

Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

Form Status: Approved

Overall Rating:	Satisfactory
Decision:	
Portfolio/Project Number:	00116233
Portfolio/Project Title:	Partnering for building a national SDG Platform
Portfolio/Project Date:	2018-12-01 / 2020-12-31

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:

The project team identified relevant changes in the external environment, such as impact on the project activities by the COVID-19 pandemic. The impact of pandemic made the project re-consider the activities that were planned to be conducted physically, but were conducted virtually. For example, the organization of the Hackathon to digitalize "Imagine 2030" game was transferred from physical organization modality to the virtual organization modality.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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

- 3: The project responded to at least one of the development settings as specified in the Strategic Plan (SP) and adopted at least one Signature Solution. The project's RRF included all the relevant SP output indicators. (all must be true)
- 2: *The project responded to at least one of the developments settings1 as specified in the Strategic Plan. The project's RRF included at least one SP output indicator, if relevant. (both must be true)*
- 1: While the project may have responded to a partner's identified need, this need falls outside of the UNDP Strategic Plan. Also select this option if none of the relevant SP indicators are included in the RRF.

Evidence:

The project responds to the Strategic Plan Output 1.1 "Capacities developed across the whole of government to integrate the 2030 Agenda, the Paris Agreement and other international agreements in development plans and budgets, and to analyse progress towards the SDGs, using innovative and data-driven solutions". The project RRF contributes to the SP Indicator "1.1.1.1 Number of countries that have development plans and budgets that integrate international agreements across the whole-of-government: a) 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development".

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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:

Targeted groups of people were engaged in the implementation of the project. In particular, these were employees of the Economic Research Institute, the employees of the National Bureau on Statistics, the employees of the Ministry of Finance and Ministry of Economy. Depending on the activity undertaken by the project, different groups of people were engaged. For example, to implement activity 2 on SDGs localization, the employees from ERI conducted 17 workshops in the regions of Kazakhstan to increase awareness about SDGs. By doing this, the project was able to achieve 2 results: 1) Enhance the capacity of national partners in SDG localization approaches, 2) Increase awareness of 750 people from the regions on the SDG Agenda 2030.

During First Regional SDG Summit, held in Almaty in 2019, the project engaged a local fashion designer to develop a set of 17 SDG Installations in the form of mannequins. The mannequins were dressed in clothes which were prepared with a help of local NGO "Petelka" that helps women came from prison to get back to a social life.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Mission2030_6359_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Mission2030_6359_303.pptx)	aigerim.yegemberdiyeva@undp.org	12/24/2020 6:31:00 AM

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 following lessons were learnt during project implementation:

1. Insufficient coordination and interaction in the implementation of the SDG Agenda between government agencies. Low level of involvement from the national coordinator of the SDG implementation process in Kazakhstan – the Ministry of National Economy was noted.
2. NGOs represent the most important tool of communication and interaction with the population. However, it was noted that in the process of implementing the SDGs, most NGOs do not have a clear vision and mission for achieving the SDGs. There is a need for the cooperation of NGO actions into one holistic, programmatic strategy, the implementation of which will bring the work on SDGs to a systematic and consistent level;
3. The uneven level of awareness and involvement in SDG implementation process was noted in the regions. In general, active work on SDGs was observed only in large cities such as Nur-Sultan and Almaty, while SDG awareness remained at a very low level in other regions;
4. A high level of interest in studying the SDG Agenda was noted among students of secondary educational institutions, as well as faculty staff. This factor is a very important direction for the state in promoting the principles of sustainable development among adolescents and young people.

The work on SDGs implementation in Kazakhstan should be centralized in one entity, which will coordinate the overall work. Considering the fact that MNERK is not closely involved in the process, it is deemed feasible that the Secretariat of SDG Coordination Council in Kazakhstan – JSC “Economic Research Institute” will coordinate the work and centrally raise awareness on SDGs among different stakeholders.

The lessons learnt were highlighted during the final project board meeting and noted by the national partners for future work on SDG Agenda 2030.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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

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

Evidence:

Since its commencement, the project has gained interest from partners in Kazakhstan, both national and international and mobilized additional funding from the Asian Development Bank in Kazakhstan in the amount of USD 200,000, which allowed a project to grow at a bigger scale and showed much interest and willingness of ADB to provide support for promoting Kazakhstan's SDG Agenda as guided by the SDG Coordination Council.

During project implementation, the platform engaged more than 1,500 deeply engaged experts, representatives of the government agencies, private sector, NGOs and youth and the interest is growing. In July 2020, the UNCT in Kazakhstan, namely UNDP, UNICEF and ESCAP mobilized a 1 mln USD grant from the UN Joint SDG Fund and commenced implementation of the Joint Programme (JP) on aligning policy and financing with SDGs towards an Integrated National Financing Framework (INFF). The dedicated project "SDG Financing Strategy" was established in UNDP with a duration of 2 years until July 2022. UNDP was defined as a lead agency in the implementation of the JP and first results of UNDP hired consultants were presented at the recently held JP Launch Event.

Currently, new proposals for mobilizing additional funding are being developed, such as proposal to the EC to establish a regional SDG knowledge-sharing platform for 5 Central Asian Countries and the ADB-UNDP joint initiative to establish a so-called "Solidarity Fund for Kazakhstan" which is a response facility to assist Kazakhstan in fighting the negative impact on the labor market caused by COVID-19 pandemic and preparing for the post-crisis socio-economic development. These initiatives will result in the growth of activities related to SDG achievement in Kazakhstan.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	20200123183638_ПротоколЦУРот16.01.2020рус_6359_305 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/20200123183638_ПротоколЦУРот16.01.2020рус_6359_305.docx)	aigerim.yegemberdiyeva@undp.org	2/25/2021 5:22:00 AM
2	20200123183658_ПланаЦУРна2020рус_6359_305 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/20200123183658_ПланаЦУРна2020рус_6359_305.docx)	aigerim.yegemberdiyeva@undp.org	2/25/2021 5:22:00 AM

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:

During project implementation, the gender factor was always considered. The following gender-related activities were performed:

- 1) 34 gender-related indicators were reviewed by the National Bureau on Statistics of RK and a “Gender – profile of Kazakhstan” publication was published in 2019. The publication was funded by UNDP;
- 2) 750 people participated in the regional workshops on citizen engagement tool “Mission 2030”, with 33.5% men and 66.5% women;
- 3) During First Regional SDG Summit among 300 participants, 153 (or 53%) were women, while 47% were men. Among 64 speakers, 21 (or 33%) were women and 43 (or 67%) were men;
- 4) For the Summit, UNDP hired a designer of sustainable fashion – Ms. Aigerim Akenova (AIKEN), who prepared installations, reflecting 17 SDGs. The mannequins were dressed in clothes which were designed by Aigerim and prepared with a help of local NGO “Petelka” that helps women come from prison to get back to a social life.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	SDG__Gender__pyc2_6359_306 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SDG__Gender__pyc2_6359_306.pdf)	aigerim.yegemberdiyeva@undp.org	2/25/2021 5:26:00 AM
2	Summitanalysis_6359_306 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Summitanalysis_6359_306.docx)	aigerim.yegemberdiyeva@undp.org	2/25/2021 5:28:00 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 were tracked during project implementation. It was ensured that project activities do not harm the environment and take into considerations the human-rights based approach.

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 was categorized as low risk through the SESP.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Management & Monitoring**Quality Rating: 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 following monitoring activities have been undertaken by the project:

- 1) Analysis of the lessons learnt. Low level of involvement by the VM of National Economy to the SDGs implementation process in Kazakhstan led to the active engagement of the JSC Economic Research Institute and National Bureau on Statistics. The capacities of the SDG Secretariat were enhanced to ensure sustainability of results and further effective work on the SDG Agenda in Kazakhstan;
- 2) Annual project quality assurance. The quality assurance was done on the annual basis to assess the quality of the project against UNDPs quality standards to identify project's strengths and weaknesses and to inform management decision making process to improve the project;
- 3) Review and course corrections (frequently). The review of the project activities was done at least 2 times a year due to the necessary budget revisions and updating the work plan accordingly based on the needs of the national counterparts;
- 4) Annual project progress report (annually). The project progress report was prepared in the end of 2019 to the donors, including UNDP. The final project progress was presented at the final project board meeting on 14 December 2020;
- 5) Project Steering Committee. The meetings were held when agreed with the national partner.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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

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

Evidence:

The Project's governance mechanism was established and set out in the project document. The meetings with the national partner were held as planned.

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 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 monitored risks on an annual basis and mitigated appropriately.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	RiskLogfromATLAS_6359_311 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/RiskLogfromATLAS_6359_311.docx)	aigerim.yegemberdiyeva@undp.org	12/24/2020 7:21:00 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:

Adequate resources were mobilized to achieve intended results.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	ATLASAWP17JUN1_6359_312 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ATLASAWP17JUN1_6359_312.PDF)	aigerim.yegemberdiyeva@undp.org	2/25/2021 5:32:00 AM

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 initiated a procurement plan on UNDP internal PROMPT platform in 2020. The platform was updated on a constant basis to update with actual procurement cases.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	ProjectProcurementPlanDetailedReport_6359_313 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ProjectProcurementPlanDetailedReport_6359_313.xlsx)	aigerim.yegemberdiyeva@undp.org	12/24/2020 7:24:00 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 ensured the value for money principle during procurement procedures. The quality assurance on submitted reports was achieved through a thorough review by qualified staff.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Effective**Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

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

- Yes
 No

Evidence:

The project was on track and delivered its expected outputs. The effectiveness of the project was approved by the final Project Board meeting.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	SCMinutesofmeeting_SDGPlatformProject_6359_315 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SCMinutesofmeeting_SDGPlatformProject_6359_315.pdf)	aigerim.yegemberdiyeva@undp.org	12/29/2020 10:17:00 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 implementation of the annual work plan was monitored by the project and programme teams. Regular reviews were made to assess the results delivery forecast and ensure risk mitigation plan given COVID-19 negative impact.

The project delivered 100% of the planned resources.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	ATLASAWP17JUN1_6359_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ATLASAWP17JUN1_6359_316.PDF)	aigerim.yegemberdiyeva@undp.org	2/25/2021 5:33:00 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 major target groups were employees of ERI, NB S, NGOs and civil society (academia and youth). During project implementation, the activities were directed towards enhancing the capacity of the targeted groups. In particular, the following activities were undertaken:

1. The project was able to attract 120 new stakeholders from the civil society, private sector and government agencies in the SDG Platform operationalization;
2. The project was able to provide trainings in methods to integrate SDGs into national planning to the representatives of ERI, MNE and MinFin (total 100 people).;
3. Trainings on explaining the methodologies to define baseline measurements, calculating SDG indicators and identifying SDG interlinkages were conducted to the employees of the National Bureau on Statistics (30 people);
4. Trainings on the DFA and RIA of national budget were provided to the employees of ERI, MNE and MinFin in October 2019, early February 2020 and October 2020.;
5. In 2019 UNDP in partnership with ADB organized a First Regional SDG Summit on SDG Finance with participation of 300 experts, youth, academia, NGO and private sector;
6. 750 people were engaged in the workshops on SDG localization in Kazakhstan
7. 53 young techpreneurs participated in the virtual Hackathon on the SDG Game

List of Uploaded Documents

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

No documents available.

