Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

Form Status: Approved	

Overall Rating:	Highly Satisfactory
Decision:	
Portfolio/Project Number:	00081940
Portfolio/Project Title:	Sustainable Land and Forest Management
Portfolio/Project Date:	2016-01-01 / 2019-12-31

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:

Since the beginning of the project, there have been a number of challenges in the external environment. These include continued reforms in the forest sector, political changes of sprint 2018, and most importantly, the COVD-19 situation and the resulting lockdown and the escalation of the Nagorno Karabakh armed conflict and the resulting martial law. Throughout its implementation, the project has regularly considered these changes, both during stakeholder consultations and during Advisory and Management board meetings. The project has done its best to adjust its course in accordance with the changes in the external environment, i.e. replacing some field trips with online monitoring, conducting Environmental Impact Assessment public consultations with Zoom, and replacing conscripted members of the counterparts with new people.

List of Uploaded Documents		
#	**File Name**	**Modified By**	**Modified On**
No documents available.			

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

○ 3: The project responded to at least one of the development settings as specified in the Strategic Plan (SP) and adopted at least one Signature Solution .The project's RRF included all the relevant SP output indicators. (all must be true)

● *2: The project responded to at least one of the developments settings1 as specified in the Strategic Plan. The project's RRF included at least one SP output indicator, if relevant. (both must be true)*

○ 1: While the project may have responded to a partner's identified need, this need falls outside of the UNDP Strategic Plan. Also select this option if none of the relevant SP indicators are included in the RRF.

Evidence:

The Project responds to the Strategic Plan, Outcome 1, Output 1.3 and its respective SP IRRF indicators.

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 targeted beneficiaries are the forest enterprises in Hayantar SNCO which are engaged in taking decisions on both national and local levels. Given the nature of the Project, excluded and marginalized groups were not specifically targeted. The Project applied wide participatory approach in identifying beneficiary priorities to design project activities.

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:

> Lessons learned and their implications are reflected in the regular project reports and during Project Board meetings. Relevant document is attached. Knowledge and lessons were learned from the external evaluation and documented in the Final Evaluation report.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	SLM_SFM_conslus_lesons_learned_recommend_7993_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SLM_SFM_conslus_lesons_learned_recommend_7993_304.docx)	lusine.sargsyan@undp.org	3/25/2021 10:18:00 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:

The project was the initiator of several innovations which have the potential to be up-scaled. These are (1) the carbon monitoring mechanism which will contribute to the establishment of the national carbon monitoring system, (2) the model briquette production facility which can be replicated at a lower cost and others. Also, the forest ecosystem rehabilitation practices applied in the Project will be replicated in the upcoming projects and state programms as well. Project has also produced number of policy recommendations related to the forest management models and inventory to be further used by the government in the course of reshaping a national forest policy.

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:

Gender sensitivity and gender considerations were taken into account in the formulation of the project; proposing gender sensitive approaches where needed, including the need to pay attention to gender equality. Roles of men and women to participate in activities of the project were equally assigned without any discrimination. Within the framework of the SGP modality, several NGOs were selected for small grants, one of which was women-led. The project took steps to ensure that women accounted for at least 30 % of pasture stakeholders undergone technical and skills training and development in sustainable pasture management, of forest dependents trained in technical skills for sustainable forest resource use, and of households reporting increased incomes from forest and non-forest resources in target communities.

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:

> The Project Document integrates Social and Environ
> mental Screening Procedures (SESP), which are ma
> naged and monitored accordingly. All risks were reg
> ularly tracked and uploaded in Atlas and in Standard
> Progress Reports. The ProDoc Annex 4 (SESP) is h
> ereto attached.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	ANNEX_4.SESP_final_docx_7993_307 (http s://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFor mDocuments/ANNEX_4.SESP_final_docx_7 993_307.docx)	lusine.sargsyan@undp.org	3/25/2021 10:09:00 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 was categorized as Moderate Risks, thu
> s the project-affected people were informed of UND
> Ps Corporate Accountability Mechanism. The project
> also regularly sought and received feedback from be
> neficiaries and project-affected people and took the
> m into consideration when developing project work p
> lans, while there were no grievances recorded.

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 project had a clearly defined Monitoring and Reporting Framework, with appropriate costs separately indicated as Activity 3 in the budget. Progress data against indicators was collected regularly and reported in accordance with the reporting standards (UNDP, GEF), as well as through Project Board and Advisory Committee Meetings. Moreover, the Project underwent Mid-term and Final evaluations, where credible evidence was provided against Project RRF and Project Capacity Development Scorecards. The project received 5 (satisfactory) out of possible 6 points in Final evaluation. The project has also hired independent consultants to verify progress of field interventions against specific targets and indicators, namely at community level interventions.

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 Project Document stipulated the establishment of an Advisory Board and a Management board. While the Management board was the main tool for project Governance and included representatives from UNDP and the main project beneficiaries, MoE and Hayantar, the Advisory board was a more technical tool to address professional issues raised during project implementation and had an extensive composition of more than 40 members. The Advisory Board met once a year, at the end of the year, to discuss project results. Four meetings were conducted in all, in 2016, 2017, 2018 and 2019. The 2020 meeting didn't take place due to the combined impact of the COVID-19 crisis and the escalation of the Nagorno Karabakh armed conflict.
The Project Management board met at least once a year, sometimes more, and conducted a total of 7 meetings. The Minutes of all MBMs are hereto attached.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	MBMMinutes2016.08.16_7993_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MBMMinutes2016.08.16_7993_310.docx)	lusine.sargsyan@undp.org	3/25/2021 10:33:00 AM
2	MBMMinutes2017.03.31_7993_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MBMMinutes2017.03.31_7993_310.docx)	lusine.sargsyan@undp.org	3/25/2021 10:34:00 AM
3	MBMMinutes2017.12.21_7993_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MBMMinutes2017.12.21_7993_310.docx)	lusine.sargsyan@undp.org	3/25/2021 10:34:00 AM
4	MBMMinutes2018.02.13_7993_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MBMMinutes2018.02.13_7993_310.docx)	lusine.sargsyan@undp.org	3/25/2021 10:34:00 AM
5	MBMMinutes2018.12.20_7993_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MBMMinutes2018.12.20_7993_310.docx)	lusine.sargsyan@undp.org	3/25/2021 10:34:00 AM
6	MBMMinutes2019.12.24_7993_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MBMMinutes2019.12.24_7993_310.DOCX)	lusine.sargsyan@undp.org	3/25/2021 10:34:00 AM
7	MBMMinutes2020.12.15_7993_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MBMMinutes2020.12.15_7993_310.pdf)	lusine.sargsyan@undp.org	3/25/2021 10:34:00 AM

11. Were risks to the project adequately monitored and managed?

○ *3: The project monitored risks every quarter and consulted with the key stakeholders, security advisors, to identify continuing and emerging risks to assess if the main assumptions remained valid. There is clear evidence that relevant management plans and mitigating measures were fully implemented to address each key project risk and were updated to reflect the latest risk assessment. (all must be true)*

○ 2: The project monitored risks every year, as evidenced by an updated risk log. Some updates were made to management plans and mitigation measures.

○ 1: The risk log was not updated as required. There was may be some evidence that the project monitored risks that may affected the project's achievement of results, but there is no explicit evidence that management actions were taken to mitigate risks.

