

# Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

**Form Status: Approved**

<b>Overall Rating:</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<b>Decision:</b>	
<b>Portfolio/Project Number:</b>	00109316
<b>Portfolio/Project Title:</b>	Innovative Solutions for SDG Implementation in Armenia
<b>Portfolio/Project Date:</b>	2018-04-01 / 2021-12-31

**Strategic**

**Quality Rating: Exemplary**

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

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

**Evidence:**

The virtual project board convened on 26 November 2019 following the Steering Committee meeting of the project donor Russia-UNDP Trust Fund for Development, where the board discussed to a) approve top-up finding in the amount of \$250,000 to be allocated to the Project for core activities of the Lab in Y2020 b) extend the project from May 2020 to 31 December 2020 following the request of UNDP Armenia office and revise the budget adding the new allocation and extension period. The board endorsed the project to proceed with proposed amendments. The meeting minutes were signed by UNDP Resident Representative Dmitry Mariyasin and Head of Deputy Prime-Minister's Office Varak Sisserian.

Following the approval of the board, budget revisions were made. To adjust the scope of the project to the new amendments, the Project Document has also been reviewed in February 2020 to include new components and reflect the no-cost extension from May 2020 to 31 December 2020. Moreover, following the COVID-19 and war-related situation in the country, and to maximize project delivery and ensure the completion of already-initiated activities, the Project request a no-cost extension which was approved until 1 May 2021. Please refer to the attached 2019 and 2020 annual reports, amendments to the Project Document, Project Board meeting minutes and the project no-cost extension approval for details.

On 28 April 2021, the Project held its final LPAC meeting, with high-level representation of the Deputy Prime-Minister of Armenia, Russia-UNDP trust fund for development, representative from the Embassy of the Russian Federation in Armenia, representatives from the Government of Armenia, UNRC and UNDP. The board members acknowledged the remarkable results achieved during the project and approved the final results. Please refer to the attached final SPR for details.

### List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Inno4SDGs_FinalLPAC_signed_28Apr2021_8334_301 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Inno4SDGs_FinalLPAC_signed_28Apr2021_8334_301.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Inno4SDGs_FinalLPAC_signed_28Apr2021_8334_301.pdf</a> )	elen.sahradyan@undp.org	6/28/2021 3:54:00 PM
2	3TFDprojectsinArmenia-interofficememoontheprojectsextension.docx_8334_301 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/3TFDprojectsinArmenia-interofficememoontheprojectsextension.docx_8334_301.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/3TFDprojectsinArmenia-interofficememoontheprojectsextension.docx_8334_301.pdf</a> )	elen.sahradyan@undp.org	6/28/2021 3:55:00 PM
3	SDGLab_AmendmenttoProDoc_2020_8334_301 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SDGLab_AmendmenttoProDoc_2020_8334_301.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SDGLab_AmendmenttoProDoc_2020_8334_301.pdf</a> )	elen.sahradyan@undp.org	6/28/2021 3:55:00 PM
4	SDGLab_27.11.19_boardminutesscan_8334_301 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SDGLab_27.11.19_boardminutesscan_8334_301.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SDGLab_27.11.19_boardminutesscan_8334_301.pdf</a> )	elen.sahradyan@undp.org	6/28/2021 3:55:00 PM
5	Armenia_InnovativesolutionsforSDGs_Finalreport_signed_8334_301 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Armenia_InnovativesolutionsforSDGs_Finalreport_signed_8334_301.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Armenia_InnovativesolutionsforSDGs_Finalreport_signed_8334_301.pdf</a> )	elen.sahradyan@undp.org	11/24/2021 12:05:00 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:**

The project responds to the 2nd development setting, accelerating structural transformations for sustainable development by integrating data analytics-AI, behavioral experimentation and design thinking into policy-making and service delivery. The project further responds to the 2nd, 4th and 6th signature solutions.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

**Relevant****Quality Rating: Exemplary**

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

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

**Evidence:**

Regular task force and beneficiary meetings were organized under different components of the project. More details information on the number and type of beneficiaries for each component can be accessed in the report.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

4. Did the project generate knowledge, and lessons learned (i.e., what has worked and what has not) and has this knowledge informed management decisions to ensure the continued relevance of the project towards its stated objectives, the quality of its outputs and the management of risk?

- 3: Knowledge and lessons learned from internal or external sources (gained, for example, from Peer Assists, After Action Reviews or Lessons Learned Workshops) backed by credible evidence from evaluation, corporate policies/strategies, analysis and monitoring were discussed in project board meetings and reflected in the minutes. There is clear evidence that changes were made to the project to ensure its continued relevance. (both must be true)
- 2: Knowledge and lessons learned backed by relatively limited evidence, drawn mainly from within the project, were considered by the project team. There is some evidence that changes were made to the project as a result to ensure its continued relevance. (both must be true)
- 1: There is limited or no evidence that knowledge and lessons learned were collected by the project team. There is little or no evidence that this informed project decision making.

**Evidence:**

The project has generated knowledge and lessons learned, which have been featured in blog posts as well and presented to the project board. Following the lessons learned reflected in the attached final SPR, the Project Document was amended in February 2020 to ensure its continued relevance. The key lessons learned are reflected in blog posts developed by the Project. Please refer to the attached final SPR for details.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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

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

**Evidence:**

The project has reached a sufficient number of beneficiaries, often exceeding the initial design projections. All components of the project have a potential to be scaled up, which has been expressly recognized by line ministries and the Government. The project has also been initiating different scaleup negotiations with both local and international partners. Please refer to the attached final SPR for details.

**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:**

Within the framework of the project's first behavioral experiment, over 20,800 women aged 30-60 were targeted and the whole activity was designed and measured to assess the impact on women. Within the framework of the SDG Monitor component of the project, the data mapping activity was initially designed with gender-sensitive disaggregation. More precisely, the data gathered from 8 public institutions reflects the gender-based disaggregation on indicator level for monitoring the progress of SDG 16 in Armenia. This disaggregation will be visualized on the online platform to be deployed in 2021, clearly indicating the gender-based proportion of population across 11 SDG 16 indicators. Moreover, as part of the innovative data collection component of this activity, out of 30 studied and analyzed FB profiles of current and former officials, 10% were female officials (all those who had/have an active FB profile/official page). Furthermore, under the R2E2 component, based on the project monitoring results, 30% of 162 families with 3 or more children receiving cash-back on rooftop solar systems installation were women-led households. Please refer to the attached final SPR for details.

**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 social and environmental risks are tracked in the risk log, managed and mitigated. The project has not made any significant changes affecting the risk levels. Please refer to the attached final SPR for details.

<b>List of Uploaded Documents</b>			
#	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 project was categorized as Low Risk through the SESP.

**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 comprehensive and M&E plan with populated baselines, targets and milestones. Progress data against indicators in the project's RRF was reported on a quarterly basis. Lessons learned were used to take corrective actions when necessary. Please refer to the attached final SPR for details.

**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's governance mechanism was operating as designed, project board meetings happening at regular pace. The project board, particularly the Government of Armenia, has used generated knowledge and insights from the project as basis for evidence-based policy/decision making. Please refer to the attached final SPR and final board meeting minutes for details.

**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 actively monitored risks every quarter in cluding consulting with key stakeholders. The risks h ave been updated following the COVID-19 outbreak in Armenia and the escalation of the hostilities in an d around Nagorno Karabakh. Relevant management plans and mitigating measures were fully implement ed to address each key project risk, and have been updated to reflect the latest risk assessment. Please refer to the attached final SPR for details.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

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

No documents available.

**Efficient**

**Quality Rating: 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 project has succeeded in mobilizing the necessary and adequate resources to achieve expected results. The project mobilized additional resources from the donor, as well as other partners to implement new components. Please refer to the attached final SP R for details.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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

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

**Evidence:**

The project procurement plan was developed and maintained throughout the implementation years.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

14. Was there regular monitoring and recording of cost efficiencies, taking into account the expected quality of results?

- 3: There is evidence that the project regularly reviewed costs against relevant comparators (e.g., other projects or country offices) or industry benchmarks to ensure the project maximized results delivered with given resources. The project actively coordinated with other relevant ongoing projects and initiatives (UNDP or other) to ensure complementarity and sought efficiencies wherever possible (e.g. joint activities.) (both must be true)
- 2: *The project monitored its own costs and gave anecdotal examples of cost efficiencies (e.g., spending less to get the same result,) but there was no systematic analysis of costs and no link to the expected quality of results delivered. The project coordinated activities with other projects to achieve cost efficiency gains.*
- 1: There is little or no evidence that the project monitored its own costs and considered ways to save money beyond following standard procurement rules.

**Evidence:**

The project regularly reviewed costs against relevant comparators and industry benchmarks to ensure the project maximized results that could be delivered with given resources. The project was also granted no-cost extension to complete some of the remaining activities that have been delayed due to COVID-19 and the conflict. Please refer to the attached final SP R for details.

**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:**

While the project was mainly on track, COVID-19 outbreak and the state of emergency declared in Armenia since March 16, have led to the necessity to readjust the ongoing projects and postpone a number of planned activities. In addition, due to the escalated hostilities in and around Nagorno-Karabagh since September 27, 2020 and the following crisis, UNDP programme and operations in the country have been strongly impacted. Nevertheless, the Project successfully (re)positioned its interventions more strategically in the broader recovery narrative. To ensure the maximum project delivery, a no-cost extension was requested and approved until May 2021. The remarkable results of the project were acknowledged during the final board meeting convened on 28 April 2021. Please refer to the attached final SPR for details.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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

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

**Evidence:**

The project submitted quarterly progress reports, including the project workplan. Following the necessary adjustments in the scope and workplan, the Project Document was revised and approved. Please refer to the attached final SPR for details.

**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:**

Under different components of the project, specific groups of beneficiaries were targeted to maximize the impact. More specifically, the 3 behavioral experiments targeted (i) women in poor rural communities of Shirak region aged 30-60 eligible to undergo cervical cancer screening (ii) turnover taxpayers in Armenia (iii) supermarket users in Yerevan. Thorough analysis has been conducted to assess their benefit from behavioral experiments. Please refer to the attached final SPR for details.

**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 project was implemented in Support to NIM modality. Stakeholders and key national partners were part of the Project Board and thus fully engaged in the decision-making and implementation of the project. At the same time the project used UNDP systems for procurement, finance, and M&E.

**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:**

Following the political escalations in Armenia in 2018 and the Velvet Revolution, the project has comprehensively assessed the changes in capacities and performance of institutions and systems, formally reviewing implementation arrangements. The amendments to the Project Document also clearly demonstrated these adjustments. Also HACT assessment of project supplier - R2E2 has been done. Please refer to the attached final SPR for details.

**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 board has reviewed the project sustainability plan and endorsed its extension from May 2020 to December 2021. Given COVID-19 and the hostilities in and around Nagorno Karabakh in 2020, a no-cost extension of the project was requested and approved until 1 May 2021.

In early 2020 the project has carried out a study to explore sustainable models of operation of Innovation Labs. Please refer to the attached final SPR, as well as the no-cost extension approval for details.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

**QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments**

The Project co-chair Deputy Prime Minister Mr. Tigran Avinyan emphasized the importance of the Government's partnership with the SDG Innovation Lab and the UNDP and highlighted the role of the Project in advancing Armenia's commitment towards achieving the SDGs. Mr. Avinyan thanked the Government of the Russian Federation for the funding and reiterated the importance of the innovative tools and methodologies applied by the Lab which came to support the implementation of Government's development programs and refined priorities. The Project co-chair UN Resident Coordinator in Armenia, Mr. Shombi Sharp highlighted the Lab's and the Project's impact on both country and international levels, which have broadened the partnerships both with UNDP offices worldwide and other international partners. Ms. Natalya Viktorova, Third Secretary of the Embassy of the Russian Federation in Armenia highlighted the fruitful partnership between the Lab and the Government of the Russian Federation, which have amounted to the implementation and successful completion of the Project.