Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

Form Status: Approved	

Overall Rating:	Highly Satisfactory
Decision:	
Portfolio/Project Number:	00089758
Portfolio/Project Title:	Support to Public Administration Reform
Portfolio/Project Date:	2016-07-26 / 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 project team proactively identified the changes in the implementation context throughout the project lifecycle through quarterly meetings, calls and reports with the donor. The project's Results Framework has been revised in response to the changes in the external environment and implementation context enabling the project to achieve its primary goals and objectives.
> Evidence - Results Framework; PAR Project Annual Report incorporating project implementation context analysis 2019; PAR Project Biannual Report 2020

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	UNDP_PAR_FinalReport_7998_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/UNDP_PAR_FinalReport_7998_301.pdf)	sophio.omanadze@undp.org	11/8/2021 1:28:00 PM
2	UNDP_PAR_ResultsFramework_7998_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/UNDP_PAR_ResultsFramework_7998_301.xlsx)	sophio.omanadze@undp.org	11/8/2021 1:28:00 PM
3	UNDPPARBi-AnnualReport_Jan-Jun_2020_7998_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/UNDPPARBi-AnnualReport_Jan-Jun_2020_7998_301.pdf)	sophio.omanadze@undp.org	11/10/2021 9:41:00 AM

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

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

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

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

Evidence:

This question was already assessed during Design Stage. Evidence - Project's Results Framework (attached to Q1)

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:

Feedback was systematically collected from the various groups of project stakeholders and counterparts that informed the decision-making process related to project implementation.
Evidence - Board Meetings Minutes and Presentation from December 2020; Public Attitudes towards Public Administration Reform, 2019 (Mid-Term Evaluation)

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	UNDPPARBoardMeetingMinutes_2020_7998_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/UNDPPARBoardMeetingMinutes_2020_7998_303.docx)	sophio.omanadze@undp.org	11/8/2021 1:43:00 PM
2	UNDP_PARBoardMeetingPPT_2020_7998_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/UNDP_PARBoardMeetingPPT_2020_7998_303.pptx)	sophio.omanadze@undp.org	11/8/2021 1:43:00 PM
3	PublicAttitudestowardsPublicAdministrationReform2019Mid-TermEvaluation_7998_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PublicAttitudestowardsPublicAdministrationReform2019Mid-TermEvaluation_7998_303.pdf)	sophio.omanadze@undp.org	11/8/2021 1:45:00 PM

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 team has continuously analyzed the implementation context and learning and tailoring the actions to support achieving the project's primary goals and objectives have always been a part of the monitoring and evaluation process. Apart from the lessons learned through internal resources, the project went through several evaluations cycles. The mid-term evaluation conducted in 2019 was followed up by the management responses for all the recommendations drafted in the evaluation. All management actions in response to the recommendations were marked as completed by 2021. Management responses were developed for the recommendations drafted in the Final Evaluation as well and are being followed up. The reports, as well as the management responses, actions and their status, can be found on the following link: https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/detail/8520 / https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/evaluations/detail/13119
>
> Evidence - Board Meetings Minutes and Presentation from December 2020 (attached to Q3); PAR Project Final Report 2020 incorporating achievements, lessons learned and risk assessment (attached to Q1); PAR mid-term and final External Evaluation Reports

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	UNDPPARMid-TermExternalEvaluationReport_7998_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/UNDPPARMid-TermExternalEvaluationReport_7998_304.docx)	sophio.omanadze@undp.org	11/8/2021 2:06:00 PM
2	UNDPPARFinalExternalEvaluationReport_7998_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/UNDPPARFinalExternalEvaluationReport_7998_304.docx)	sophio.omanadze@undp.org	11/8/2021 2:06:00 PM

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 ultimate goal of the project envisages serving the citizens through enhancing the policy coordination, strengthening the professionalism of the civil servants and improving public service delivery practices and the final report incorporates all the achievements of the project contributing to the development change. Evidence - PAR Project Final Report 2020 (attached to Q1), PAR Final External Evaluation Report (attached to Q4)

