision.

Based on the assessment results a Unified/systemized Capacity-Building Programme has been developed. To support the program, the project has conducted ToT courses for 100 highly qualified trainers and developed 8 training modules. In addition, the Guide to Hydrotechnics was prepared, which includes modern new technologies in the areas of water management, use of hydraulic facilities and their safety, water counting, hydrometry, pumping stations, and land reclamation. In 2020, a final draft of the capacity-building programme and a draft government resolution on measures to establish a system of training of water professionals and managers were prepared and adopted by the government on March 2021.

**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 sustainability of the project had been reviewed by the project board. Pls. refer to the PR minutes.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

**QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments**

The results of QA has been reviewed and approved by PB