Evidence:

Risks were monitored quarterly and duly recorded in respective platforms. Screenshots from Atlas risk m onitoring are hereto attached.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	SLMProjectRisks_7993_311 (https://intranet. undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocument s/SLMProjectRisks_7993_311.pdf)	lusine.sargsyan@undp.org	3/25/2021 10:36:00 AM

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:

All the co-funding resources committed at the projec t design stage were operationalised. Moreover, twice during its implementation, the project involved a Rus sian expert on demand funded by UNDP Russia Tru st Fund to conduct forestry-related studies.
The project involved Government co-financing in 20 19 in the amount of $17,520.14 to contribute toward rehabilitation of degraded pastures in Tavush and Lo ri. Respective Memorandums are hereto attached.
In 2020, the project involved Government co-financi ng in kind, to contribute to the rehabilitation of degra ded pastures in Vahagni village.
The project also had one local and two international interns.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Berd_7993_312 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Berd_7993_312.pdf)	lusine.sargsyan@undp.org	3/25/2021 10:42:00 AM
2	Gugarq_7993_312 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Gugarq_7993_312.pdf)	lusine.sargsyan@undp.org	3/25/2021 10:42:00 AM
3	Margahovit_7993_312 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Margahovit_7993_312.pdf)	lusine.sargsyan@undp.org	3/25/2021 10:42:00 AM
4	Yenoqavan_7993_312 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Yenoqavan_7993_312.pdf)	lusine.sargsyan@undp.org	3/25/2021 10:43:00 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 project developed procurement plans on a yearly basis and had them approved by the Management Board..

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:

> Procurement of services, works and goods for the project purposes was handled according to UNDP standard procurement terms and regulations. Availability of several price offers for each procurement case contributes to cost-efficiency of the project expenditures. The project actively coordinated its activities with on-going initiatives, namely with activities of FAO, WWF, GIZ and the GEF SGP to avoid overlapping, coordinate joint action and achieve the best cost efficiency.

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:

The project was able achieve most of its objectives. There were some deviations regarding some of the outputs, mainly the Forest Management Plans and the indicators proceeding from this, while on some other outputs, notably degraded forest rehabilitation and trainings, the project overachieved the initially planned objectives:

-The project prepared FMPs for 6 FEs, instead of the initially planned 8, which are currently undergoing EIA.

-9 communities have updated development plans (initially planned - 5)

-651,727 metric t CO2 avoided and sequestrated carbon benefits over ten-year period due to improved sustainable management of forests (planned - 681,990 metric t)

-166,704 ha of forest area (66,7% of all forest cover of project target area, including specially protected nature areas) is managed for multiple forest management and ecosystem benefits (planned - 250,000 ha)

-60 forest staff in 6 FEs trained in the use of ecosystem-based planning tools (planned - 60)

-120 pasture stakeholders (of which 55 were women) in Tavush and Lori marzes for the period of 2018-2020 have received technical skills and practical knowledge in sustainable pasture management (planned - 100)

-500 forest dependents (of which 150 were women) in total are trained in technical skills for sustainable forest resource use for the period of 2017-2020 (planned - 500)

-85,000 High conservation value forests (HCVF) have been delineated in Lori and Tavush region (planned - 85,000 ha)

-5682 ha degraded forests have been rehabilitated (planned - 4,932 ha)

-1000 ha degraded pastures rehabilitated (planned - 1000 ha)

Project final SPR with RRF is hereto attached for more details.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	SLM_SFM_SPR_2016_2020_Final_7993_31 5 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/Q AFormDocuments/SLM_SFM_SPR_2016_2 020_Final_7993_315.docx)	lusine.sargsyan@undp.org	3/31/2021 7:36:00 AM

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

○ 3: Quarterly progress data informed regular reviews of the project work plan to ensure that the activities implemented were most likely to achieve the desired results. There is evidence that data and lessons learned (including from evaluations /or After-Action Reviews) were used to inform course corrections, as needed. Any necessary budget revisions were made. (both must be true)

◉ *2: There was at least one review of the work plan per year with a view to assessing if project activities were on track to achieving the desired development results (i.e., outputs.) There may or may not be evidence that data or lessons learned were used to inform the review(s). Any necessary budget revisions have been made.*

○ 1: While the project team may have reviewed the work plan at least once over the past year to ensure outputs were delivered on time, no link was made to the delivery of desired development results. Select this option also if no review of the work plan by management took place.

Evidence:

> The project reviewed the Workplan every year and had it approved during the Project Management Board meeting. 2019-2020 AWP is hereto attached as a sample.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	AnnualWorkPlan-2019-2020_7993_316 (http s://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFor mDocuments/AnnualWorkPlan-2019-2020_7 993_316.xlsx)	lusine.sargsyan@undp.org	3/25/2021 10:50:00 AM

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 targeted beneficiaries are the forest enterprises in Hayantar SNCO which are engaged in taking decisions on both national and local levels. Given the nature of the Project, excluded and marginalized groups were not specifically targeted. The Project applied wide participatory approach in identifying beneficiary priorities to design project activities. There were particular cases where project generated benefits were directed especially toward distressed families: community resources were used to identify them. One example is distribution of generated firewood after coppicing activities during degraded forest rehabilitation - firewood was given to the most distressed families. Another example is procurement by the project of 60 tons of briquettes for families displaced from Nagorno Karabakh after the escalation of the conflict - the families were identified by the Lori governor's office. Relevant documents are hereto attached.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	LetterfromLorimarzpetaran39259Nov18briquettesrequest_7993_317 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/LetterfromLorimarzpetaran39259Nov18briquettesrequest_7993_317.pdf)	lusine.sargsyan@undp.org	3/25/2021 10:54:00 AM
2	RE_Procurementofbriquettes_7993_317 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/RE_Procurementofbriquettes_7993_317.pdf)	lusine.sargsyan@undp.org	3/25/2021 10:54:00 AM

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:

UNDP CO provided support services, and the government was fully engaged into the design and further decision-making through engagement in the Project Management Board, Advisory board, etc. The Government approved annual budgets, annual work plans, and project standard progress reports. UNDP and the Government jointly developed TORs based on which tenders were announced. The Advisory board participated in technical discussions in order to adjust the course of activities. Local authorities were also engaged into planning and implementation of community pasture schemes. In particular, local communities participated in awareness-raising campaigns.

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:

There was regular monitoring of changes in capaciti es and performance of national institutions and syst ems relevant to the project. The project signed three Responsible Party Agreements with "Hayantar" SNC O. After the second RPA, a HACT micro-assessmen t of Hayantar was carried out in 2019, with the overa ll mark being satisfactory, after which the third RPA was granted to the SNCO.
The project has also carried out several capacity-bui lding exercises for the beneficiaries. Among these ar e: Remote sensing workshop, GIS concept training, GPS and Trimble usage training, and Forest Invento ry Backstopping Data Analysis workshop for the em ployees of the State Forest Monitoring Center, MoN P, and Forest Enterprises.
Several trainings were also carried out for cattle-bre eders in Lori and Tavush on sustainable pasture usa ge. Similarly, the employees of Lori and Tavush Fore st Enterprises were trained on identification and mon itoring of indicator bird and butterfly species.

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 applied all efforts to link the Project's work to the Government reform agenda in the forest sector, thus ensuring the sustainability of the project outcomes. During the final Project Management Board meeting, the board discussed follow-up activities and some sustainability elements, which were also considered and included into the final evaluation's recommendations.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	MBMMinutes_15December2020-FINALEngArm-signed_7993_320 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MBMMinutes_15December2020-FINALEngArm-signed_7993_320.pdf)	lusine.sargsyan@undp.org	3/26/2021 9:08:00 AM

QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments

Project Management Board recommendation during the final meeting of the Board:

1.   The Project will do final inventory and submit a list to the Ministry of Environment of the assets and equipment which will be transferred to the Ministry and which will be transferred to the new upcoming project.

2.   UNDP and the Ministry will revisit the issue of organizing a final workshop for the project in January/February 2021, contingent upon the COVID situation.

3.   UNDP and the Ministry will further organize a more technical meeting in order to take deeper stock of all the project achievements and explore the logical next steps in terms of spin-off and follow-up projects.