

Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

Form Status: Approved

Overall Rating:	Highly Satisfactory
Decision:	
Portfolio/Project Number:	00083690
Portfolio/Project Title:	Climate resilient flood management in Vrbas River Basin
Portfolio/Project Date:	2015-03-24 / 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:

In 2019 and 2020 the Project has explored additional funding possibilities and as a result has developed one new Project Concept and submitted to the Green Climate Fund (GCF), named "Scaling up climate resilient flood risk management in Bosnia and Herzegovina" and requesting grant in value of 14 MUSD. The planned co-financing amounts to 70 MUSD. Input for this concept was generated through the above mentioned Projects. The GCF approved the concept and asked for submission of full funding proposal for approval by the Board.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	BiH_Impact-basedFFEWS_6402_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/BiH_Impact-basedFFEWS_6402_301.pptx)	alisa.grabus@undp.org	11/23/2020 1:15:00 PM
2	FP-UNDP-120820-6360_final_JK-24Sept2020COMMENTSaddressed20Nov2020_6402_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FP-UNDP-120820-6360_final_JK-24Sept2020COMMENTSaddressed20Nov2020_6402_301.docx)	alisa.grabus@undp.org	11/23/2020 1:15:00 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 was developed to respond previous cycle of the SP but it was also aligned to the new SP linking to "building resilience to shocks and crisis".

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:

There are evidences that Project engaged decision makers, technical experts and beneficiary representatives into implementation of all activities and results sharing. For example Ministries, water agencies, hydro meteorological institutes were not only beneficiaries of the project, they also had their saying in decision making through participation on Project Boards, Working Groups and they were also continuously consulted whenever some products were developed. Besides of active participation of targeted groups the, marginalized and most vulnerable social groups from Vrbas Basin participated in activities of raising awareness and knowledge to build their capacities in flood risk management and response. In that sense, the tailored trainings for local communities were implemented for farmers and local community representatives in all 13 municipalities, including those representing the most vulnerable categories. Also, needs of woman are specifically recognized during the flood vulnerability assessment, which resulted in preparation of Flood Emergency Plans that incorporate gender aspect for the first time. Developed tools like Loss and Damage Model and Flood Insurance model are based on research that included all social categories in order to screen the most realistic state in regard of flood risk specific economic losses and mechanisms for risk transfer.

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:

There is evidence that the Project had strong focus on lessons learnt on which basis other Projects include those into their implementation such as National Adaptation Project (NAP) Project, Disaster Risk Management or new projects are being developed, please see evidence under Q1. The Project created a platform to keep and provide access to the key products developed within the project such as hazard and risk assessment modelling and mapping tools and generate definitive flood hazard, risk and vulnerability maps for all basins in B&H. This result of the Project will be upscaled through new GCF initiative to improve flood risk management in entire BiH. Tools developed for the project also will be upscaled and transferred to institutions, specifically, the Vrbas GeoPortal will be transferred to civil protection. For evidence please visit <http://vrb.pmfbl.org/>.

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 is sufficiently at scale to reach project objectives and meaningfully contribute to development change, but at the same time it recognized large potential for scaling up through development of new projects as mentioned under Q1. Scaling up within the new Project will take place through application of ecosystem based approach, non structural measures and integrated water management. For evidence kindly refer to the attachment under Q1 and information related to the Output 2: Scaled-up ecosystem-based and non-structural climate resilient flood risk reduction of the Funding Proposal. The proposed Project builds upon lessons learned and success of the past and ongoing interventions, existing data/information, institutional and management frameworks and capacities and, communications and coordination mechanisms operational currently in Bosnia and Herzegovina in climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction areas areas. Moreover, it will scale-up the outcomes of the prototype Vrbas Flood project as well as other baseline projects. Therefore, expanding the scope of already attested and verified interventions with close participation of national-wide and local stakeholders is more cost-effective than the implementation of a completely new initiative. For more evidence have a look at para 40 of the Funding Proposal.

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:

As per updated Gender Assessments and related Gender Action plan, the project continuously paid attention inclusion of gender perspective in its activities. For more evidence please see the update of the Assessment and Action Plan, but also Monitoring tool, attached under Q9.

List of Uploaded Documents			
#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	GenderAssessmentandActionPlan_CRFMVRB_6402_306 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/GenderAssessmentandActionPlan_CRFMVRB_6402_306.docx)	alisa.grabus@undp.org	11/23/2020 3:14:00 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:

The Project was categorized as a low risk and the identified risks have been monitored through Atlas.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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

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

Evidence:

The Project has not experienced unanticipated social and environmental risks or grievances. But project affected people were introduced to project level grievance mechanism and focusing on implementation of infrastructural measures.

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 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 has a costed M&E Plan, and most baselines and targets are populated. For details see the Project monitoring platform for 2020. The Project conducted the planned Final Evaluation attached hereto as evidence. In addition, the Project keeps track on its progress in the GEF tracking tool.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	PIMS5241BiHVRBTEreport_31Mar2020final-signed_6402_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PIMS5241BiHVRBTEreport_31Mar2020final-signed_6402_309.pdf)	alisa.grabus@undp.org	11/23/2020 3:21:00 PM
2	DetailedProjectMonitoringPlatform_VRBCRFM_NAP-FNC2020_6402_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/DetailedProjectMonitoringPlatform_VRBCRFM_NAP-FNC2020_6402_309.xlsm)	alisa.grabus@undp.org	1/15/2021 10:36:00 AM
3	PIMS5241AdaptationTrackingToolTE14May202003_6402_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PIMS5241AdaptationTrackingToolTE14May202003_6402_309.xlsx)	alisa.grabus@undp.org	1/15/2021 10:36:00 AM

