

# Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

Overall Project Rating: **Satisfactory**

Project Number : 00087576

Project Title : Rural Development in Georgia (ENPARD2) - the main objective of the support is, the establishment and implementation of Rural Development Strategies for Georgia and its Adjara region.

Project Date : 01-Jul-2016

## Strategic

Quality Rating: **Satisfactory**

### 1. Did the project pro-actively take advantage of new opportunities and adapt its theory of change to respond to changes in the development context, including changing national priorities? (select the option from 1-3 which best reflects this project)

- 3: The project team regularly completed and documented a comprehensive horizon scanning exercise to identify new opportunities and changes in the development context that required adjustments in the theory of change. There is clear evidence that the project board considered the scanning and its implications, and documented changes to the project's RRF, partnerships, etc. made in response, as appropriate. (both must be true to select this option)
- 2: *The project team has undertaken some horizon scanning over the life of the project to identify new opportunities and changes in the development context. The project board discussed the scanning and its implications for the project, as reflected in the board minutes. There is some evidence that the project took action as a result, but changes may not have been fully integrated in the project's theory of change, RRF, partnerships, etc. (all must be true to select this option)*
- 1: The project team may have considered new opportunities and changes in the development context since implementation began, but this has not been discussed in the project board. There is limited to no evidence that the project team has considered changes to the project as a result. This option should also be selected if no horizon scanning took place during project implementation.

#### Evidence

Yes.

The new policy of the Rural Development was introduced, the strategy and action plan of the Rural Development of Georgia have been developed and agreed. More than 2770 project beneficiaries were enabled to participate various capacity building activities and events arranged through the UNDP SRDG project. The Project document was revised according to the findings and new priorities.

### 2. Was the project aligned with the thematic focus of the Strategic Plan? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

- 3: The project responded to one of the three areas of development [work](#) as specified in the Strategic Plan. It addressed at least one of the proposed new and emerging [areas](#) and implementation was consistent with the issues-based analysis incorporated into the project. The project's RRF included all the relevant SP output indicators. (all must be true to select this option)
- 2: *The project responded to one of the three areas of development [work](#) as specified in the Strategic Plan. The project's RRF included at least one SP output indicator, if relevant. (both must be true to select this option)*
- 1: While the project may have responded to one of the three areas of development [work](#) as specified in the Strategic Plan, it was based on a sectoral approach without addressing the complexity of the development issue. None of the relevant SP indicators were included in the project's RRF. This option is also selected if the project did not respond to any of the three SP areas of development work.

#### Evidence

Yes,

the project has addressed 2 out of 3 thematic focus areas of development work: 1. Sustainable development Pathways and 2.

Inclusive and Effective Democratic Governance through introducing, elaborating and adopting the new policy of the Rural Development, partnering with the wide range of stakeholders, elaborating regional chapters to capture the needs and challenges of regions of Georgia through bottom up approach, improve and equip policy-makers, CSOs and rural community representatives capacity and skills to sustain development and create an environment for better governance. An integrated model of governance was introduced and established to support implementation the Rural Development Action Plan. The community representative from Ajara Autonomous Republic was given an opportunity to participate in the Rural Development pilot projects. The project initiated and established a platform of idea generating, information sharing and cooperation building, named as a Georgian Rural Development Network (GRDN) to boost relationships among stakeholder and interested parties.

**3. Evidence generated through the project was explicitly used to confirm or adjust the programme/CPD's theory of change during implementation.**

- Yes
- No

**Evidence**

The project first output result: 1.1 Government of Georgia is supported to develop and adopt a National Rural Development Strategy for Georgia directly respond to the CPD Outcome 2/UNPSD Outcome 3: Growth and development are inclusive and sustainable, creating employment and livelihoods for the poor and excluded and Indicator 1. Number of new policies, systems, institutional measures at national and subnational levels to generate/strengthen employment and livelihoods Baseline (2014): 3 policies/ programmes to support private sector development, including agricultural loan programmes (Ministry of Agriculture), support for cooperatives, ICCs and produce in Georgia (Ministry of Economy and Sustainable Development), EDA and GNITA programmes; Target (2020): At least 2 new policies for supporting inclusive business development, application of innovations and rural development.

**Relevant**

**Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

**4. Were the project's targeted groups systematically identified and engaged, with a priority focus on the excluded and marginalized, to ensure the project remained relevant for them? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)**

- 3: Systematic and structured feedback was collected regularly from a representative sample of beneficiaries, with a priority focus on the excluded and marginalized, as part of the project's monitoring system. Representatives from the targeted group were active members of the project's governance mechanism (i.e., project board or equivalent) and there is credible evidence that their feedback informed decision making. (all must be true to select this option)

- 2: Targeted groups were engaged in implementation and monitoring, with a priority focus on the excluded 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

It was not project direct scope and no data was compiled to track it.

#### 5. Did the project generate knowledge, particularly lessons learned (i.e., what has worked and what has not) – and has this knowledge informed management decisions and changes/course corrections to ensure the continued relevance of the project towards its stated objectives, the quality of its outputs and the management of risk? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

- 3: Knowledge and lessons learned (gained, for example, from Peer Assists, After Action Reviews or Lessons Learned Workshops) backed by credible evidence from evaluation, analysis and monitoring were regularly discussed in project board meetings and reflected in the minutes. There is clear evidence that the project's theory of change was adjusted, as needed, and changes were made to the project to ensure its continued relevance. (both must be true to select this option)
- 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 to select this option)*
- 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

Evaluation of project relevance towards its stated objectives, the quality of its outputs and the management enabled through 1. Beneficiaries feedback; 2. Stakeholders meetings (including the Georgian Rural Development Network, GRDN); 3. Review meetings with staff and donors. The project lessons learned document was developed to capture the main achievements, drawback, and challenges on the way the project implementation. Main lessons learned are: • Although RDS has been accepted by GoG even more political support, understanding of RD and in the end ownership of the policy is required to ensure good implementation of RDS and its AP. It is unclear how long GoG's commitment to RD will last if clear ownership will be missing. Objectives are not adequately translated into shorter-term operational solutions, in the form of measures, each with their distinct rationale. Pros and cons of different options have not been assessed for their likely consequences, especially impact and sustainability. Underlying assumptions, pre-conditions, and risks affecting the prospects for its measures are not described. Criteria for selecting/designing measures are missing. • Ensuring the sustainability of project results through already established mechanisms and exploring new practices should be continued since it is an embedded risk of any government institution support project. Given risk can be considerably decreased by focusing on specific types of activities that can further promote sustainability such as institutional development, ToT approach, investment in long-term planning. • The existence of

baseline information should be ensured at all stages. Unless baseline data is an available evaluation of the change/impact as a result of any initiative would lack the validity.

• Systematized mechanism of Monitoring and Evaluation should be applied within Project initiatives, which would ensure quality monitoring of the activities, on the one hand, and provision of valid information for impact assessment, on the other hand. • IACC members have submitted monitoring reports with delays and often without appropriate data. It was perceived as 'additional burden' in many cases. It is unclear for evaluation can be conducted without impact indicators. Annual monitoring report of RDS AP 2017 was developed with rigorous efforts to overcome the quality shortcomings of draft versions. IACC members lack the capacities and motivation of monitoring and often there is a lack of communication with financial/budgetary departments. • SRDG project should continue to use cross-cutting capacity development approach mainstreamed throughout the whole set of project interventions. In the current context, national counterparts are more enthusiastic to cooperate when a single intervention provides evidence for future planning and is a component of a longer-term initiative linked to high importance reforms at the national agenda. The majority of initiatives supported within ENPARD II provide evidence for such judgment.

**6. Were the project's special measures (through outputs, activities, indicators) to address gender inequalities and empower women relevant and produce the intended effect? If not, were evidence-based adjustments and changes made? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)**

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

**Evidence**

The project considered Gender aspect in each activity, especially while planning for training and workshops. For example, each training provider or partner organization is asked during the planning and implementing to enable the gender representation, even the project considered the representation of other groups as well, where it is possible. As of November 2018, the project outreached 2777 beneficiaries, where the number of women is 1226 (44%). Please see data per output, activity, and events through gender perspective: Output 1. INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY IN PLACE FOR THE DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF A NATIONAL POLICY ON RURAL DEVELOPMENT IN GEORGIA Total Number of beneficiaries Woman Man 895 406 489 Activity 1.1. Supporting participatory multi-stakeholder processes leading to the adoption of the National Rural Development Strategy Sub-activity 1.1.1: Facilitating an Inter-Agency Coordination Council (IACC) Total Number of beneficiaries Woman Man 100 47 53 Activity 1.3 Support to the improvement of institutional capacities in rural development policy Total

Number of beneficiaries Woman Man 795 359 436  
 Sub-activity 1.3.1: Supporting the relevant Ministry officials (MoA, MRDI, MoESD, MoENRP) to design and deliver a targeted capacity building programme for staff in terms of RDS policy development, Action Plan Total Number of beneficiaries Woman Man 66 33 33  
 Sub-activity 1.3.2: Supporting the ENPARD Stakeholder Committee to design and develop a capacity building programme (including general awareness raising) for public sector staff and stakeholders Total Number of beneficiaries Woman Man 639 286 353  
 Sub-activity 1.3.3: Creating the conditions for an effective learning network by drawing on best practice from within Georgia (including Ajara AR), South Caucasus, ENPARD countries and the EU and developing case study material portraying the benefits of rural development in Georgia including how it builds resilience for rural communities. Total Number of beneficiaries Woman Man 90 40 50  
 Output 2. Institutional capacities for implementation of the Rural Development Strategy in Ajara AR Activity 2.2 Support to the improvement of Ajara regional policy capacities in rural development Total Number of beneficiaries Woman Man 1882 820 1062  
 Sub-activity 2.2.1: Liaising with the Government of Ajara to design and deliver a targeted capacity building program for staff in terms of RDS policy development, Action Plan design and delivery, and monitoring and evaluation in Ajara AR. Total Number of beneficiaries Woman Man 1863 801 1062  
 Sub-activity 2.3.5: Piloting RD projects on the ground Total Number of beneficiaries Woman Man 19 19

**7. Was the project sufficiently at scale, or is there potential to scale up in the future, to meaningfully contribute to development change? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)**

- 3: *There is credible evidence that the project reached a 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 initiative in the future (e.g. by extending its coverage in a second phase or using project results to advocate for policy change).
- 1: The project was not at scale, and there are no plans currently to scale up the initiative in the future.

**Evidence**

The project has created a highly functional, effective mechanism of Inter-Agency Coordination Council (IACC) to manage the Rural Development in partnership with the Ministry of Environmental Protection of Georgia. The ownership response rate from MEPA and other Government stakeholders was very high. Working level relation with IACC members are streamlined to the Thematic Working Groups created a good environment for the project policy support related interventions planning. Additionally, the project worked closely with beneficiaries and partners to respond to their needs in the loop of the project scope. Each project intervention has been discussed with the beneficiary groups or partners beforehand to raise buy-in and ownership. Cooperation lasted in the implementation process as well to make a project and its intervention successful.

**8. Did the project seek to further the realization of human rights using a human rights-based approach? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)**

- 3: There is credible evidence that the project aimed to further the realization of human rights, on the basis of applying a human rights based approach. Any potential adverse impacts on enjoyment of human rights were actively identified, managed and mitigated through the project's management of risks. (all must be true to select this option)
- 2: *There is some evidence that the project aimed to further the realization of human rights. Potential adverse impacts on the enjoyment of human rights were identified and adequately mitigated through the project's management of risks. (both must be true to select this option)*
- 1: There is no evidence that the project aimed to further the realization of human rights. There is limited to no evidence that potential adverse impacts on the enjoyment of human rights were managed.

### Evidence

Strengthening the rights-holders is an integral part of the LEADER (A French acronym meaning Links between actions for the development of the rural economy) and therefore the project's approach. In a post-Soviet transition economy like Georgia, anchoring a rights-based approach is a long-term endeavor. Nevertheless, the project made great advancements not only in empowering the rights holders (e.g. LAGs, AMAGs) but also in integrating their concern into the approaches of the duty-bearers (e.g., LEADER working group within IACC). It can hence be argued that the approach worked better than one could expect though a long way is still to go.

**9. Were social and environmental impacts and risks (including those related to human rights, gender and environment) successfully managed and monitored in accordance with the project document and relevant action plans? (for projects that have no social and environmental risks the answer is "Yes")**

- Yes
- No

### Evidence

The project contributed to improving the overall environment for the Rural Development Policy establishment, where social and environmental impacts and risks are successfully managed through a Common Monitoring and Evaluation System, elaborated to measure the performance of the Rural Development Action Plan, which has programmes promoting social development, environment.

**10. Were any unanticipated social and environmental issues or grievances that arose during implementation assessed and adequately managed, with relevant management plans updated? (for projects that did not experience unanticipated social and environmental risks or grievances the answer is "Yes")**

- Yes
- No

## Evidence

There were not any unanticipated social and environmental issues of grievances regarding to the implementation of management plans.

## Management & Monitoring

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

### 11. Was the project's M&E Plan adequately implemented? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

- 3: *Progress data against indicators in the project's RRF was reported regularly using highly credible data sources and collected according to the frequency stated in the project's M&E plan, including sex disaggregated data as relevant. Evaluations, if conducted, fully met decentralized evaluation standards, including gender UNEG standards, and management responses were fully implemented. Lessons learned, including during evaluations, were used to take corrective actions when necessary. (all must be true to select this option)*
- 2: Progress data against indicators in the project's RRF was collected on a regular basis, although there may have been some slippage in following the frequency stated in the project's M&E plan and data sources were not always reliable. Any evaluations conducted meet most decentralized evaluation standards; management responses were fully implemented to the extent possible. Lessons learned have been captured but not used to take collective actions. (all must be true to select this option)
- 1: Progress data either was not collected against the indicators in the project's RRF, or limited data was collected but not regularly; evaluations did not meet decentralized evaluation standards; and/or lessons learned were rarely captured and used.

## Evidence

A full-fledged M&E plan covered each aspect of the project. The project was using a participatory monitoring approach to have a better picture of the implementation process, achievements, shortcomings or challenges. The project worked closely with beneficiaries and partners to respond to their needs in the loop of the project scope. Each project intervention has been discussed with the beneficiary groups or partners beforehand to raise buy-in and ownership. Cooperation lasted in the implementation process as well to make a project and its intervention successful.

### 12. Did the project's governance mechanism (i.e., the project board or equivalent) function as intended? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

- The project's governance mechanism operated very well, and is a model for other projects. It met in the agreed frequency stated in the project document and the minutes of the meetings are 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)
- 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)*
- The project's governance mechanism did not meet in the frequency stated in the project document, and/or the project board or equivalent did not function as a decision making body for the project as intended.

## Evidence



The project's governance mechanisms functioned as intended, monthly, quarterly and annual reports were developed. One of the tools was evaluation forms (pre-posttests, training or workshop final evaluation form); meetings keynotes; IACC notes; training or workshop reports; ad-hoc monitoring visits, involvement in the FAO's arranged stakeholder and steering committee meetings. However, Due to the EU representative suggestion, there were not arranged the project board meetings. Mainly, frequent communication was held via meetings and email communications.

**13. Were risks to the project adequately monitored and managed? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)**

- 3: The project actively monitored risks every quarter including consulting with key stakeholders at least annually to identify continuing and emerging risks to project implementation and to assess if the main assumptions remain valid. There is clear evidence that relevant management plans and mitigating measures were fully implemented to address each key project risk, and some evidence that risk mitigation has benefitted performance. (all must be true to select this option)
- 2: The project monitored risks every quarter, as evidenced by a regularly updated risk log. Some updates were made to management plans and mitigation measures. (both must be true to select this option)
- 1: *The risk log was not updated every quarter as required. There may be some evidence that the project monitored risks that could have affected the project's achievement of results, but there is no explicit evidence that management actions were taken to mitigate risks. The project's performance was disrupted by factors that could have been anticipated or managed.*

**Evidence**

the project was regularly updating risk log and informed on quarterly basis the donor and the Government. The project adequately monitored and managed risks through various participatory monitoring mechanisms: pre- and post-tests, training or workshop final evaluation form, meetings keynotes training or workshop reports; ad-hoc monitoring visits, stakeholder and steering committee meetings, Georgian Rural Development Network meetings and etc.

**Efficient**

**Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

**14. 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 a streamlined AWP and Procurement plan to mobilize resources to achieve the intended results. Please, tsee he project AWP and PP for further information.



**15. Were project inputs procured and delivered on time to efficiently contribute to results? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)**

- 3: The project had a procurement plan and kept it updated. Implementation of the plan was generally on or ahead of schedule. On a quarterly basis, the project reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addressed them through appropriate management actions. (all must be true to select this option)
- 2: *The project had a procurement plan and kept it updated. The project annually reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addressed them through appropriate management actions. (all must be true to select this option)*
- 1: The project did not have an updated procurement plan. The project team may have reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs regularly, however management actions were not taken to address them. This option is also selected if operational bottlenecks were not reviewed during the project in a timely manner.

**Evidence**

The project was followed up the AWP and PP smoothly and reviewed any operation bottlenecks timely and immediately.

**16. Was there regular monitoring and recording of cost efficiencies, taking into account the expected quality of results? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)**

- 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 to select this option)
- 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 communicated with a few other projects to coordinate activities. (both must be true to select this option)*
- 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. It is not clear that the link between cost savings and quality of results was made.

**Evidence**

The project actively coordinated activities with FAO (which also implemented ENPARD phase II activities) and UNDP PAR project (Public Administration Reform Support project. Each large procurement case was a subject of value for money analysis and the unit rates provided by potential contractors were analyzed and compared to relevant market average rates (applied in other relevant cases).

**Effective**

**Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory**

**17. Is there evidence that project outputs contributed to the achievement of programme outcomes?**

- Yes
- No

**Evidence**

The project terminal evaluation report will be ready by the end of January 2019. However, please see the project M&E matrix for detailed information about achievements.

---

**18. The project delivered its expected outputs.**

- Yes
- No

**Evidence**

---

The project terminal evaluation report will be ready by the end of January 2019. However, please refer to the project M&E matrix for detailed information about achievements.

---

**19. 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? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)**

- 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) were used to inform course corrections, as needed. (both must be true to select this option)*
- 2: There was at least one review of the work plan each year with a view to assessing if project activities were on track to achieving the desired development results (i.e., outputs.) There is no evidence that data or lessons learned were used to inform the review(s).
- 1: While the project team may have reviewed the work plan at least once per 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 regular review of the work plan by management took place.

**Evidence**

---

Please refer to AWP. The progress on AWP implementation was quarterly reported to Donor and Government

---

**20. Were the intended targeted groups systematically identified and engaged, prioritizing the marginalized and excluded, to ensure results were achieved as expected? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)**

- 3: Targeted groups were systematically identified 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 to confirm that targeted groups were reached as intended. The project engaged regularly with targeted groups to assess whether they benefitted as expected and adjustments were made if necessary to refine targeting. (all must be true to select this option)
- 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 were members of the targeted groups. There was some engagement with beneficiaries to assess whether they benefitted as expected. (all must be true to select this option)*
- 1: The project did not report on specific targeted groups, or there is no evidence to confirm that project beneficiaries have capacity needs or are populations deprived and/or excluded from development opportunities relevant to the project's area of work. There may have been some engagement with beneficiaries to assess whether they benefitted as expected, but not regularly.

Not Applicable

#### Evidence

The project terminal evaluation report will be finalized in the beginning of February. However, project reports and evaluation forms (attached) definitely prove that targeted groups were reach intended.

**21. Were at least 40 per cent of the personnel hired by the project, regardless of contract type, female?**

Yes

No

#### Evidence

4530  
% female among the personnel and consultants.

### Sustainability & National Ownership

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

**22. Were stakeholders and partners fully engaged in the decision-making, implementation and monitoring of the project? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)**

- 3: Only national systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) were 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. (all must be true to select this option)
- 2: *National systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) were used in combination with other support (such as country office support or project systems) to implement and monitor the project, as needed. 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 to select this option)*
- 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 had a strong tie with stakeholders, particularly with the Ministry of Environmental Protection and Agriculture of Georgia (MEPA). Starting from the development of Rural Development Strategy/Action Plan with the governance body Inter-Agency Coordination Council, improved new capacities/skills in policy development/making to a Common Monitoring and Evaluation System of RDSG/RDAP 2017-2020. In addition to these highlights, one more distinct result of an efficacious partnership is merging two state agencies (AMPA and ACDA, functional under MEPA for years) to establish an EU type the rural development paying agency adopted to the local context.

**23. Were there regular monitoring of changes in capacities and performance of institutions and systems, and were the implementation arrangements adjusted according to changes in partner capacities? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)**

- 3: Changes in capacities and performance of national institutions and systems were regularly and comprehensively assessed/monitored using clear indicators, rigorous methods of data collection and credible data sources. There is clear evidence that capacities and performance of national institutions and systems improved by the end of the project, if applicable. Implementation arrangements were formally reviewed and adjusted, if needed, in agreement with partners according to changes in partner capacities. (all must be true to select this option)
- 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. There is limited evidence that capacities and performance of national institutions and systems improved by the end of the project, if applicable. Some adjustment was made to implementation arrangements if needed to reflect changes in partner capacities. (all must be true to select this option)*
- 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 were not considered. Also select this option if changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems were not monitored by the project.
- Not Applicable

#### Evidence

---

The project introduced the participatory monitoring approach to enable immediate response to shortcomings or achievements of the project. Information and data were collected monthly or quarterly bases, a database of the project related events and beneficiaries created. Monthly, quarterly and annual reports captured the project management cycle, ups, and downs. As a result, positive achievements were noted in reporting, the project effectiveness and relevance played an important role in succeeding project activities.

---

**24. Were the transition and phase-out arrangements implemented as planned by the end of the project, taking into account any adjustments made to the plan during implementation? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)**

- 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 to select this option)
- 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. The plan was implemented by the end of the project, taking into account any adjustments made during implementation. (both must be true to select this option)*
- 1: The project may have had a sustainability plan that specified arrangements for transition and phase-out, 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 transition and phase-out arrangements was implemented toward the continuation of ENAPRD II into ENAPRD III, the last year of implementation of the ENAPRD II coincided with the ENAPRD III inception phase which would support the project to sustain the results achieved through the ENAPRD II and build a strong cornerstone for the ENAPRD III toward the EU Association Agreement in developing Rural Development Policy in Georgia. As for ENAPRD II, the terminal evaluation took

place in December 2018 and a final report would be submitted at the end of January 2019 for further references.

---

**25. Please upload the final lessons learned report that was produced for this project.**

**Summary/Final Project Board Comments:**