

Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

Form Status: Approved	
Overall Rating:	Satisfactory
Decision:	
Portfolio/Project Number:	00102216
Portfolio/Project Title:	Minamata initial assessment
Portfolio/Project Date:	2017-01-01 / 2019-06-30

Strategic	Quality Rating: Satisfactory
<p>1. Did the project pro-actively identified changes to the external environment and incorporated them into the project strategy?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="radio"/> 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) <input checked="" type="radio"/> 2: <i>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)</i> <input type="radio"/> 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:

Changes analysis was implemented by the Project on a regular basis throughout the project implementation to timely identify and follow the contextual and national priorities changes with new opportunities to the project's ability to achieve its objectives and scale up its achievements.

As such the review was prepared for existing of national legislation on mercury handling (managing) and the assessment of the existing regulatory legal acts in the field of mercury handling was made.

The following recommendations were prepared on the required changes and amendments to the legislation for the purposes of ratification of the Minamata Convention on Mercury

- Report was prepared on determination of roles and responsible parties on mercury management issues. Key parties on the treatment and management of mercury were considered and assessed. Recommendations on their institutional interaction are submitted.
- Proposals were prepared for inclusion in strategic documents, legislative and regulatory acts of additions to mercury management issues.

All these activities allowed to identify new opportunities to expand the project's objectives within the next project on strengthening the national capacity of the Republic of Kazakhstan to regulate chemicals through ensuring compliance with obligations under international multilateral environmental agreements.

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 clearly responded to Strategic Plan Output "1.1.1 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".

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Relevant

Quality Rating: Highly 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:

Three targeted groups were identified as the most vulnerable from the effects of mercury: the unborn children, small children and people who are regularly exposed (chronic exposure) to high levels of mercury (such as populations that rely on subsistence fishing, people who are exposed through their occupations (e.g. mercury mining) or those exposed to mercury containing products.

As mercury is passed on from the mother to the child (in utero and during breastfeeding), and fetuses and children are most susceptible to developmental effects from mercury, the MIA paid particular attention to assessing national capacity to keep such risk groups safe.

Recommendations on how to address gender dimensions related to mercury and priority actions in this area were also highlighted in the MIA report.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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 data collection including accumulation of knowledge and lessons learnt were initially identified among the main project results to be achieved. Throughout its implementation the project used official statistical information (annual reports of governmental bodies). On top of this the project initiated direct communication with the potential emitters to send the official requests to the interested organisations. Representatives of industrial enterprises had a neutral attitude to ratification of the Minamata Convention and ignored project's requests. To change the attitudes, the project conducted a number of workshops for representatives of industrial enterprises, explaining the necessity of ratification of Minamata convention and necessary measures. These capacity building activities resulted in the intensive cooperation with the industry with more than 300 responses for the project's requests with practical information. This information became the basis for the 2-nd level of mercury inventory in the Republic of Kazakhstan.

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:

Achievements of the project allowed to scale up its results within the forthcoming the new project on chemicals . The main objective of this new project is to support the country efforts in strengthening the capacity to implement an integrated approach to the management of chemicals at the national level to effectively implement the Stockholm, Basel and Rotterdam Conventions, Strategic Approach to Integrated Chemicals Management (SAICM) and promote the ratification of the Minamata Convention. achieve Sustainable Development Goal №12 of Agenda 2030.

This main objective will be achieved through improved interagency coordination among government agencies, improvement of the legislative base for international multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs), capacity building and stakeholder information on chemical safety, a system for the classification and labelling of chemicals.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	ProjectBoardMinutes_July2019_472_305 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ProjectBoardMinutes_July2019_472_305.pdf)	zhanetta.babasheva@undp.org	9/30/2019 1:36:00 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 team regularly gathered data and evidence on the relevance of the measures to address gender inequalities and empower women through the organization of gender focused events and side sections within all events, organized within the project activities. For example:

- A round table entitled «Chemical and Hazardous Wastes: Integrating Gender Aspects into Safe Handling» was held as part of the GEWR'18 Green Growth Forum. During the Round Table, many factors affecting health of the population, especially women and children were discussed. Promotion of the gender policy in the field of safe handling of chemical and hazardous wastes has not been raised up to this day. One of the results of the Round Table was the possibility of including such session as a permanent component of the program of the annual Forum”.
- At the seminar in Pavlodar (November 2018), a round table was held on «The Role of Central Asian Women in Preventing Mercury Pollution of Lake Balkyldak effects on the health of women and children in Pavlodar region». Global gender policy and gender mainstreaming in environmental issues at the local level were considered. An active discussion took place on advancing gender equality in the issues of public health and welfare and measures were proposed to prevent the effects of mercury pollution of Lake Balkyldak on the health of women and children.
- A video clip was shot called «Equal opportunities». It encompasses issues on gender in chemicals and chemical safety.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

7. Were social and environmental impacts and risks successfully managed and monitored?

- 3: Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. Appropriate assessments conducted where required (i.e., Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) for High risk projects and some level of social and environmental assessment for Moderate risk projects as identified through SESP). Relevant management plan(s) developed for identified risks through consultative process and implemented, resourced, and monitored. Risks effectively managed or mitigated. If there is a substantive change to the project or change in context that affects risk levels, the SESP was updated to reflect these changes. (all must be true)
- 2: *Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. Appropriate assessments conducted where required (i.e., Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) for High risk projects and some level of social and environmental assessment for Moderate risk projects as identified through SESP). Relevant management plan(s) developed, implemented and monitored for identified risks. OR project was categorized as Low risk through the SESP.*
- 1: Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. For projects categorized as High or Moderate Risk, there was no evidence that social and environmental assessments completed and/or management plans or measures development, implemented or monitored. There are substantive changes to the project or changes in the context but SESP was not updated. (any may be true)

Evidence:

Project was rated as Low risk through the SESP. The risks were visited regularly in Atlas. No major risks were identified throughout the project implementation.

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:

All the project stakeholders and beneficiaries were timely informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism during the meetings at the working level.

List of Uploaded Documents

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

No documents available.

Management & Monitoring

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

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

- 3: *The project had a comprehensive and costed M&E plan. Baselines, targets and milestones were fully populated. Progress data against indicators in the project's RRF was reported regularly using credible data sources and collected according to the frequency stated in the Plan, including sex disaggregated data as relevant. Any evaluations conducted, if relevant, fully meet decentralized evaluation standards, including gender UNEG standards. Lessons learned, included during evaluations and/or After-Action Reviews, were used to take corrective actions when necessary. (all must be true)*
- 2: The project costed M&E Plan, and most baselines and targets were populated. Progress data against indicators in the project's RRF was collected on a regular basis, although there was may be some slippage in following the frequency stated in the Plan and data sources was not always reliable. Any evaluations conducted, if relevant, met most decentralized evaluation standards. Lessons learned were captured but were used to take corrective actions. (all must be true)
- 1: The project had M&E Plan, but costs were not clearly planned and budgeted for, or were unrealistic. Progress data was not regularly collected against the indicators in the project's RRF. Evaluations did not meet decentralized evaluation standards. Lessons learned were rarely captured and used. Select this option also if the project did not have an M&E plan.

Evidence:

The project has developed and followed M&E Plan. All monitoring activities were implemented in line with UNDP monitoring policy. The project regularly updated risks and issues logs in Atlas project management module. No major risks and issues were identified. All annual reports were timely prepared and reported during the annual Project Board meetings. The project was evaluated as a part of the related CPD Outcome evaluation as well as ICPE evaluation.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	UNDPKazakhstanCPDOutcomeEvaluationReport_472_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/UNDPKazakhstanCPDOutcomeEvaluationReport_472_309.pdf)	zhanetta.babasheva@undp.org	9/30/2019 1:35:00 PM

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

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

Evidence:

A detailed schedule of project reviews meetings was developed by the project management, in consultation with project implementation partners and stakeholder representatives and incorporated in the Project Inception Report. All the meetings were organized in accordance with a schedule for Steering Committee Meetings within the adopted advisory and coordination mechanisms. The project board was the steering group that provided the forum for participation by multiple actors and their engagement in all phases of preparation of the project, including active roles within the Project Board in order to steer the project implementation parallel to national circumstances related to this thematic area.

List of Uploaded Documents			
#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	ProjectBoardMinutes_472_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ProjectBoardMinutes_472_310.pdf)	zhanetta.babasheva@undp.org	9/30/2019 1:15:00 PM

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:

As per standard UNDP requirements, the Project Manager monitored and updated the risks quarterly on a quarterly basis in Atlas.
 No major risks were identified during the project implementation.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Efficient

Quality Rating: Exemplary

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 mobilised sufficient resources committed and allocated by GEF for the entire cycle of the project lifespan.

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 procurement plan was developed on annual basis and updated on a monthly basis. The operational bottlenecks were reviewed and addressed in a timely manner.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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

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

Evidence:

The cost efficiency is ensured through thorough planning of the project results and costs mainly based on the lessons learnt and best practices of other projects in the country office. The project regularly monitored planned vs expended costs through Atlas reports. The project prepared its procurement plan on annual basis and monitored its implementation on a monthly basis to ensure efficient and effective financial project management.

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 all planned activities were completed on time. All planned projects results were fully achieved as scheduled.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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

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

Evidence:

The Project monitored its Annual work plans and achievement of relevant indicators to ensure the Project's objectives to be delivered in line with the approved plans. To overcome emerging challenges and to respond to changes in the development context the Project quarterly revisited the annual work plans, indicators achievement plan to adjust it accordingly.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	AWP2019Minamata_472_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/AWP2019Minamata_472_316.pdf)	nina.gor@undp.org	8/14/2019 11:52:00 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:

Generally, three groups are most vulnerable from the effects of mercury. The unborn child, small children and people who are regularly exposed (chronic exposure) to high levels of mercury (such as populations that rely on subsistence fishing, people who are exposed through their occupations (e.g. mercury mining, ASGM) or those exposed to mercury containing products.

As mercury is passed on from the mother to the child (in utero and during breastfeeding), and fetuses and children are most susceptible to developmental effects from mercury, the MIA paid particular attention to assessing national capacity to keep such risk groups safe.

Recommendations on how to address gender dimensions related to mercury and priority actions in this area were also highlighted in the MIA report.

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 national stakeholders were fully engaged into the decision-making and monitoring of the project through active participation in project boards, working consultations, and assessment of the annual work plans, independent evaluation of the procurement activities, etc. UNDP provided the support in project operations and oversight activities as outlined in the ProDoc.

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 arrangements⁸ 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:

The changes with which the project contributed to the national system would include compilation of official information and inventories and creating capacities within the existing system in order to appropriately deal with obligations brought on by the convention. For example, for strengthening of capacity and awareness of stakeholders in the field of mercury and chemicals, as well as the presentation of the Project, the following activities were carried out:

- In collaboration with the Ministry of Energy, a working meeting was held with associations of environmental stakeholders to determine the impact of the ratification of the Minamata Convention on industries in the Republic of Kazakhstan.
- Together with the Ministry of Energy and RSE «Information and Analytical Center», seminars were held on the "Emission of pollutants and mercury into the environment: methods for determining, inventorying and including in the pollutant release and transfer register of the Republic of Kazakhstan". In the course of the work, the issues of application of methods for estimating emissions of heavy metals in Kazakhstan were discussed. Recommendations for solving the problems of mercury pollution in Kazakhstan and recommendations on the development of a system to control emissions of pollutants, including the improvement of software for reporting on PRTRs were made. Also, every capacity building activity included test initiatives, allowing to evaluate the impact of organized activity on the capacity of focus group.

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 worked at the systemic, institutional and individual levels of capacity, providing multiple leverage points to further self-sufficiency of the waste management sector, in particular management of mercury wastes. It used strategies that work at the policy, planning, programme and community implementation levels. It worked at both national and local levels, to stimulate mutually reinforcing “top-down” and “bottom-up” activities. Interventions at the national level facilitated the improvement of the enabling environment for implementing capacity building and increased the knowledge and skills of project beneficiaries, including government and non-government organizations. Interventions at the local level motivated sub-national government offices and civil society to address pressing waste management issues that have both national and local implications.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	FinalReport_472_320 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FinalReport_472_320.pdf)	nina.gor@undp.org	8/14/2019 12:47:00 PM

QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments

The Final Project Board considered the project as successfully achieved its planned results and targets.