

# Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

**Form Status: Approved**

<b>Overall Rating:</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<b>Decision:</b>	
<b>Portfolio/Project Number:</b>	00088146
<b>Portfolio/Project Title:</b>	Green Chemistry
<b>Portfolio/Project Date:</b>	2018-01-01 / 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:**

Overall, the project faced initial delay due to delay in selection of Demonstration sites and then faced major issues due to the pandemic which did not allow many activities on ground. The project adapted to alternative ways of working as much as possible and worked on ground as and when COVID situation allowed and is all set to complete all targets by project closure date.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	PSCMeetingminute2020EN_11209_301 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PSCMeetingminute2020EN_11209_301.doc">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PSCMeetingminute2020EN_11209_301.doc</a> )	hoang.thanh.vinh@undp.org	12/13/2021 5:05:00 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:**

Output 1.3: Solutions developed at national and sub-national levels for sustainable management of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste.

Indicator 1.3.1: Number of new partnership mechanisms with funding for sustainable management solutions of natural resources, ecosystem services, chemicals and waste at national and/or subnational level.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

**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:**

In the Stakeholder Engagement Plan the prodoc identifies as main beneficiaries: workers in industries, consumers, and communities and secondly, the chemical and manufacturing industry. The first will benefit from the reduction of exposure to chemicals such as POPs emissions, mercury among others. The chemical and manufacturing industry will benefit through possible incentives, technical assistance and training and possible input in the regulations and guidance involved in GC implementation.

To promote the stakeholder's awareness raising, activities were held in which Green Chemistry principles were explained with all the GC and POPs relationships presented and the benefits. The PMU and the key stakeholders worked together identifying incentive mechanisms that would effectively sustain the development of Green Chemistry in the country.

**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:**

Of these impacts established the following results were obtained regarding each one of them. An enabling environment on GC was established through many actions and products resulting to the implementation. One of them was the 2 demonstration pilots in the companies Nishu and Plato. This hands-on experience can be shared with other industrial production process and small-scale companies that were fearful of the original need to make changes in technology and equipment.

The Project also has a list of communication products to be shared/

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Listofcommunicationproducts_11209_304 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Listofcommunicationproducts_11209_304.doc">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Listofcommunicationproducts_11209_304.doc</a> )	hoang.thanh.vinh@undp.org	12/13/2021 5:10:00 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:**

Probably the most important element of financial sustainability is concentrated in the government agency VEPF that gives loans for initiatives such as the application of GC principles in companies. This along with the revision of the Law on Chemicals that could provide incentives for GC applications is another factor that could assist in the financial sustainability.

The benefits that the application of GC in companies, such a marketing improvement, production cost reduction are all positive inputs to make the sustainability even more probable after the GEF funds have finished.

**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 Gender Marker Rating was GEN1: some contribution to gender equality in the 2020 PIR. At the time of this rating there were still gaps which had not been taken into consideration but were considered in the project implementation.

Gender mainstreaming plan developed at the beginning and is being monitoring annually. The project has strived to ensure that the following criteria will be respected: Equal opportunity to jobs; Equal rights to access of information and training; Engage more women in the Project team.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	2020GenderImplementationreport_11209_306 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2020GenderImplementationreport_11209_306.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2020GenderImplementationreport_11209_306.pdf</a> )	hoang.thanh.vinh@undp.org	12/13/2021 5:19:00 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 overall risk rating under the Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) is “Low” for this project at the time of its design. In the social and environmental safeguards identified in the SESP there was no way of knowing of the upcoming COVID-19 pandemic that effected and continues to do so in almost all of the project activities.

At the project design it was expected that GC demonstration activities in industrial processes, capacity building and awareness raising, and incentives would provide for a safer and more competitive manufacturing sector that in turn is a benefit for environment and society. For this reason, is that the SESP rating was low.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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

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

**Evidence:**

The overall risk rating under the Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) is “Low” for this project at the time of its design. No affected people were identified and no complains during project implementation.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

**Management & Monitoring**

**Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory**

9. Was the project’s M&E Plan adequately implemented?

- 3: *The project had a comprehensive and costed M&E plan. Baselines, targets and milestones were fully populated. Progress data against indicators in the project’s RRF was reported regularly using credible data sources and collected according to the frequency stated in the Plan, including sex disaggregated data as relevant. Any evaluations conducted, if relevant, fully meet decentralized evaluation standards, including gender UNEG standards. Lessons learned, included during evaluations and/or After-Action Reviews, were used to take corrective actions when necessary. (all must be true)*
- 2: The project costed M&E Plan, and most baselines and targets were populated. Progress data against indicators in the project’s RRF was collected on a regular basis, although there was may be some slippage in following the frequency stated in the Plan and data sources was not always reliable. Any evaluations conducted, if relevant, met most decentralized evaluation standards. Lessons learned were captured but were used to take corrective actions. (all must be true)
- 1: The project had M&E Plan, but costs were not clearly planned and budgeted for, or were unrealistic. Progress data was not regularly collected against the indicators in the project’s RRF. Evaluations did not meet decentralized evaluation standards. Lessons learned were rarely captured and used. Select this option also if the project did not have an M&E plan.

**Evidence:**

The M&E budget proposed was well prepared and correspond to an accurate estimation of the expenditure associated to these exercises. During implementation stage the M&E plan was sufficiently budgeted according to the budget presented in the project document. The APR/PIR reports for each year well prepared efficiently and risk management, social and environmental risks were analysed were identified using the UNDP SESP, gender analysis were covered accordingly in different yearly PIR reports.

The GEF/LDCF/SCCF core indicators were only presented at the TE stage. These indicators were not indicated early on in the project.

The Annual Implementation Reports were completed for 2019 and 2020. The Quarterly Reports were completed for all of 2020 and 2019.

**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:**

National Implementing Partner (NIP) for this project is the Ministry of Industry and Trade (MOIT) in coordination with the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MONRE) and other participating agencies and organisations. The MOIT is responsible and accountable for managing this project, including the monitoring and evaluation of project interventions, achieving project outcomes, and for the effective use of UNDP resources.

**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 faced the novel risk of the pandemic during implementation leading to delays in implementation. Viet Nam went through several lockdowns during 2020 and 2021. This affected most of the activities. The project worked hard to deploy alternative ways of working to make up for the delays in the previous years and got back on track in 2021. The project also ensured development, monitoring and implementation of the gender mainstreaming plan.

### List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

### Efficient

Quality Rating: **Highly Satisfactory**

12. Adequate resources were mobilized to achieve intended results. If not, management decisions were taken to adjust expected results in the project's results framework.

- Yes  
 No

#### Evidence:

The originally committed co-financing for the project, as indicated in Table 9 Co-financing table, was USD 8 400 000. The PMU has accounted as the amount invested by the stakeholders during implementation as USD 27 333 751. The difference in co-financing investments that were used as environmental improvements should be accounted for as co-financing. As indicated in Table 10 Confirmed Sources of Co-Financing at TE Stage there are large amounts that correspond to investment mobilized by some companies for environmental protection (e.g., investment on wastewater treatment plant) and should not be considered co-financing for the GC project. The actual co-financing that was used for GC work amounts to USD 9 863 990, which represents 17.4% above of the original amount committed by the stakeholders. This is a very good percentage of co-financing.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ConfirmedSourcesofCo-FinancingatTEstagefinal_11209_312">ConfirmedSourcesofCo-FinancingatTEstagefinal_11209_312</a> (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ConfirmedSourcesofCo-FinancingatTEstagefinal_11209_312.xlsx)	hoang.thanh.vinh@undp.org	12/13/2021 5:28:00 AM

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 MOIT as implementing partner was committed to the project objectives and played an important role in the obtaining of key results, like the regulations that apply to the Chemical Management Law. The funds were utilized in an efficient and effective manner in all cases of procurement of consultancies and services.

The implementing partner was direct and realistic in the PIR comments and reporting done regarding the project progress, challenges that it faced and the possible risks.

**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 budget invested in project activities and the resulting outcomes were well balanced and there was an efficient use of the funds. The total project expenditures till TE date only reached 77% of the original GEF grant of USD1 999 800. Although the total GEF grant was not disbursed, the positive results obtained were the product of an efficient use of the funds and the important stakeholder participation in fulfilling their committed co-financing in 17.4% above of the original amount. All project activities were completed in most cases above and beyond the expected results.