10. Was the project's governance mechanism (i.e., the project board or equivalent) function as intended?

- 3: *The project's governance mechanism operated well, and was a model for other projects. It met in the agreed frequency stated in the project document and the minutes of the meetings were all on file. There was regular (at least annual) progress reporting to the project board or equivalent on results, risks and opportunities. It is clear that the project board explicitly reviewed and used evidence, including progress data, knowledge, lessons and evaluations, as the basis for informing management decisions (e.g., change in strategy, approach, work plan.) (all must be true to select this option)*
- 2: The project's governance mechanism met in the agreed frequency and minutes of the meeting are on file. A project progress report was submitted to the project board or equivalent at least once per year, covering results, risks and opportunities. (both must be true to select this option)
- 1: The project's governance mechanism did not meet in the frequency stated in the project document over the past year and/or the project board or equivalent was not functioning as a decision-making body for the project as intended.

Evidence:

The Project informs the Project Board on all plans, results and risks. The Project organized project closure conference inviting members of the Project Board, all stakeholders to promote results. For evidence see the presentation from the conference and participants list. The Board was also notified on official closure of the project and by this occasion the Project shared Final Report with the Board members.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Vrbas-Finalconference04Mar2020_6402_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Vrbas-Finalconference04Mar2020_6402_310.ppt)	alisa.grabus@undp.org	1/15/2021 12:45:00 AM
2	ListofparticipantsVRBCRFMCompletionConference_BanjaLuka04-03-2020_6402_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ListofparticipantsVRBCRFMCompletionConference_BanjaLuka04-03-2020_6402_310.pdf)	alisa.grabus@undp.org	1/15/2021 12:46:00 AM
3	NotificationonprojectclosuretotheProjectBoard_6402_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/NotificationonprojectclosuretotheProjectBoard_6402_310.docx)	alisa.grabus@undp.org	1/15/2021 12:46:00 AM
4	VrbasprojekatFinalniizvjestajimplementaciju_6402_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/VrbasprojekatFinalniizvjestajimplementaciju_6402_310.docx)	alisa.grabus@undp.org	1/15/2021 12:46:00 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:

The Project records risks in Atlas regularly and communicates those with Project Board members and other relevant stakeholders. In addition to Atlas the Project Implementation Report that is submitted to GEF by the Focal Point from the Ministry of Foreign Trade and Economic Relations of BIH, has to reflect also risks status.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Efficient

Quality Rating: Exemplary

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

- Yes
- No

Evidence:

As per Budget Revisions (BR) in 2020 the funds were sufficient to enable adequate implementation of all remaining activities.
 In addition to GEF funds, the Project ensured local co-financing for the implementation of non structural measures.

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 follows its annual procurement plan entered into PROMPT and makes necessary updates in case of need.

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:

In order to achieve the maximum of available funds the project used opportunity to upgrade existing tools, already developed in country and owned by Water Agencies, in order to improve flood management e.g. upgraded existing WIS (water information system) to improve water and torrents management (significant cause of floods in BiH). The same approach is used through NAP Project that uses Vrbas project results for further developments. e.g. Development of Study On Economic Impact of Climate Change on the energy and agriculture sector in the Vrbas basin is using the same approach for hydrological modelling and climate change input into hydrological models.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Effective

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

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

- Yes
- No

Evidence:

The Project is on track to deliver its expected outputs. There are evidences on numerous results in form of products that are accepted and used by local communities and also confirmed by the Project Board.

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:

Work Plan has been regularly discussed by the Project and the UNDP Energy and Environment Sector. Review of the Project's Annual Work Plan (that is prescribed within the ProDoc and discussed on Project Board meeting) follows revisions of the Procurement Plan, Budget revisions. All evidences listed under previous questions.

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:

As evident from the Project Board meeting minutes, the Project makes sure no one is left behind in terms of timely involvement of relevant stakeholders and beneficiaries into discussions and preparation of each Project activity or development of a new product for flood risk prevention and management. The Board met regularly to review project progress, discuss and agree on project work plans.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Sustainability & National Ownership

Quality Rating: Exemplary

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 has closely worked with local partners and authorities. However, full implementation by national systems was not applicable due to the fact that the Project was under Direct Implementation Modality.

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:

Due to the nature of the Project, capacity assessment of the Project partners was not required.

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 works to transfer knowledge and project results to national governments and institutions so as to increase their capacities on how to use and sustain products of the project.

The transfer of knowledge and results was ensured through institutionalization of tools developed within the project e.g. the FFEWS that was developed in cooperation with water agencies and hydrometeorological institutes has been finalized with signing of Protocol which defines role of System users, relevant institutions in the process of notification of flood forecasts and institutional settings for system management in the future. The donor funding continued towards flood risk management, including ongoing EU funding and a GCF project that will be submitted for approval in the first half of 2021. The sustainability of flood risk management is ensured through its institutionalization by transposing the EU Flood Directive in RS and development of VRB Flood Risk Management Plan that provides a practical framework for prioritizing investment from domestic and international sources for further reducing flood risks. Also, part of revenues from water tariffs in FBiH are earmarked for operation and maintenance of hydrometeorological stations and similar arrangements have been made in RS with Fund for Environmental Protection and Energy Efficiency. In addition, strong commitment from private insurance sector partners in continuing the development of an affordable natural disaster insurance product has been further confirmed by co-financing support letter to the new GCF initiative.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments

The Project was implemented in line with the UNDP Programming Quality Standards.

