

Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

Form Status: Approved

Overall Rating:	Needs Improvement
Decision:	
Portfolio/Project Number:	00081909
Portfolio/Project Title:	Elimination of Persistent Organic Pollutants
Portfolio/Project Date:	2015-04-01 / 2021-12-31

Strategic

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

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

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

Evidence:

Unpredictable double force majeure factors occurred in 2020, namely the emergence of COVID-19 pandemic in early 2020, and then the hostilities in and around Nagorno-Karabakh in the fall, developed a situation in the country causing shift of Government's priorities to overcome the humanitarian, economic, health, social and political crisis. In this situation the fulfillment of Government's commitments of the project became impossible during the planned project lifetime.

Given these circumstances and the remaining time limitations to perform the core activity (disposal of obsolete pesticides waste) the Project Management Board has confirmed the scheduled project end date 31 December 2021 through the PMB meeting held on 11 May 2021

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	PMB_MeetingMinutes_11.05.2021_ENG_7978_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PMB_MeetingMinutes_11.05.2021_ENG_7978_301.pdf)	kristina.tereshchatova@undp.org	10/26/2021 8:29:00 PM

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

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

Evidence:

From three development settings under the UNDP Strategic Plan (2018-2021 and 2022-2025), the project corresponds to:

2. Accelerate structural transformations for sustainable development

2.8 outcome indicator: Number of parties to international multilateral environmental agreements on hazardous waste, and other chemicals that meet their commitments and obligations in transmitting information as required by each relevant agreement

Signature solution 4: Promote nature-based solutions for a sustainable planet

Sustainable solution output 2.4.1: Gender-responsive legal and regulatory frameworks, policies and institutions strengthened, and solutions adopted, to address conservation, sustainable use and equitable benefit sharing of natural resources, in line with international conventions and national legislation

Output indicator 2.4.1.1: Number of additional countries with gender-responsive measures in place for conservation, sustainable use, and equitable access to and benefit sharing of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems.

PRF Indicator: Volume (1,052 tons) of Category 1 waste exported and disposed environmentally sound under the PRF Outcome 2.1: Export and environmentally sound disposal of Category 1 waste.

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:

The project conducted series of public hearings and consultations on the development of a storage facility to host the repackaged POP/OPs waste from Nub arashen burial site/landfill. Concerns of the impacted communities and CSOs raised by the grievance of an alliance of environmental NGOs and community representing CSOs were discussed through series of round table meetings at UNDP, Aarhus Center, Ministry of Environment, Ministry of Emergency Situations, and ultimately the raised aspects were put on the Project Management Board agenda. The latter decided to cancel this project and a new site to serve as a waste storage was selected. Similarly, series of public hearings and consultations were held involving stakeholders, impacted communities on on-site works of POP/OPs waste excavation, repackaging and making ready for disposal. Through SGP support, the AWHHE conducted POPs and chemical waste related awareness building seminars for the impacted community members and leaders. The subsequently developed Environmental and Social Impact Assessment report has been developed addressing aspects and concerns raised by beneficiaries and received preliminary approval. Representatives of two environmental CSOs are involved in the Project Advisory Committee.

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:

In 2017 the project contractor company performed a reassessment of POP/OPs waste contamination in Nubarashen landfill, and the reported amounts were different from the ones reflected in the Project Document. The Project's Mid-term Evaluation was conducted in early 2018. Per the MTE recommendation, the Project's Results Framework was modified and approved by the PMB respectively reflecting the revised quantities of the waste to be treated and disposed, thus the project expected Global Ecological Benefit measured in tons of disposed waste was changed from Category 1 initially estimated 900 ton the modified amount is 1,052 ton, the Category 2 soil was 7,100 per the initial estimate, the revised amount was 4,123 ton, the Category 3 soil was estimated 12,700 ton, reassessed amount was 8,500 ton.

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:

Severely impacted by COVID-19 pandemic and hostilities in and around Nagorno-Karabakh in 2020, the project team and the Government counterparts were not able to achieve the ultimate goal, namely the disposal of around 1,052 tons of POP/OPs waste, and decontamination of up to 4,123 tons of soil (specified as GEB). However, dwelling on knowledge accumulated within the project and transferred to stakeholders, the Government of the Republic of Armenia is planning to undertake the waste disposal commitment under the state funding upon availability of feasible solutions after the end of the project on 31 December 2021. Development of a package of documents in compliance with respective state funding proposal was finalized through support provided by the project and handed over to the Ministry of Environment before its closure. A Roadmap of necessary actions was developed and approved by the Project Management Board, to guide the subsequent steps necessary for the approval of the state funding proposal to execute the Nubarashen waste elimination.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	ROADMAP_statefundingallocationsteps_ENG_7978_305 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ROADMAP_statefundingallocationsteps_ENG_7978_305.docx)	gayane.gharagebakyan@undp.org	12/21/2021 10:54:00 AM

Principled

Quality Rating: **Needs Improvement**

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

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

Evidence:

Project's gender equality policy aimed at ensuring the participation/involvement of women in all project-related managerial and advisory groups through the project lifetime, given that the project is implemented in male-dominated professional specialization areas (including engineering/construction, hydrogeology, heavy transportation). Project's core staff consisted two women and one man, around 30% women in the Project Management Board (at the time of current Q A reporting the PMB consisted 4 women and 4 men), 50% - in the Project Advisory Committee. From hired 15 national consultants 7 women specialists were involved in the expert work.

The project was attaching importance of women's empowerment and expanding women's role in the project implementation process also by involving women led CSOs, professional companies (in civil-engineering design field, awareness building) in public hearings and public discussion events, in training course – a special focus was on advocacy, encouragement and motivation initiatives aimed to ensure equal access for women to various narrow professional capacity development, training, initiatives, etc. Thus, in the project organized and conducted training/capacity building and public consultation events in total 374 national specialists (188 women and 186 men – 50% women participation) participated from different areas representing the CSOs, academia, governing bodies, private professional institutions. During the Project implementation phase, the initial Gender Marker score was increased from GEN1 to GEN2.

See the Standard Progress Report (SPR Q3), Part I V

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Q3_SPR_POPsproject_2021_7978_306 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Q3_SPR_POPsproject_2021_7978_306.pdf)	kristina.tereshchatova@undp.org	10/26/2021 8:40:00 PM

7. Were social and environmental impacts and risks successfully managed and monitored?

- 3: Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. Appropriate assessments conducted where required (i.e., Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) for High risk projects and some level of social and environmental assessment for Moderate risk projects as identified through SESP). Relevant management plan(s) developed for identified risks through consultative process and implemented, resourced, and monitored. Risks effectively managed or mitigated. If there is a substantive change to the project or change in context that affects risk levels, the SESP was updated to reflect these changes. (all must be true)
- 2: *Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. Appropriate assessments conducted where required (i.e., Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) for High risk projects and some level of social and environmental assessment for Moderate risk projects as identified through SESP). Relevant management plan(s) developed, implemented and monitored for identified risks. OR project was categorized as Low risk through the SESP.*
- 1: Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. For projects categorized as High or Moderate Risk, there was no evidence that social and environmental assessments completed and/or management plans or measures development, implemented or monitored. There are substantive changes to the project or changes in the context but SESP was not updated. (any may be true)

Evidence:

At the design and Inception phase the Project was categorized with overall Moderate Risk. Two risks were added in ProDoc reflecting 5 risks after the Inception Workshop, then 8 risks were also added from the SESP checklist. Through the project implementation three new risks were also added in response to the emerged force majeure situations in the following aspects: political – “velvet revolution” in 2018, health – COVID-19 pandemic since early 2020, and military – hostilities in NK in fall of 2020. The project’s Risk Log covers all types of risks relevant to the project and was updated regularly with commenting on updated mitigation measures. The status of all 18 risks were marked as “Eliminated/Completed” in the last update of the project Risk-Log (June 2021), since per the PMB decision as of 11 May 2021 meeting, the project will complete on 31 December 2021, without performing its field activities.
See the SPR Q3, Offline Risk Log

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:

There are civil society organizations, in the format of environmental NGOs/associations, actively acting and cooperating with the project and affected communities. They supported in raising population's concerns in relation to the project activities and to timely address potential grievances. Public consultations held through the EIA (publicizing the EIA report, protocols of consultations, etc.) or in a separate round table processes, were the mechanism to inform project impacted people on potential risks of the project activities, to hear their concerns and to address those. See also the response to the Question #3.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Management & Monitoring

Quality Rating: 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 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:

Project's M&E was conducted in compliance to the Project Document Chapter IX. Monitoring Framework and Evaluation, p.88-93., following all GEF and UNDP required formats and processes to monitor, evaluate and report. The Mid-Term Evaluation is conducted in March-June 2018. The Terminal Evaluation is held in May-October 2021. The required standard progress reports were developed and submitted timely. Donor required brief progress reports were also posted in ATLAS. Annual PIR was developed and submitted due time. Data sources were reliable and based on the project's direct observations. GEF tracking tools on chemicals and POPs were applied as appropriate.