**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:**

Despite of all the restrictions from the COVID-19 pandemic, the project has been able to continue its work and produce important results toward the fulfillment of its objective; the reduction of the use and release of chemicals controlled under MEAs, other hazardous chemicals, improve energy and natural resource efficiency and reduce (GHG) emissions through the application of Green Chemistry principles in Vietnam. The Government of Vietnam and project team should be commended for their efforts to keep the project initiative alive during these difficult working times.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ProjectTerminalEvaluationReportVietnamfinal_11209_315.pdf">ProjectTerminalEvaluationReportVietnamfinal_11209_315 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ProjectTerminalEvaluationReportVietnamfinal_11209_315.pdf)</a>	hoang.thanh.vinh@undp.org	12/13/2021 5:32:00 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:**

A quarterly report is prepared indicating progress and important issues discussed and addressed. During this PIR, four quarterly progress reports submitted to UNDP and MOIT.

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 has successful collaboration and coordination between PMU and other stakeholders including the relevant ministries (MOIT, MONRE, MOST), Viet Nam Environmental Protection Fund, Local Government Agencies (Thai Nguyen, Ha Nam and Phu Tho, Quang Ngai and Quang Tri DONREs and DOITs), association and NGOs (Viet Nam Chemical Association, Viet Nam Responsible Care Council, etc.), institution and education sector (Hanoi University of Science and Technology, Hanoi University of Industry, Phenikaa University, Viet Nam Institute of Industrial Chemistry, etc.), private sector manufacturers (Plato JS C. VN, Nishu paint JSC, Northern Paint and Printing Ink Club, The Viet Nam Corrosion and Metal Protection Association, etc.), and UNDP.

**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:**

MOIT chairs the PSC and assigned VINACHEMIA as the national implementing partner (NIP) of the project. PSC provide guidance on project strategy and approve project annual work plans. With the leadership and guidance from MOIT, the project PMU has worked closely with UNDP and other stakeholders for implementation of the project as planned and ensuring the achievement of set objectives.

**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:**

MOIT is the national implementing partner (NIP) and will chair the PSC meeting for guiding PMU on project execution and correct its course, if required. The PSC will also oversee the work done by the PMU in line with MOIT function and responsibility on a regular basis.

The UNDP CO reporting in the yearly PIR is consistent with what in general was the project action and results. The possible risks associated to challenges such as the non-definition of the pilot companies was well defined and the actions taken and supported by UNDP were positive and effective.

The UNDP CO has been responsive to the different challenges that the PMU faced regarding different adaptive management changes that needed to be applied because of COVID-19 pandemic restrictions.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/UNDP-MA-VINACHEMIA2019-ENG_11209_319.pdf">UNDP-MA-VINACHEMIA2019-ENG_11209_319 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/UNDP-MA-VINACHEMIA2019-ENG_11209_319.pdf)</a>	hoang.thanh.vinh@undp.org	12/13/2021 5:36:00 AM

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 review of the project's sustainability plan was conducted at the Project Board meeting in early 2021. This is to ensure the project remained on track in meeting the requirements set out by the plan.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	PSC2020_11209_320 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PSC2020_11209_320.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PSC2020_11209_320.pdf</a> )	hoang.thanh.vinh@undp.org	12/13/2021 5:44:00 AM
2	PSCMeetingminute2020EN_11209_320 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PSCMeetingminute2020EN_11209_320.doc">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PSCMeetingminute2020EN_11209_320.doc</a> )	hoang.thanh.vinh@undp.org	12/13/2021 5:44:00 AM

**QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments**

The project is in line with related national policies (strategies and plans on environment protection, sustainable development, green growth, socio-economic development, clean industrial production, imports and exports, and sustainable production and consumption) and international commitments that Viet Nam has participated in as such the National Implementation Plan (NIP) for the implementation of the Stockholm Convention. The results and outcomes of the project will contribute to various levels of outcomes, outputs, indicators and goals of the UNDP CPD, strategy, and SDGs in Viet Nam.

The Project has conducted terminal evaluation with overall rating of Satisfactory.