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

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

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

Evidence:

The project was implemented as NIM project with U NDP support services.
The project engaged Economic Resources Institute as a responsible partner based on the HACT micro assessment with low risk rating.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

19. Were there regular monitoring of changes in capacities and performance of institutions and systems relevant to the project, as needed, and were the implementation [arrangements](#)⁸ adjusted according to changes in partner capacities?

- 3: Changes in capacities and performance of national institutions and systems were assessed/monitored using clear indicators, rigorous methods of data collection and credible data sources including relevant HACT assurance activities. Implementation arrangements were formally reviewed and adjusted, if needed, in agreement with partners according to changes in partner capacities. (all must be true)
- 2: *Aspects of changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems were monitored by the project using indicators and reasonably credible data sources including relevant HACT assurance activities. Some adjustment was made to implementation arrangements if needed to reflect changes in partner capacities. (all must be true)*
- 1: Some aspects of changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems may have been monitored by the project, however changes to implementation arrangements have not been considered. Also select this option if changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems have not been monitored by the project.
- Not Applicable

Evidence:

Economic Resources Institute (ERI) as a responsible partner was closely monitored by UNDP through HACT assurance activities i.e. meetings with ERI management, regular consultations and advisory support in clarifications of UNDP HACT framework, a strict control of the expenses to be in line with the planned activities and results.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	UNDP2020-3065Kazakhstan-ERI-Micro-assessmentreport-final_6359_319 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/UNDP2020-3065Kazakhstan-ERI-Micro-assessmentreport-final_6359_319.pdf)	aigerim.yegemberdiyeva@undp.org	2/25/2021 5:55:00 AM

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 final project board meeting was conducted on 14 December 2020. It highlighted the successful completion of the project as achieved all planned results and reviewed transition and phase out plans to ensure the project sustainability.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	SCMinutesofmeeting_SDGPlatformProject_6359_320 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SCMinutesofmeeting_SDGPlatformProject_6359_320.pdf)	aigerim.yegemberdiyeva@undp.org	12/29/2020 10:18:00 AM

QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments

The following important points were made by the SC participants:

- Ms. Nurgul Zhannazarova, Director of the Social Policy and Development of Governmental Agencies Department, MNE RK, expressed a gratitude to UNDP and ADB for the effective and successful implementation of the project "Partnering for building a national SDG platform", and expressed readiness to support further initiatives of UNDP.
- Deputy Chairperson of JSC "Economic Research Institute" - Ms. Shakharbanu Zhakupova thanked UNDP and ADB for their high-quality joint work, highlighted the successful presentation of the VNR at the HLPF, and thanked for the support provided in the organization of trainings on "Mission 2030" game. Ms. Zhakupova also noted that the potential of ERI in implementing the SDG Agenda has significantly increased and the work of 5 working groups has been put in place.
- Economics Officer at the Asian Development Bank - Mr. Gennady Rau noted that even though the share of ADB financing in the project was slightly less than 50%, a lot of good results were achieved. ADB is ready to continue supporting national partners and UNDP in implementing the SDGs in Kazakhstan, namely in terms of nationalizing the SDGs. This year, ADB has launched a new technical assistance for the exchange of experience and knowledge in the amount of 2 million US dollars and is ready to support new interesting initiatives. Mr. Rau also expressed his hope for further fruitful cooperation.
- The head of the SDG statistics office, Ms. Ainur Dossanova, thanked UNDP and ADB for their fruitful cooperation and expressed her desire to cooperate in future projects.
- Director of the SDG Secretariat at the JSC "Economic Research Institute" - Ms. Bakhytgul Khambar noted the continuous support of the UNDP project team within the project implementation. The effectiveness of the project team's presence in the office of the ERI was also noted.

SC decision

- Approve the effectiveness of the project (effective)
- Approve the date of the operational closure of the project due to the full implementation of the assigned tasks of the project - December 31, 2020
- Approve the transfer of assets as per Annex 1 "Assets" and ensure further effective use of project's assets.