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:

The cumulative Standard Progress Report (reflecting the PRF, Risks Log, Future Action and Detailed Work-Plan) was developed and updated on a regular/quarterly basis (and uploaded in ATLAS), the Armenian version was shared with the PMB at the beginning of each year. Respective Project Management Board meeting protocols were developed in English and Armenian languages, shared with all PMB members for comments, signed by co-chairs and distributed to all PMB members – in some cases also with the Project Advisory Committee members, and uploaded in the ATLAS system. As an exemplary evidence, the PMB protocol of the recent meeting as of 11 May 2021 and 30 November 2021 are uploaded for this QA. See also the SPR Q3.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	PMB_MeetingMinutes_11.05.2021_ENG_7978_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PMB_MeetingMinutes_11.05.2021_ENG_7978_310.pdf)	gayane.gharagebakyan@undp.org	12/21/2021 11:44:00 AM
2	PROTOCOL_PMBPOPsProject_30Nov2021_ENG_7978_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PROTOCOL_PMBPOPsProject_30Nov2021_ENG_7978_310.pdf)	gayane.gharagebakyan@undp.org	12/21/2021 3:20:00 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:

The list of Project risks is adequately reflected in the online system and is regularly updated with treatment measures and comments, as well as updated in the standard progress reports.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Efficient

Quality Rating: Needs Improvement

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:

Volatile double force majeure factors occurred in 2020, namely the emergence of COVID-19 pandemic and the hostilities in and around Nagorno-Karabakh, developed a situation in the country when the Government's priorities were shifted to overcome the humanitarian, economic, health, social and political crises. In this situation the fulfillment of Government's co-financing commitments to the project became impossible during the planned project lifetime. The project succeeded in attracting a small-scale co-financing funding from UNDP Russian Trust Fund and Czech Trust Fund in support of its initiatives directed to the risk assessment, study and recommendations on chemical waste disposal alternative options. The expected results were adjusted in the project's results framework. Initiatives under the project exit strategy were developed and agreed with PMB, to guide the project course before its closure.

See the SPR Q3, Results Framework

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Q3_SPR_POPsproject_2021_ENG_7978_312 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Q3_SPR_POPsproject_2021_ENG_7978_312.pdf)	gayane.gharagebakyan@undp.org	12/21/2021 3:26:00 PM

13. Were project inputs procured and delivered on time to efficiently contribute to results?

- 3: The project had a procurement plan and kept it updated. The project quarterly reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addressed them through appropriate management actions. (all must be true)
- 2: *The project had updated procurement plan. The project annually reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addressed them through appropriate management actions. (all must be true)*
- 1: The project did not have an updated procurement plan. The project team may or may not have reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs regularly, however management actions were not taken to address them.

Evidence:

The project develops and follows annual procurement plans reflected and updated in the PROMPT platform per the required procedure. The project team was responsible for developing respective ToRs for national and international procurement involving International Consultant in the evaluation processes. For complex cases the project and CO team were directly screening all the tender documents and applied UNDP HQ procedures for procurement advisory committee (ACP) for the relevance of applied approaches and for receiving ACP's prior approval.

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:

All Project costs were carefully discussed, planned, necessary market research conducted, and most valued results were obtained with the minimum cost (corresponding procurement evaluation reports were developed). Anecdotal examples:

The Project had saving due to the usage of other Projects' vehicles on ad hoc request bases (the vehicle, maintenance, petrol, driver salary etc. costs were minimized during the first two operational years).

The Project team moved to one room from earlier occupied three rooms to save the budget. For national capacity building activities, the project attracted external resources from Czech Trust Fund and Russian Trust Funds.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Effective

Quality Rating: Needs Improvement

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

- Yes
- No

Evidence:

See the Terminal Evaluation Report and the cumulative PIR.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	TE-POPsProject_7978_315 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/TE-POPsProject_7978_315.pdf)	kristina.tereshchatova@undp.org	10/26/2021 8:56:00 PM
2	2020-GEF-PIR-PIMS4905-GEFID4737_7978_315 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2020-GEF-PIR-PIMS4905-GEFID4737_7978_315.docx)	gayane.gharagebakyan@undp.org	12/21/2021 2:19:00 PM

16. Were there regular reviews of the work plan to ensure that the project was on track to achieve the desired results, and to inform course corrections if needed?

- 3: Quarterly progress data informed regular reviews of the project work plan to ensure that the activities implemented were most likely to achieve the desired results. There is evidence that data and lessons learned (including from evaluations /or After-Action Reviews) were used to inform course corrections, as needed. Any necessary budget revisions were made. (both must be true)
- 2: *There was at least one review of the work plan per year with a view to assessing if project activities were on track to achieving the desired development results (i.e., outputs.) There may or may not be evidence that data or lessons learned were used to inform the review(s). Any necessary budget revisions have been made.*
- 1: While the project team may have reviewed the work plan at least once over the past year to ensure outputs were delivered on time, no link was made to the delivery of desired development results. Select this option also if no review of the work plan by management took place.

Evidence:

Project's detailed annual work plan has been reviewed and updated in December-January each year, shared with the PMB respectively incorporated into the previous year's annual standard progress report, for comments or no-objection. Respective budget revisions were conducted accordingly. See the 2020 SPR Q4, with Detailed work plan

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	SPR_POPs_Q4_2020_ENG_7978_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SPR_POPs_Q4_2020_ENG_7978_316.docx)	gayane.gharagebakyan@undp.org	12/21/2021 3:32:00 PM

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

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

Evidence:

The CSO and representatives of administrations (mayors and municipality representatives of the communities from potential impact communities (Mushavan, Voghjabers, Geghadir, Hrazdan, Yerevan - geographically located close to the project site Nubarashen landfill) participated in the Project supported public consultations and capacity building events to increase their knowledge in the project focus activities and their impact, and for their informed involvement in the project implementation or decision making.

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:

The modality of the Project is support to NIM. All relevant stakeholders (including 7 national managerial bodies, eg. the Government, Ministries of the RA, Yerevan Mu are involved in the Project Management Board (PMB), 10 national and CSO organizations with representatives were involved in the PAC and in the decision-making, implementation and monitoring, however the procurement and Project's day to day management is implemented by the Project Management Unit and UNDP CO. Important procurement/tender documentation packages were being shared with the PMB and PAC members for their comments/no-objection.

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:

Based on the institutional capacity gaps revealed by the Project, an assessment for national hazardous waste management, specifically on improvement of national analytical capacity on POPs and other hazardous waste substances was conducted, two pieces of analytical/lab equipment were purchased: a) sample evaporator system (to facilitate sample preparation process for chemical analysis of POPs); and b) hand-held XRF field analyzer/spectrometer (to detect chemical elements at atomic level, including chlorine [Cl] for detection of chlorinated POPs pesticides). Training on operation and use of XRF field analyzer/spectrometer for national laboratories on POPs was conducted by the representative of "Olympus Moscow" LLC on 04.09.2018 and the second training – on 07.05.2019. The project transferred both pieces of equipment to respective beneficiaries and conducted a follow-up on their use. Other hazardous waste management national capacity building events were organized by the project (374 national specialists participated from different areas representing the CSOs, academia, governing bodies, private professional institutions).

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

20. Were the transition and phase-out arrangements 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 Terminal report summarized the results achieved (objectives, outcomes, outputs), lessons learned, problems met and areas where results may not have been achieved. It also laid out recommendations for further steps that may need to be taken to ensure sustainability and replicability of the project's results. The TE report suggests three main sustainability dimensions: i) social – through wide consultations the understanding of chemicals waste issue understanding was improved in the country, environmental community became more inclusive which will contribute to the future sustainability; ii) financial – the positive aspect is that through increased awareness of policy makers and communities on the need to address the risks posed by the chemical waste and has also shown that one key factor in addressing this issue is the planning of financial allocations. Assisted by the project and in close collaboration with the Ministry of Environment a package of the state funding proposal was developed together with the Roadmap directed to achieve the objective set for the project, namely the elimination of the OPs/POP waste from Nu barashen landfill; iii) institutional – the project was successful building national capacity in the chemical waste handling and contributed to this also involving valuable external expertise; iv) environmental – use of the latter in mitigating potential risks when once again the POP/OPs elimination initiative will be on the government's agenda.

See uploaded Terminal Evaluation Report (point 15) and the Protocol of the PMB last session dated 30 November 2021 (point 10).

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments**NOTED AND PROPOSED**

- 1) The project delivered results were highly appreciated.
- 2) Efforts in finding a feasible solution for Nubarashen OPs waste disposal and the support in this direction to be continued by the national responsible parties.

CONCLUDED AND DECIDED

The PMB session confirmed consensus decision:

1. Considering the Project Terminal Evaluation Report as appropriate and acceptable.
2. Acknowledging the Roadmap (Annex 1) for inclusion of the state funding proposal on Nubarashen OPs waste disposal in the 2023-2025 MTEF and processing by the Ministry of Environment for the state financing allocation.
3. Acknowledging the transfer of the Project developed knowledge materials/documents to stakeholders.