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 and inclusion have been a day-to-day commitment for the project since initiation. The project followed an engrained human rights-based approach that is not only advocated but put into practice at the project implementation level. This approach is now embedded in the national policy formulation process, as the policy planning handbook (developed with project support) requires the adoption of a human rights-based approach when formulating goals and objectives in the national, sectorial and institutional policy documents. The documents are expected to incorporate and have relevant linkages with the SDGs, issues related to gender, minorities and vulnerable groups. Currently the project is supporting new PAR strategy drafting process and jointly with UN Women aims to ensure that Gender Equality and Social Inclusion principles are properly integrated in the new PAR strategy. Human resource capacity development measures supported by the project have strong female participation. Of the 25 main training events, 18 had participants gender-disaggregated. At these 18 events, a total of about 2,907 individuals were trained with about 1,854 women trained (63.8% of those trained). Under the public service delivery outcome area of the project work has been done to ensure inclusive service delivery via the Public Service Halls and Patrol Department Unified Service Center with a focus on all groups to include women, minorities, and those with disabilities. The research and civil society grant schemes supported by the project also emphasized gender issues and few of these initiatives had an explicit focus on analyzing careers in the civil service from gender perspective, exploring challenges in the provision of services to women victims of domestic violence during COVID-19, along with several other research initiatives addressing gender issues, the elderly, and people with disabilities.

Evidence - PAR Final External Evaluation Report (attached to Q4)

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:

N/A, project was categorized as Low risk through the SESP.

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:

N/A, the project targets public institutions and CSOs only.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Management & Monitoring   **Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

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

○   3: The project had a comprehensive and costed M&E plan. Baselines, targets and milestones were fully populated. Progress data against indicators in the project's RRF was reported regularly using credible data sources and collected according to the frequency stated in the Plan, including sex disaggregated data as relevant. Any evaluations conducted, if relevant, fully meet decentralized evaluation standards, including gender UNEG standards. Lessons learned, included during evaluations and/or After-Action Reviews, were used to take corrective actions when necessary. (all must be true)

◉   *2: The project costed M&E Plan, and most baselines and targets were populated. Progress data against indicators in the project's RRF was collected on a regular basis, although there 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 regularly revised the work plan to address the potential or occurring slippages from the milestones and the progress against the targets as per the results framework was reported in the semi-annual and annual reports.
> Evidence - Results Framework (attached to Q1), Costed M&E Plan

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	UNDP_PARDraftWorkPlan2020_21_COVID19response_7998_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/UNDP_PARDraftWorkPlan2020_21_COVID19response_7998_309.xlsx)	sophio.omanadze@undp.org	11/8/2021 4:11:00 PM
2	UNDP_PAR_ME_Plan_7998_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/UNDP_PAR_ME_Plan_7998_309.xlsx)	sophio.omanadze@undp.org	11/8/2021 4:12:00 PM

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 briefly reported on its achievements and risks quarterly and developed full-fledged reports on biannual and annual basis. The project board met o nce per year to discuss the achievements and ways forward.
>
> Evidence - Board Meetings Minutes and Presentatio n from December 2020 (attached to Q3); PAR Proje ct Quarterly Update, PAR Project Biannual Report 2 020 (attached to Q1), PAR Project Final Report 202 0 (attached to Q1)

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:

> Project Risks were reassessed or identified through out the project lifecycle and reported on a regular ba sis.
> Evidence -PAR Project Quarterly Update, PAR Proje ct Biannual Report 2020 (attached to Q1), PAR Proj ect Final Report 2020 (attached to Q1)

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	UNDPPARProgressSummaryUpdateQ32020 _7998_311 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/Pr ojectQA/QAFormDocuments/UNDPPARProg ressSummaryUpdateQ32020_7998_311.doc x)	sophio.omanadze@undp.org	11/10/2021 9:47:00 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:

Project expenditure was aligned with project activity in each of the output areas. There were some variations in the early years at project start-up with more emphasis or faster start on policy planning than public service delivery. The activity and expenditure evened out over time so the project was operating more efficiently in all outcome areas. The expenditure for policy planning and coordination outcome was about 13% over planned expenditure and service delivery 21% under planned expenditure as of December 2020. The policy planning and coordination outcome was a smaller size component of the project with 14% of expenditure with service delivery at 22%. The civil service reform component was only 2% over planned expenditure. The project management structure was appropriate for the size of the project and its scope of work. The project structure and staffing was adjusted at the inception phase to meet the resource needs given the complexity and broad scope of the project.
Evidence - PAR Final External Evaluation Report (attached to Q4) Annex M

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:

PAR project carried out all financial operations and procurement of relevant consultancy services and technical assistance in accordance with the UNDP rules and regulations as stipulated in the Programme and Operations Policies and Procedures (POPP) and in line with best international standards. The POPP created safeguards for the realization of the value for money (VfM) approach in the operations of all UNDP projects through consistent, transparent, and detailed procedures. The project procurement plans were integrated in the unified procurement plan of the Country Office.

Evidence - PAR Project Final Report 2020 (attached to Q1)

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:

> Before any contract or cooperation agreement is approved, the PAR project management and the CO conduct a value for money assessment of all potential applicants/bidders by comparing the proposed total cost and benefits of the contract. If there is only one proposed applicant, the VfM assessment looks at the proposed daily rates (in case of individual consultants, for instance) or management fee (in case of a consultancy company, CSO, or grant agreement with the Government partners), salaries and other costs, and compares them with national and international standards to determine if the costs are reasonable. The VfM assessment thus evaluates whether the costs are in line with market rates for Georgia.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On

No documents available.

Effective   **Quality Rating: Exemplary**

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

○ *Yes*
○ No

Evidence:

The project outcomes and most outputs were achiev
ed. However, the measurement of achievements is o
ngoing and will continue to be ongoing since the sub
ject areas addressed will take time to embed and pr
ogress as cycles of activity occur over the medium t
erm. The COVID-19 impact had slowed some activiti
es but they found continuation in the next phase of t
he project.

Evidence - PAR Project Final Report 2020 (attached
to Q1), PAR Final External Evaluation Report (attac
hed to Q4) Annex E

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 regularly reviewed the project work plan
> to ensure that the planned activities are relevant and
> ensure achievement of the intended results.
> Evidence - Costed M&E Plan

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:

> Evidence - PAR Project Final Report 2020 (attached
> to Q1), PAR Final External Evaluation Report (attach
> ed to Q4), Public Attitudes towards Public Administr
> ation Reform, 2019 (Mid-Term Evaluation)

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 represents National Implementation Modality (NIM) with Country Office (CO) support and therefore procurement, monitoring, evaluation, etc. were performed by UNDP CO at the request of the Government. Although, the responsible parties were delivering the project outputs using the national systems to implement and monitor the sub-projects.
>
> Evidence - Contribution Agreement (CA) and Amendment to CA, Board Meetings Minutes and Presentation from December 2020 (attached to Q3), Letters of Agreement with PSDA, CSB and DGA

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	ContributionAgreementUNDP_DfiD_2016_20 20_7998_318 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ContributionA greementUNDP_DfiD_2016_2020_7998_31 8.pdf)	sophio.omanadze@undp.org	11/8/2021 2:57:00 PM
2	ContributionAgreementAmendenemtUNDP_ DfiD_2020_2021_7998_318 (https://intranet. undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocument s/ContributionAgreementAmendenemtUNDP _DfiD_2020_2021_7998_318.pdf)	sophio.omanadze@undp.org	11/8/2021 2:57:00 PM
3	LoA_PSDA_2020_7998_318 (https://intranet. undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocument s/LoA_PSDA_2020_7998_318.pdf)	sophio.omanadze@undp.org	11/8/2021 2:57:00 PM
4	LoA_CSB_2019_7998_318 (https://intranet.u ndp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ LoA_CSB_2019_7998_318.pdf)	sophio.omanadze@undp.org	11/8/2021 2:58:00 PM

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:

> HACTs Assurance activities were closely followed throughout the project lifecycle in relation to project partners and grantees.
>
> Evidence - Micro Assesemnt reports performed for the project partners including Public Service Development Agency; Public Service Hall, Digital Governance Agency (formed Data Exchange Agency), Civil Service Bureau

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	MicroAssessmentReportSDA_7998_319 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MicroAssessmentReportSDA_7998_319.pdf)	sophio.omanadze@undp.org	11/8/2021 2:38:00 PM
2	MicroAssessmentReportPSH_7998_319 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MicroAssessmentReportPSH_7998_319.pdf)	sophio.omanadze@undp.org	11/8/2021 2:38:00 PM
3	MicroAssessmentReportDGA_7998_319 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MicroAssessmentReportDGA_7998_319.pdf)	sophio.omanadze@undp.org	11/8/2021 2:39:00 PM
4	MicroAssessmentDEA_7998_319 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MicroAssessmentDEA_7998_319.pdf)	sophio.omanadze@undp.org	11/8/2021 2:39:00 PM
5	MicroAssessmentCSB_7998_319 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MicroAssessmentCSB_7998_319.pdf)	sophio.omanadze@undp.org	11/8/2021 2:39:00 PM

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's outcomes and outputs incorporated the elements of sustainability and considered transition arrangements of the results and achievements to the project partners and other stakeholders throughout the project lifecycle.
> PAR Final External Evaluation Report (attached to Q 4)

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments