

Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

Overall Project Rating: **Satisfactory**

Project Number : 00081777

Project Title : Expanding the opportunities of the Mangystau region in achieving sustainable development and socio-economic modernization

Project Date : 01-Jan-2014

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

The activities undertaken during 2014-2016 provided Mangystau region with opportunities that led or developed basis for reduction of inequities and disparities in social well-being of specific population strata, changes in local government and NGOs' attitudes and cooperation practices, efficient implementation of the projects in energy saving, SME support, etc. For regional and local administrations the JP allowed to understand and make use of the experiences of the UNDP, and introduce change at high level of professional quality, including the facilitation of international exposure that resulted appreciated and effective. While the decision about the selection of the Regions and the overall structure of the JP had been made by the Agencies and the central Government, decisions concerning implementation were mainly taken at local / regional level, The cooperation with regional authorities has become a good practice and also a very important opportunity for learning, both for the UNDP involved and for the regional authorities.

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

Relevance

refers to the assess consistency, ownership and congruency, technical adequacy, and complementarity of the UN JPD with other initiatives and with the strategic government and regional documents and plans, and the UN Agencies country documents, to ensure that activities were appropriate to the context, and significant for the achievement of the strategic objectives of these documents.

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 programme addressed different dimensions of development and had a strong potential for helping to break the intergenerational transfer of rural population's poverty and dis-empowerment: through educational and skill enhancement opportunities of especially most vulnerable ones to improve their access to livelihood options, social services and economic opportunities, strengthening their confidence and respect in the communities, increasing their engagement in local governance systems, and decreasing problems in housing and communal sector.

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

One of the most vulnerable groups in the region was found to be the ethnic Kazakh repatriates, oralmans, with low level of social and economic integration. UNDP worked closely with the Centre for Rehabilitation and Integration of Repatriates in Aktau to address the challenges of the oralmans, providing the target group language and literary courses and business training to increase their capacities in the labour market. UNDP has supported 17 projects that have ensured 17 jobs for local people, including 2 persons with disabilities. Young people with disabilities have additionally received training in site administration, translation, accounting and design, and rural artisans have been capacitated through artisan development workshops. Unemployed persons released from prisons and unemployed women subjected to domestic violence have received psychological counselling, resulting in 14 people trained and receiving employment assistance, and all presently carrying out labour activities and some heading towards private entrepreneurs. Regional NGOs have been implementing similar projects since 2017.

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

In general, the program was successfully implemented. Good working relations with partners were created. The media actively provides good coverage of most events in Aktau. Assistance from the UN team is well received and fewer beneficiaries are considering providing development assistance as charity work, even in comparison to 2014.

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

In Mangystau region there are certain areas that needed support, especially in areas addressed by JP: local self-governance, inclusive social development, SME development, promotion of gender equality and improving prevention and response to violence against women, agriculture development, energy efficiency, inequities, health, public participation, improvement of well-being, etc. Despite its high GRDP, Mangystau's share of the poor is relatively high (more than 6%). Level of development of agriculture is the lowest in Kazakhstan, level of SME (business) activities is low, especially in rural areas, and the local self-government instruments are at the embryonic stage. Many initiatives taken by the JP, if further developed and continued, could actually bring about over the time to concrete improvements in terms of inclusion, equity and gender equality. For instance, this is specifically visible in i) the active inclusion of people with disabilities or particularly vulnerable, such as NEETs; ii) experimenting the scheme of social enterprise promoted by the government, and actively sustaining women employment generation; iii) the promotion of energy efficiency in the schools, which in turn created better conditions for the children, specifically allowing children with disabilities to access more easily to school and thus concretely contributing to their school reintegration.

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 Akimat of Mangistau has expressed interest in a possible use of the system for the Situational Analysis centre to be developed in the region, and the baseline information and data for one year has allowed the first analysis. Another area for further work and testing is the subjective well-being perception by children and their parents. The successful testing of the approach will allow introducing the statistically sound subjective data collection into routine

monitoring of the situation of children and families in the region. It is expected that upon completion of the costing and evaluation of the model, it will scale up to other regions. At the same time the nature of several activities aimed at piloting intervention that could be possibly replicated on a wider scale, and the success of the implementation, allowed the Agencies involved to be more effective in their conversation with the Republican government.

Social & Environmental Standards

Quality Rating: Needs Improvement

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

UNDP during the programme period has focused on supporting the capacities of local NGOs in the region. The number of active NGOs has been relatively low and lacking skill in working with international organizations, experience in developing project proposals, and ensuring sustainable operations. NGO employees have been trained in human rights and human rights mechanisms, and planning and development of inclusive projects, and monitoring and evaluation. More than 45 NGOs representatives were trained in 2017 in assessing the needs of the local community and formation of tax reporting.

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 JP aimed at reaching the most significant outcome in a few main directions, as foreseen in the JPD: • Strengthen the capacities of local government to plan for the economic development of the region, stimulate productive employment and enhance entrepreneurial skills of the rural population, especially in the core settlements; • Support to the system of self-governance by working with state and civil institutions

in order to create conditions in which important local issues can be addressed by local population; • Strengthen the capacity of local institutions at every level including health system (focus on integrated care across all health system levels, from the primary health care level to effective and efficient hospital care), sexual and reproductive health, child protection, cultural heritage to provide better services to the population, especially those in most need (women, children, youth, elderly, PWDs, repatriates, etc.); • Introduce innovative approaches in the region with regards to the well-being and protection of vulnerable groups of population, including children and youth, support to their social and economic inclusion, creation of social infrastructure and 'barrier free' environment; • Promote sustainable environmental development, including piloting water, energy efficiency in housing and communal sectors, environmentally oriented and adapted usage of land and other natural resources and disaster risk reduction practices.

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

The project had no major social and environmental risks.

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

The JP appears to have been decided in its main features at Ministerial / UN Agencies level, and implemented at regional and local level with the involvement of the Akimat and some degree of participation of local authorities and local

stakeholders; this resulted in a good level of ownership of the programme, and at the same time in good involvement of the local (oblast and rayon) administration in the programme, for a number of different reasons.

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

For what it was possible to ascertain in the field work, the management of the JP is characterized by a certain level of coordination between Agencies working on similar or joint activities; lower level of coordination among other UN Agencies taking part in the JP: coordination therefore seems to be strictly activity based, rather than programme based. A low level of awareness of the complexity and scope of the JP was noticed among local representatives and partners, with strong focus on the single activities to be carried out by the programme managers;

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

UNDP produced, according to their own internal procedures, a Work Plan, in some cases, on yearly base), detailing the specific actions or activities to be carried out in the period and the expected results. Work plans were drafted and put in place separately and autonomously by the participating Agencies. Contents and timing of the Work plans were defined according

to each Agency regulations (not all Agencies share the same fiscal year, as well as not all foresee the same format of work plans). In correspondence with these plans, activities and results achieved were monitored.

Efficient

Quality Rating: Exemplary

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 sufficient resources were mobilized in line with the funding agreement.

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

UNDP has facilitated significantly the discussion and the relationship between akimat and assemblies. Perspectives as indicated by the deputy akim, in particular procedure are to be clarified and complexity of state procedure (eg: procurement regulations) are to be kept under control in order to avoid councils to be paralyzed.

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

Effectiveness refers to the achievement of results planned by the JP, through the activities carried out, highlighting reasons for achievement and non-achievement of results and factors contributing or hindering these achievements. Efficiency is also taken into consideration, underlying the evidences gathered to assess the cost efficiency of the programme implementation.

Effective

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

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

- Yes
- No

Evidence

The interventions in the field and well-being showed among other aspects, how well-being and strong indicators, and main outcomes, of development programmes. The impact of the activities of the JP and of their outcomes on the high-level dialogue of the UN Agencies with the Government is significant, according to the analysis made through interviews with UN Agencies and Akimat.

18. The project delivered its expected outputs.

- Yes
- No

Evidence

The JPD defines a series of strategic objectives to be addressed by the activities foreseen by the UN Agencies in three different components (refer to the table below and the next section). The activities are shortly described and characterized by the outputs that they are expected to produce. For each result one or more indicators are given, which may refer to number of beneficiaries, number of outputs produced, or other parameters. The relevance of the Joint Programme was verified against the planning and strategic documents indicated in the ToR: the tables show how different strategic documents contributed to the identification of

specific outputs of the JP in Mangystau region, how the Outputs of the JP properly address the issues identified in the country, as expressed in the programming documents, and how the JP intervention relates to other interventions carried out by the Government.

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

The results of the work were evaluated annually. All planned activities for the project were aimed at achieving the results of the project. Lessons learned from the results of the mid-term evaluation were studied and used in the work to improve the results of the project. Management report on mid-term evaluation.

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 pilot territories were determined by the PMC decision. Further design solutions and activities were developed with the involvement of all target groups and taking into account their needs. Representatives of the target groups were members of the PMC and the advisory and technical council. All project activities were developed taking into account the objectives

of the project and the interests of local communities and target groups.

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

- Yes
- No

Evidence

50% of the project personnel are female

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

JP is a results-oriented collaborative programme jointly developed by the Ministry of National Economy of the Republic of Kazakhstan and Akimat of Mangystau Region and the above-mentioned seven UN Agencies to expand the opportunities of the Mangystau Oblast (region) in achieving sustainable and equitable progress in social, health and economic development for 2014-2016. In the implementation phase, the Programme activities have been carried out through a strong cooperation with national and local authorities – Regional Akimat and local Akimat – and with local counterparts and stakeholders: in this sense it has resulted in a Joint Programme, in which what is more relevant are the joint efforts of UN Agencies staff and consultants with the local officers and local partners.

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

In this context, the Joint Programme envisaged specific areas of cooperation: ✓ enhancing access to locally provided quality social and economic services especially for vulnerable groups of population, including vulnerable categories of women, children, youth, elderly, PWDs, repatriates, undocumented and stateless persons; ✓ increase capacity of local decision makers in oil rich region in efficient planning and use of state resources for effective and efficient health and social protection of vulnerable populations, diversification of economy, expanding income opportunities, stimulating productive employment, and sustainable development including protection of natural and cultural heritage; ✓ piloting innovative approaches of providing health and special social services to women – survivors of violence, children, youth, elderly, PWDs, repatriates, undocumented and stateless persons in rural areas, developing local plans responsive to the needs of the population at the primary health care level, informing the society and professionals on best practices of child care and new participatory mechanisms for community involvement; ✓ capacity development of the population to improve their wellbeing through local self-governance and capacitating businesses in rural areas; ✓ empowering local authorities and communities in application of sustainable environmental practices to respond to existing environmental challenges.

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 ensured that the lessons learnt are applied during the implementation of the projects focused on the regional development. Special attention was paid to raising awareness of the partners on accountability for implementation, including the local executive and legislative authorities, and civil society.

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

Summary/Final Project Board Comments: