

Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

Form Status: Approved

Overall Rating:	Satisfactory
Decision:	
Portfolio/Project Number:	00102856
Portfolio/Project Title:	Small Grants Programme in Kazakhstan
Portfolio/Project Date:	2017-04-30 / 2021-12-31

Strategic

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

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:

During implementation all the external changes that affected the project, such as COVID-19 restrictions, changing partners, stakeholders, project territory, and others related to the grant projects have been properly addressed. All the issues raised were timely discussed with the National Steering Committee, all necessary adaptive measures and monitoring to ensure project smooth operations and achievement of the project objectives were approved and implemented.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	8_SGPNSC_Minutes_06.06.2019_rus_10059_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/8_SGPNSC_Minutes_06.06.2019_rus_10059_301.pdf)	katerina.yushenko@undp.org	10/21/2021 3:40:00 PM
2	12_SGPNSCMinutes_24.04.2020_10059_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/12_SGPNSCMinutes_24.04.2020_10059_301.pdf)	katerina.yushenko@undp.org	10/21/2021 3:32:00 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 responded to SP development setting "Build resilience to shocks and crisis". The project also responded to CPD 2021-2025 Outcome 4: By 2025, all people in Kazakhstan, in particular most vulnerable, benefit from increased climate resilience, sustainable management of environment and clean energy, and sustainable rural and urban development, and related strategic plan Outcome 2. Accelerate structural transformations for sustainable development/ Output 4.1: Solutions developed, and resources mobilized for more sustainable use of ecosystems for the improvement of the well-being of local communities and nature.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	ProjectFinalReport_SGP_10059_302 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ProjectFinalReport_SGP_10059_302.pdf)	katerina.yushenko@undp.org	10/21/2021 3:59:00 PM

Relevant**Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

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

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

Evidence:

Target groups were clearly defined in the project and actively participated at all stages of the project: starting from the baseline assessment and initial consultations in focus project landscapes, during formation of working groups at the level of each project focus landscape, during grant projects portfolio implementation, and results monitoring; through participation in training programmes and site-visits exchanges, landscape dialogue platforms discussions on strengthening partnership with regional akimats, etc. The grant projects actively involved a wide range of stakeholders, such as farmers, educational institutions, youth, social facilities with disabled people (crisis centers for women, centers for people with mental and physical disabilities), fisheries, protected areas staff etc. The project results achieved, experience gained, and lessons learned were presented to the local and oblast (regional) akimats, Ministry of Ecology, geology and natural resources and Ministry of agriculture through regional round tables, discussions and project final seminar. The feedback from key partners and stakeholders to strengthen the SGP activity was reflected in the Project document "Seventh Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme".

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Minutes_MinEcomtng_11Feb2021_10059_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Minutes_MinEcomtng_11Feb2021_10059_303.docx)	katerina.yushenko@undp.org	10/21/2021 4:03:00 PM
2	КраткаясправкадляМЭГПР_2020_10059_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/КраткаясправкадляМЭГПР_2020_10059_303.docx)	katerina.yushenko@undp.org	10/21/2021 4:05:00 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 developed 29 lessons learned documents on the results of the grant projects implemented. Some LLs included: (a) setting up a viable system of separate waste collection for eight multi-story apartment buildings, engaging private waste recycling companies, creating a revolving fund for accumulation of waste generated income for EE investments and upgrades in the condominium; (b) demonstrating an integrated approach to energy efficiency in public buildings (secondary schools) including technical solutions - energy audit and EE light fixtures, organizational - setting up an energy management system at pilot schools, and institutional - development of city energy management documentation; (c) an integrated approach to the construction and management of energy efficient greenhouses serving the needs of public schools, colleges, social facilities/institutions; (d) a successful partnership of community-based organizations with a private partner in demonstrating sustainable fish farming practices (hatchery and cage farming) in the Aral Sea region, and active engagement of the regional and local administrations (akimats and department of natural resources), members of the Chamber of Entrepreneurs resulting in the inclusion of the project's demonstrated approaches/practices (cage farming, fry breeding workshops, fish restocking in natural lakes) to the regional fishery development plan for 2021-2030 with earmarked public funding and subsidy opportunities; (e) sustainable beekeeping and honey production in the vicinity of production (agricultural) landscapes as a co-benefit to agricultural producers (increased crop yields) and as a good job opportunity and sustainable source of income for youth and marginal groups; (f) creation of pharmacy gardens at public schools and dachas as a means of conserving medicinal herbs (including Red Book or endangered species) in forests and growing a cultivated alternative, and setting up family health schools for herbal education and knowledge sharing; (g) piloting a digital livestock grazing control system that includes

elements of distant monitoring, digital boundaries of public pasture areas, notifications and reporting of violations of an approved pasture use plan of a community; (h) the use of drainage and collector waters for rice irrigation as a means of water saving in semi-desert areas and adaptation practice; (i) demonstrating the effectiveness of cooperation of small farmers (farmer cooperatives) growing vegetables for market access and supply chain management.

Besides, the gender analysis related to the project implementation was developed, summarizing results, lessons learned and recommendations for the next phase. Findings and recommendations of the gender publication were used for the SGP OP-7 strategy and gender action plan.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Lessons_ProEco_10059_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Lessons_ProEco_10059_304.docx)	katerina.yushenko@undp.org	10/21/2021 4:07:00 PM
2	Lessons_ИстокиДобра_10059_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Lessons_ИстокиДобра_10059_304.docx)	katerina.yushenko@undp.org	10/21/2021 4:07:00 PM
3	Lessons_Касиети_ОрАлтай_10059_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Lessons_Касиети_ОрАлтай_10059_304.docx)	katerina.yushenko@undp.org	10/21/2021 4:08:00 PM
4	Lessons_Перекресток_10059_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Lessons_Перекресток_10059_304.docx)	katerina.yushenko@undp.org	10/21/2021 4:09:00 PM
5	AralTenizi_LLReport_10059_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/AralTenizi_LLReport_10059_304.docx)	katerina.yushenko@undp.org	10/21/2021 4:13:00 PM
6	Kansonar_LLReport_10059_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Kansonar_LLReport_10059_304.docx)	katerina.yushenko@undp.org	10/21/2021 4:13:00 PM

7	LessonsLearned_Arho_Грин_10059_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/LessonsLearned_Arho_Грин_10059_304.doc)	katerina.yushenko@undp.org	10/21/2021 4:14:00 PM
8	LessonsLearned_ФондсодействияЕНбекши_10059_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/LessonsLearned_ФондсодействияЕНбекши_10059_304.docx)	katerina.yushenko@undp.org	10/21/2021 4:14:00 PM
9	LessonsLearned_ArhoСоюз_10059_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/LessonsLearned_ArhoСоюз_10059_304.doc)	katerina.yushenko@undp.org	10/21/2021 4:15:00 PM
10	GenderPublication_Final1_10059_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/GenderPublication_Final1_10059_304.docx)	katerina.yushenko@undp.org	10/21/2021 4:16:00 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 project covered all the target groups and reached more than 30,000 beneficiaries, which is higher than the planned indicator in the project logframe. But the issues for further project scaling up were marked in the project terminal evaluation report, and were reflected in the project document for the Seventh Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	2021-GEF-PIR-PIMS5469-GEFID9205_final_10059_305 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2021-GEF-PIR-PIMS5469-GEFID9205_final_10059_305.docx)	katerina.yushenko@undp.org	10/21/2021 4:18:00 PM

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:

The project addressed gender-related issues through incorporated gender-specific activities, outputs, outcomes, and disaggregated indicators in project design and reporting, development and implementation of the project Gender Action Plan; assistance by the gender specialist to potential grant applicants on the inclusion of a gender component in the grant projects; providing support to grant projects to strengthen capacities of women who are in lead roles in implementing grant projects; support of women-led grant projects (29 projects out of 49 grant projects in total) and projects with special focus on women empowerment (9 projects); providing benefits to women within sustainable land management & agricultural projects (42% of women on average benefited from increased income averaging US\$ 349 per person annually); ensuring equal participation of women in the multistakeholder groups in target landscapes (over 50% are women), actively engaged in knowledge/experience sharing and participation in policy dialogue platforms; conducting gender trainings for the GEF SGP grantees and partners; development of the gender analysis including gender assessment at country/landscape/project levels, gender progress in SGP OP6 and recommendations for SGP OP7.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	2021-GEF-PIR-PIMS5469-GEFID9205_final_10059_306 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2021-GEF-PIR-PIMS5469-GEFID9205_final_10059_306.docx)	katerina.yushenko@undp.org	10/22/2021 7:29:00 AM

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:

Social and Environmental risks identified during project SESP procedure were monitored and kept updated in the Atlas risk log. Management response measures were developed and implemented throughout project cycle.

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 monitored all the project activities on a regular basis. Project partners and grantees were in regular contact with the project team and could get an adequate and timely response to any issues raised. This strategy ensured sustainable project work, mitigation of conflicts and grievances before they might appear. All the situations with potential risks were immediately brought to the Project decision-making level, i.e. to National Steering Committee.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	12_2_17.06.2020_Amendment_2toNSCmeetingminutes_24.04.2020_10059_308 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/12_2_17.06.2020_Amendment_2toNSCmeetingminutes_24.04.2020_10059_308.pdf)	katerina.yushenko@undp.org	10/22/2021 7:38:00 AM

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 implemented a comprehensive monitoring & evaluation plan through such tools as quarterly and annual project reports, monitoring of the project risks in Atlas, National Steering Committee meetings, weekly Energy & Environment Unit meeting updates, monthly programme meetings.

At the level of the grant projects implementation, the Project also used several tools, such as monitoring site visits to the project sites, grant progress reports. In 2020 to respond COVID-19 restrictions "Plan B" was developed and approved for each grant project, and then regularly monitored by the project team through virtual calls arranged regularly with each project within the portfolio.

The Project midterm evaluation was held in 2019 and the Terminal Evaluation was done in 2021 according to the GEF projects rules to assess the project progress and results.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	SGP6MTRReport_Dec2019_Final_10059_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SGP6MTRReport_Dec2019_Final_10059_309.docx)	katerina.yushenko@undp.org	10/22/2021 7:40:00 AM
2	FinalTEReport_SGP6Kazakhstan_10059_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FinalTEReport_SGP6Kazakhstan_10059_309.docx)	katerina.yushenko@undp.org	10/22/2021 7:40:00 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 had a clear management mechanism that defined the role of the main Project management body, i.e. the National Steering Committee, as well as its composition, the principle of formation, and functions. The NSC included representatives of NGOs, academic institutions, the Ministry of Ecology, geology and natural resources, UNDP, etc. The NSC met 2-4 times a year to review grant projects, discuss and approve the adaptive management activities to respond to the external situations (like COVID-19), review and approve annual work plans, project reports, risks status, etc. NSC members also participated in the project monitoring activities (midterm review and terminal evaluation), experience exchange seminars, and workshops.

List of Uploaded Documents			
#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	SGP_Prodoc_final_eng_10059_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SGP_Prodoc_final_eng_10059_310.doc)	katerina.yushenko@undp.org	10/22/2021 7:41:00 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 risks were regularly monitored and reflected with adaptive measures in Atlas accordingly.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Efficient**Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

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

- Yes
- No

Evidence:

The project mobilized a sufficient amount of resources (\$5,3 mln) from UNDP projects and CSOs to successfully implement all the project activities.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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

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

Evidence:

The project procurement was based on the budget and AWP approved for each project year. The project procured expert services through UNOPS according to UNOPS procedures. There were also a few expert short-term ICs (up to 3 months) and the project vehicle purchasing that was done following UNDP procurement procedures and based on the procurement plan tracked by UNDP CO.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	AtlasAWPrevised2017-2021_10059_313 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/AtlasAWPrevised2017-2021_10059_313.pdf)	katerina.yushenko@undp.org	10/22/2021 7:50:00 AM

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

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

Evidence:

The project performed on the basis of efficient resources use principles through additional co-financing of the grant projects, joint grant project activities in the same portfolio and same region; exchanging experience between projects in the same region, and through online activities, implementation of joint activities with other UNDP projects in order to demonstrate more visible impact, and disseminate experience and results, planning of monitoring trips efficiently to cover more grant projects during each trip.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Проектитог_10059_314 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Проектитог_10059_314.docx)	katerina.yushenko@undp.org	10/22/2021 7:53:00 AM
2	NEW_Report_Temirtau__04-2021__PRINT_10059_314 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/NEW_Report__Temirtau__04-2021__PRINT_10059_314.pdf)	katerina.yushenko@undp.org	10/22/2021 7:56:00 AM
3	A3__RUS__Infogra_03-2021__FIN__QQQ_10059_314 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/A3__RUS__Infogra_03-2021__FIN__QQQ_10059_314.pdf)	katerina.yushenko@undp.org	10/22/2021 7:56:00 AM
4	TravelPlan_South_Kyzylorda_Nov2020_10059_314 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/TravelPlan_South_Kyzylorda_Nov2020_10059_314.pdf)	katerina.yushenko@undp.org	10/22/2021 7:56:00 AM

Effective

Quality Rating: **Satisfactory**

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

- Yes
 No

Evidence:

The project was successfully implemented, which was proved by the Terminal Evaluation, and all the project objectives, outcomes, and outputs were achieved.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	FinalTEReport_SGP6Kazakhstan_10059_315 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FinalTEReport_SGP6Kazakhstan_10059_315.docx)	katerina.yushenko@undp.org	10/22/2021 7:59:00 AM

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

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

Evidence:

The project AWP's (and the budget) were revised on ce per year to adjust the project activities to ensure successful achievements of the project according to the project document.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Рабочийплан_2021_10059_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Рабочийплан_2021_10059_316.docx)	katerina.yushenko@undp.org	10/22/2021 8:00:00 AM

17. Were the targeted groups systematically identified and engaged, prioritizing the marginalized and excluded, to ensure results were achieved as expected?

- 3: The project targeted specific groups and/or geographic areas, identified by using credible data sources on their capacity needs, deprivation and/or exclusion from development opportunities relevant to the project's area of work. There is clear evidence that the targeted groups were reached as intended. The project engaged regularly with targeted groups over the past year to assess whether they benefited as expected and adjustments were made if necessary, to refine targeting. (all must be true)
- 2: *The project targeted specific groups and/or geographic areas, based on some evidence of their capacity needs, deprivation and/or exclusion from development opportunities relevant to the project's area of work. Some evidence is provided to confirm that project beneficiaries are members of the targeted groups. There was some engagement with beneficiaries in the past year to assess whether they were benefiting as expected. (all must be true)*
- 1: The project did not report on specific targeted groups. There is no evidence to confirm that project beneficiaries are populations have capacity needs or are deprived and/or excluded from development opportunities relevant to the project area of work. There is some engagement with beneficiaries to assess whether they benefited as expected, but it was limited or did not occurred in the past year.
- Not Applicable

Evidence:

The project had thematic (steppe and desert ecosystems) and geographical priorities (7 pilot regions/landscapes). The project also identified the main focus groups: rural communities, NGOs, youth, vulnerable groups and people with disabilities, local governmental bodies, etc. All project focus groups actively participated in the project activities at different stages, starting from baseline assessment with identification of the focus project stakeholder groups' needs and priority actions. Later, the grant portfolio was formed based on those needs and priorities identified by representatives of different focus groups. Involvement in training programs, experience exchange visits, dialogue platform discussions, activities to strengthen partnerships with government agencies, promotion of results, and at a later stage, analysis of the results achieved ensured focus work with the project target groups and multistakeholder partnership development.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Landscapestrategy_KaragandyOblast_ENG_10059_317 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Landscapestrategy_KaragandyOblast_ENG_10059_317.docx)	katerina.yushenko@undp.org	10/22/2021 8:05:00 AM
2	ПриложениеE_10059_317 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ПриложениеE_10059_317.doc)	katerina.yushenko@undp.org	10/22/2021 8:05:00 AM
3	AnnexC_Annex_E_finalreport_10059_317 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/AnnexC_Annex_E_finalreport_10059_317.pdf)	katerina.yushenko@undp.org	10/22/2021 8:09:00 AM

Sustainability & National Ownership**Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

18. Were stakeholders and national partners fully engaged in the decision-making, implementation and monitoring of the project?

- 3: Only national systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) were used to fully implement and monitor the project. All relevant stakeholders and partners were fully and actively engaged in the process, playing a lead role in project decision-making, implementation and monitoring. (both must be true)
- 2: *National systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) were used to implement and monitor the project (such as country office support or project systems) were also used, if necessary. All relevant stakeholders and partners were actively engaged in the process, playing an active role in project decision-making, implementation and monitoring. (both must be true)*
- 1: There was relatively limited or no engagement with national stakeholders and partners in the decision-making, implementation and/or monitoring of the project.
- Not Applicable

Evidence:

Local and national project stakeholders actively participated in the project implementation at all stages, including baseline assessment in focal regions and priority actions identification, landscape plans development, grant projects development and implementation, monitoring of the grant projects progress achieved as well as evaluation of the Project results (through terminal evaluation). Also, through experience exchange, participation in training programs, dialogue platforms discussions stakeholders and partners participated in the project activities realization, made recommendations to the project strengthening activities, evaluated project achievements. NSC ensured project management, UNDP CO has ensured oversight of the project at the program level (participation in the NSC, monitoring site visits, coordinating partnership with other UNDP projects, reporting monitoring, etc.).

List of Uploaded Documents			
#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	FinalTEReport_SGP6Kazakhstan_10059_318 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FinalTEReport_SGP6Kazakhstan_10059_318.docx)	katerina.yushenko@undp.org	10/22/2021 8:11:00 AM

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:

CSOs and local authorities (regional akimats) were the main project partners. The project regularly monitored capacities of its partners but hasn't observed any changes in the capabilities that could require adjustments to implementation arrangements.

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 has successfully completed all the activities and achieved the project objectives, which were stated in the Terminal Evaluation report. But at the same time, the TE report marked a number of actions that need to be taken to strengthen activities on replication, policy dialogue platform sustainability, etc. The related management response was approved with set of measures included into the project document for the Seventh Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	ManagementResponse_TE_SGP6_KAZ_final_10059_320 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ManagementResponse_TE_SGP6_KAZ_final_10059_320.doc)	katerina.yushenko@undp.org	10/22/2021 8:41:00 AM
2	6450GEF7Prodoc_SGPOP7Kazakhstan_15Oct2021_10059_320 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/6450GEF7Prodoc_SGPOP7Kazakhstan_15Oct2021_10059_320.docx)	katerina.yushenko@undp.org	10/22/2021 8:42:00 AM

QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments

All project deliverables have been produced satisfactorily. Project meets UNDP quality standards. The lessons learned during project implementation will be taken into account for designing and implementation of Seventh Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme.