

Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

Form Status: Approved

Overall Rating:	Highly Satisfactory
Decision:	
Portfolio/Project Number:	00101373
Portfolio/Project Title:	Support to Law/Rulemaking and RIA Phase 2
Portfolio/Project Date:	2017-01-01 / 2020-12-31

Strategic

Quality Rating: Exemplary

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

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

Evidence:

The project was monitoring the external environment changes in order to ensure relevance of the support delivered to national partners. For instance, in November-December 2019 when the trainings on RIA had been delivered, the MoJ started to pay more attention to such tool as the regulatory guillotine. To support national partners with best knowledge on the matter, the Project conducted the third training on RIA with specific attention to the regulatory guillotine.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	PD5953from03.03.2020_5521_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PD5953from03.03.2020_5521_301.pdf)	mukhammadjon.tursunov@undp.org	12/17/2020 8:59:00 AM

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

- ☒ 3: *The project responded to at least one of the development settings as specified in the Strategic Plan (SP) and adopted at least one Signature Solution . The project's RRF included all the relevant SP output indicators. (all must be true)*
- ☐ 2: The project responded to at least one of the developments settings¹ as specified in the Strategic Plan. The project's RRF included at least one SP output indicator, if relevant. (both must be true)
- ☐ 1: While the project may have responded to a partner's identified need, this need falls outside of the UNDP Strategic Plan. Also select this option if none of the relevant SP indicators are included in the RRF.

Evidence:

The project contributed to "Governance for peaceful, just, and inclusive societies" signature solution. Moreover, the project included the following relevant UNDAF outcomes and CPD outcomes indicators:

- UNDAF Outcome 7. By 2020, the quality of public administration is improved for equitable access to quality public services for all.
- UNDAF Outcome 8. Legal and judicial reforms further ensure strong protection of rights, freedoms and legitimate interests of citizens.
- CPD Outcome 3.3. Public policy and new legislation development processes reflect international standards
- CPD Outcome 4.3. Parliament is able to adopt legislation of high quality, reflecting citizens inputs and international standards.

Final Project Report is attached.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	ria2_freport_en_5521_302 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ria2_freport_en_5521_302.pdf)	sherzodbek.sharipov@undp.org	1/26/2021 8:20:00 AM

Relevant**Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory**

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

- ☐ 3: Systematic and structured feedback was collected over the project duration from a representative sample of beneficiaries, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized, as part of the project's monitoring system. Representatives from the targeted groups were active members of the project's governance mechanism (i.e., the project board or equivalent) and there is credible evidence that their feedback informs project decision making. (all must be true)
- ☒ 2: *Targeted groups were engaged in implementation and monitoring, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized. Beneficiary feedback, which may be anecdotal, was collected regularly to ensure the project addressed local priorities. This information was used to inform project decision making. (all must be true to select this option)*
- ☐ 1: Some beneficiary feedback may have been collected, but this information did not inform project decision making. This option should also be selected if no beneficiary feedback was collected
- ☐ Not Applicable

Evidence:

The project was working with the target groups directly – the public servants, members of parliament, think tanks analysts and NGOs. All analytical and legal acts drafting activities were implemented in close cooperation and engagement of public servants and independent experts from civil society institutions. This approach was ensuring practical skills of applying the RIA methodology.

For instance, the RIA-2 Project had conducted 3 trainings on RIA (including anticorruption screening) and regulatory guillotine and trained 75 public servants to perform RIA, including 11 trainers / lecturers from Tashkent Law University, University of world economy and diplomacy, Academy of Public Administration. The training of trainers module on RIA was also developed and provided to the Academy of Public Administration for further use.

At the same time, the piloting of the RIA methodology was launched and in 2019 and in 2020 it was accomplished. 5 piloting expert groups were composed from representatives of ministries, think tanks and NGOs. 5 RIA reports were developed during the piloting of regulatory impact assessment on:

- the draft law "On beekeeping",
- the draft law "On craftsmanship",
- recently adopted Administrative Procedures Act,
- expected impact after reduction of VAT rate;
- Intergovernmental Agreement "On dry ports".

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:

Yes. The project prepared a separate discussion paper on prospects of introduction of the regulatory impact assessment into norm-making practice in Uzbekistan was developed. The discussion paper was summarizing the results of the piloting and proposed the following lessons learned:

1. There is a need to develop separate training programs on RIA and anti-corruption screening of legal acts specialized for three key groups of audience: top managers, mid-range managers and specialists, independent experts. The terms of training delivery to these different types of audience should also differ by the length, the content, the expected results.
2. There is a need to accompany RIA trainings with trainings on project management for public servants because in a number of cases it was recommended to hire independent consultants or consulting companies to conduct the RIA. In such cases, the public servants have to apply project management approach to effectively coordinate activities of independent consultants.
3. Republic of Uzbekistan will have to make significant investments to train civil servants to apply RIA countrywide. To ensure the current paces of law-making and rulemaking (around 2000 legal acts adopted annually) the Government and Oliy Majlis will have to expense around 102.9 bln Sums annually for conducting the analytical works related to RIA only. That will require to hire 400 civil servants more and to contract about 5300 independent experts to outsource the RIA where it is possible. Another 2.2 bln Sums should be addressed to RIA training program for civil servants. Considering enormous costs and complexities of capacity building, the Government of Uzbekistan will need a support from donors community in that field.
4. Although the public servants and members of parliament in Uzbekistan have enough competences and education, and have understanding of what should be done, or what should be the result, they often are not aware how to do, or how to achieve the result. In this regard, the capacity building programs should pay more attention for experience exchange and transfer of "know how" in sphere of public policy.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Policybrief.ProspectsofRIainUzbekistan_4_5521_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Policybrief.ProspectsofRIainUzbekistan_4_5521_304.pdf)	sherzodbek.sharipov@undp.org	1/25/2021 8:54:00 AM

5. Was the project sufficiently at scale, or is there potential to scale up in the future, to meaningfully contribute to development change?

- ☒ 3: *There was credible evidence that the project reached sufficient number of beneficiaries (either directly through significant coverage of target groups, or indirectly, through policy change) to meaningfully contribute to development change.*
- ☐ 2: While the project was not considered at scale, there are explicit plans in place to scale up the project in the future (e.g. by extending its coverage or using project results to advocate for policy change).
- ☐ 1: The project was not at scale, and there are no plans to scale up the project in the future.

Evidence:

For the second phase of the project the scale was sufficient because at this stage the primary practical experience of training the public servants and applying the regulatory impact assessment methodology was received. Based on the results of piloting and training activities, the Project can state that there is a great space for scaling up the experience received on the Phase 2 of the RIA project. First of all, the training activities on regulatory impact assessment and anticorruption screening of legal acts should be expanded and delivered countrywide.

According to estimations of the RIA-2 Project, to ensure the current paces of law-making and rulemaking (around 2000 legal acts adopted annually) the Government and Oliy Majlis will have to expense around 102.9 bln Sums annually for conducting the analytical works related to RIA only. That will require to hire 400 civil servants more and to contract about 5300 independent experts to outsource the RIA where it is possible. Another 2.2 bln Sums should be addressed to RIA training program for civil servants.

To enable those personnel and expert to perform RIA the intensive training program should be deployed.

Secondly, the support on further improvement and polishing the methodology on regulatory impact assessment is required. At the current stage, the methodology and procedures may contain blank spots, which would occur only when massive experience of applying the RIA in practice could have place. The process of improving the methodology should be continuous, thus requires a constant monitoring and analysis of the practice of RIA implementation.

List of Uploaded Documents

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

No documents available.

Principled

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

6. Were the project's measures (through outputs, activities, indicators) to address gender inequalities and empower women relevant and produced the intended effect? If not, evidence-based adjustments and changes were made.

- ☐ 3: The project team gathered data and evidence through project monitoring on the relevance of the measures to address gender inequalities and empower women. Analysis of data and evidence were used to inform adjustments and changes, as appropriate. (both must be true)
- ☒ *2: The project team had some data and evidence on the relevance of the measures to address gender inequalities and empower women. There is evidence that at least some adjustments were made, as appropriate. (both must be true)*
- ☐ 1: The project team had limited or no evidence on the relevance of measures to address gender inequalities and empowering women. No evidence of adjustments and/or changes made. This option should also be selected if the project has no measures to address gender inequalities and empower women relevant to the project results and activities.

Evidence:

The RIA procedures proposed to use in the draft new revision of the law on normative and legal acts contain a step of conducting the gender based legal expertise of the draft legal act.

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:

Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. The project is categorized as Low risk through the SESP. See SESP report attached.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	RIA-2_SocialandEnvironmentalScreening_5521_307 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/RIA-2_SocialandEnvironmentalScreening_5521_307.docx)	sherzodbek.sharipov@undp.org	1/25/2021 9:57:00 AM

8. Were grievance mechanisms available to project-affected people and were grievances (if any) addressed to ensure any perceived harm was effectively mitigated?

- ☐ 3: Project-affected people actively informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism (SRM/SECU) and how to access it. If the project was categorized as High or Moderate Risk through the SESP, a project -level grievance mechanism was in place and project affected people informed. If grievances were received, they were effectively addressed in accordance with SRM Guidance. (all must be true)
- ☒ 2: *Project-affected people informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism and how to access it. If the project was categorized as High Risk through the SESP, a project -level grievance mechanism was in place and project affected people informed. If grievances were received, they were responded to but faced challenges in arriving at a resolution.*
- ☐ 1: Project-affected people was not informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism. If grievances were received, they were not responded to. (any may be true)

Evidence:

The project used reporting mechanisms, consultations with national partners to mitigate any possible grievances.

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 was regularly monitored of implementation of activities and evaluation of possible risks against targeted plan. Lessons learned from previous years were considered in implementation of project activities in 2020. The project progress was regularly reviewed at the Cluster meetings on monthly basis and during Cluster monitoring visits to the project office, in accordance with Monitoring and Evaluation Plan of the project. Please see M&E Plan attached and Annual Project Report upload in Atlas.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	MEPlan_RIA2_5521_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MEPlan_RIA2_5521_309.pdf)	sherzodbek.sharipov@undp.org	1/26/2021 7:41:00 AM

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:

Yes. The Project board were regularly held, at which a report on the work done was provided and work plans were approved. Attached file with PBM.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	minutesen2_5521_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/minutesen2_5521_310.pdf)	mukhammadjon.tursunov@undp.org	12/28/2020 12:54:00 PM

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:

Yes. The Risk Log has been regularly monitored and updated by the project in Atlas. For instance, such risk as a change of the management at the key national partnering organizations had emerged in 2019 when the former director of the LPR Institute received a new assignment at the Law University. The project team managed to maintain effective cooperation with the LPR Institute, jointly facilitate and complete the piloting of the regulatory impact assessment.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	FINAL_Risk_Log_RIA.doc_5521_311 (http://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FINAL_Risk_Log_RIA.doc_5521_311.pdf)	sherzodbek.sharipov@undp.org	1/26/2021 8:02:00 AM

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 team made its best to raise the funds for ensuring achievement of the key project outputs and goals.

Main challenges were related to underfinancing of the Project. The initial project budget was 1,500,000 USD, including 600,000 USD funded by UNDP, and 900,000 USD to be mobilized. By the end of the project life-cycle, total UNDP TRAC funding reached 413,194 USD. Starting from 2019 the project team consists only 3 staff – PM, AFA and specialist. No funds for positions of Task manager and project specialist were available, nor for activities under Component 3 (international treaties and standards).

The project was successful in raising donors funds for the critical program activities – promotion of smart regulation tools, anticorruption screening, civic engagement to law-making.

A number of capacity building and analytical activities were performed by the Project team, ensuring timely delivery of high quality policy advice products, such as the policy briefs, draft legal acts, expertise of the draft legal act.

This allowed ensuring full implementation of the Project outputs with lower costs.

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:

Yes. The project was focusing primarily on ensuring the policy advice and legal expertise services delivery. Thus, the biggest share of procurement activities of the Project was related to hiring the national and international consultants. All procurement activities were conducted in accordance with relevant procedures and plans of UNDP. All procurement requests were entered into online PROMPT system in line with relevant UNDP policies and procedures.

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 works effectively to monitor own costs and always considering ways to save money beyond following standard procurement rules. In particular, the Project pays special attention to the Value for Money Assessment during involvement of the national experts for short-term assignments in the framework of the Project. The results reviewed closely and developed further upon the necessity. The monitoring of cost efficiencies done through the relevant procedures of UNDP with involvement of the related departments of CO.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Effective**Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory**

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

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

Evidence:

All project activities was delivered timely and majorit y of expected project outputs was achieved as plann ed.

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:

Yes, the Project activities were reviewed by the GG C management on monthly basis. All changes in delivery and budgets were timely reflected in Budget revisions.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

17. Were the targeted groups systematically identified and engaged, prioritizing the marginalized and excluded, to ensure results were achieved as expected?

- ☐ 3: The project targeted specific groups and/or geographic areas, identified by using credible data sources on their capacity needs, deprivation and/or exclusion from development opportunities relevant to the project's area of work. There is clear evidence that the targeted groups were reached as intended. The project engaged regularly with targeted groups over the past year to assess whether they benefited as expected and adjustments were made if necessary, to refine targeting. (all must be true)
- ☒ 2: *The project targeted specific groups and/or geographic areas, based on some evidence of their capacity needs, deprivation and/or exclusion from development opportunities relevant to the project's area of work. Some evidence is provided to confirm that project beneficiaries are members of the targeted groups. There was some engagement with beneficiaries in the past year to assess whether they were benefiting as expected. (all must be true)*
- ☐ 1: The project did not report on specific targeted groups. There is no evidence to confirm that project beneficiaries are populations have capacity needs or are deprived and/or excluded from development opportunities relevant to the project area of work. There is some engagement with beneficiaries to assess whether they benefited as expected, but it was limited or did not occurred in the past year.
- ☐ Not Applicable

Evidence:

The project takes all necessary measures to involve all relevant groups to the implementation of the project. The groups of national partners which were identified in the project documents has been communicated directly by the project team and through the channels of NPC.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Sustainability & National Ownership**Quality Rating: 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 closely cooperating with all national partnering organizations (Ministry of Justice, LP R Institute, Academy of GPO, Academy of Public Administration, Ministry of Foreign Affairs) and was timely coordinated by NPC. The communications were maintaining via focal points at every national partnering organizations. The decisions made had always been preliminary discussed at the working and then at the decision making levels.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

19. Were there regular monitoring of changes in capacities and performance of institutions and systems relevant to the project, as needed, and were the implementation [arrangements](#)⁸ adjusted according to changes in partner capacities?

- ☐ 3: Changes in capacities and performance of national institutions and systems were assessed/monitored using clear indicators, rigorous methods of data collection and credible data sources including relevant HACT assurance activities. Implementation arrangements were formally reviewed and adjusted, if needed, in agreement with partners according to changes in partner capacities. (all must be true)
- ☒ 2: *Aspects of changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems were monitored by the project using indicators and reasonably credible data sources including relevant HACT assurance activities. Some adjustment was made to implementation arrangements if needed to reflect changes in partner capacities. (all must be true)*
- ☐ 1: Some aspects of changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems may have been monitored by the project, however changes to implementation arrangements have not been considered. Also select this option if changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems have not been monitored by the project.
- ☐ Not Applicable

Evidence:

All aspects of changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems have been monitored by the project on regular basis. For instance, the newly established Academy of the General Prosecutor's Office and the Legislative and Parliamentary Research Institute under the Oliy Majlis were engaged as new national partners in all capacity building activities of the project since 2018.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

20. Were the transition and phase-out arrangements were reviewed and adjusted according to progress (including financial commitment and capacity).

- ☒ 3: *The project's governance mechanism regularly reviewed the project's sustainability plan, including arrangements for transition and phase-out, to ensure the project remained on track in meeting the requirements set out by the plan. The plan was implemented as planned by the end of the project, taking into account any adjustments made during implementation. (both must be true)*
- ☐ 2: There was a review of the project's sustainability plan, including arrangements for transition and phase-out, to ensure the project remained on track in meeting the requirements set out by the plan.
- ☐ 1: The project may have had a sustainability plan but there was no review of this strategy after it was developed. Also select this option if the project did not have a sustainability strategy.

Evidence:

The project APA was regularly reviewed by Cluster and Project board, and was constantly monitor it, in order to ensure sustainability of project activity. Project document has been amendment in June 2020, with updates on project implemented partner.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Prodoc_RIA_2_phase_July_2020_eng_5521_320 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Prodoc_RIA_2_phase_July_2020_eng_5521_320.pdf)	mukhammadjon.tursunov@undp.org	12/28/2020 1:28:00 PM

QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments

The final project board, has evaluated delivered results and achievements and founded that project has been implemented timely, efficiently and within initial plan and with overall rate- good.

The final Project Board has adopted the following decisions:

1. To consider and approve the Final Report on results of the "Support to enhancement of lawmaking, rulemaking and regulatory impact assessment. Phase 2" UNDP Project.
2. To approve the results of final Quality Assurance of the Project results achieved in 2017-2020.
3. To conduct final budget revision to identify and reflect in financial documents the actual expenses and unspent financial resources. To approve the transfer of unspent funds to the UNDP project on parliamentary development.
4. To approve December 31, 2020 as the date of the Project's operational closure.
5. To submit the Project analytical papers for consideration of the Presidential Administration and further dissemination among other national partners.
6. To consider proposals of the D. Fayzieva, F. Otakhonov and I. Khamedov on organizing the workshops and lectures for the members of parliament on results of the Project and mechanisms of regulatory impact assessment within the framework of actual UNDP projects.
7. To approve the to transfer the project assets and equipment to the Center for International Legal Research and Comparative Public Law according to the Annex 2.
8. To finalize the procedure of assets and equipment transfer to the Center for International Legal Research and Comparative Public Law till December 31, 2020.