

Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

Form Status: Approved

Overall Rating:	Exemplary
Decision:	
Portfolio/Project Number:	00075228
Portfolio/Project Title:	Support for Low Emission Development in Kosovo
Portfolio/Project Date:	2013-08-01 / 2021-12-31

Strategic

Quality Rating: Exemplary

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 proactively identified relevant changes as per Project strategy, i.e Changes within the administration and management of Prizren municipality, opportunities to scale-up climate financing through public-private partnerships (PPPs), partnership with UNDP's regional program funds, additional co-financing by Municipal authorities allowed for an increase in the number of smart urban solutions modules to be implemented to demonstrate the effectiveness of such solutions in promoting resilient urban development as a model in the region. There is evidence that the project board considered the implications, and documented the changes needed. For more details see the Final Progress Report uploaded under question 4. and Project Board Meeting's minutes uploaded under question 10.

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 was aligned with the UNDP Strategic PI an 2019-2020; Build Resilience to shocks and crises and has contributed to Signature solutions: Enhance national prevention and recovery capacities for resilience societies; Promote nature-based solutions for a sustainable planet; Strengthen gender equality and empowerment of women and girls.
 For more details see the uploaded Prodoc, Logframe/ RRF.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	01Annex_1_Logframe_Matrix_UrbanNAMA_10490_302 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/01Annex_1_Logframe_Matrix_UrbanNAMA_10490_302.doc)	xhevrije.berisha@undp.org	11/11/2021 10:43:00 AM
2	00Project_Document__UrbanNAMA_10490_302 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/00Project_Document__UrbanNAMA_10490_302.docx)	xhevrije.berisha@undp.org	11/11/2021 10:44:00 AM

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:

The monitoring of the project was done by both quantitative and qualitative indicators outlined in the project Logical Framework and Atals. Project performed regular monitoring , the feedback from beneficiaries was collected through Prizren Green Growth Center, Women NGOs, Community representatives with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized. The members of the Board include representatives of UNDP, ADA, the public and private sectors, University of Prizren, CSOs, and the municipal office for human rights and gender equality as well as the municipal office for communities to ensure equal input from both men and women from all sectors, - including marginalized communities. For more details see the Final Progress Report uploaded under question 4. and Project Board Meeting's minutes uploaded under question 10.

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 project generated knowledge, and lessons learned and reported on regular mid-term reviews, analyses and monitoring, updated the Issue log in the Atlas for any emerging risk. The project ensured that all stakeholders were consulted both at the central and local levels. The best practice example as a coordination mechanism in the local green initiatives is the establishment of the PGGC. The PGGC enables better coordination, participatory approach with beneficiaries and works closely with projects and relevant institutions on climate change. It serves to improve coordination of intersectoral departments and communication with CSOs and communities and to capture the lessons.

For more details see the Final Progress Report uploaded under question 4. Lessons learned and perspectives

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	UrbanNAMAsFinal_ProgressReport_30Sep2021_10490_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/UrbanNAMAsFinal_ProgressReport_30Sep2021_10490_304.pdf)	xhevrije.berisha@undp.org	11/11/2021 10:47:00 AM

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

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

Evidence:

The project played an active role to involve important partners in the climate change agenda and scale-up efforts for green development. As a result, an experimental collaboration with Prizren under the City Experiment Fund project was established for the digital city network; the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) completed a feasibility study on the EE refurbishment of 100 public buildings in Prizren. The approved EBRD loan agreement is approximately EUR 7.5 million. The project served as a platform to engage with the UNDP Climate Promise initiative to support local institutions and the Kosovo Climate Change Committee (KCCC) to accelerate climate action, reduce emissions and prioritize green investments to build back better from the COVID-19 pandemic. As a result of the successful achievement of the project, the funding of the second phase of the next 3 years is approved by the donor. For more details see the Final Progress Report uploaded under question 4.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Principled**Quality Rating: Exemplary**

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's addressed gender inequalities and empowered women to priorities related to climate change needs through baseline Study on gender-related climate change risks and priority needs, in the integration of the climate gender issues and needs of marginalised groups in the Climate Change Cross Sectorial Plan, workshop consultations with Women NGOs, Association for People with Disabilities, Community Members, municipal relevant officials with the purpose of integrating the climate gender issues and needs of marginalized groups in CSIP. For more details see the Final Progress Report uploaded under question 4 and baseline Study Report and CSIP: <https://www.ks.undp.org/content/kosovo/en/home/projects/support-for-sustainable-prizren--initiating-urban-namas--nationa.html>

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:

The project directly contributed to improving the environment and well-being of inhabitants in Prizren. The UNDP's global Social and Environmental Standards (SES) were applied to the project, ensuring the dual achievement of building partners' SES capacity throughout implementation while also maintaining SES compliance in the project activities executed by UNDP. As such, the project strengthened environmental sustainability by enhancing the capacities of local institutions, Administrative Board members and the PGGC staff through the introduction of SES-informed principles in the planning of activities (impact on beneficiaries, wider social groups and the environment), e.g when executing training on GHG emission data collection, verification and reporting as well by developing and implementing the green interventions, which include EE, renewable energy uses and smart greening for GHG reduction and air purification. For evidence see the SES uploaded under question 8.

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 executed directly by UNDP applying UNDP's rules and procedures for project management and a results-based management approach. The grievance mechanism was set up by the project, the Administrative Board included representatives of UNDP, ADA, the public and private sectors, University of Prizren, CSOs, and the municipal office for human rights and gender equality as well as the municipal office for communities to ensure equal input from both men and women from all sectors, - including marginalized communities and to address any grievances. The Public presentation and discussions of the smart green intervention were conducted with citizens to ensure an inclusive and participatory approach and expression of grievances. For more details see the PB meeting minutes uploaded under question 10.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Management & Monitoring

Quality Rating: Exemplary

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 monitoring of the project was done by both quantitative and qualitative indicators outlined in the Logical Framework and the M&E plan. the project baselines, targets and milestones were fully populated on yearly basis in the Atlas system. A common external evaluation was commissioned at the end of the project by UNDP Kosovo and was prepared in line with UNDP internal processes as well as ADA's Guidelines for Project and Programme Evaluation. For more details see the Project Evaluation ERC <https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/documents/detail/19450>

List of Uploaded Documents			
#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	FinalEvaluationReport_UrbanNAMApatform_10490_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FinalEvaluationReport_UrbanNAMApatform_10490_309 .pdf)	xhevrije.berisha@undp.org	11/16/2021 12:39:00 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:

The project board function very well and has steered the municipality towards a sustainable shift by adopting all developed plans and supporting the implementation of project activities and green pilot interventions.

For more details see the Final Progress Report uploaded under question 4. and Project Board Meeting's minutes uploaded in here.

List of Uploaded Documents			
#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	01November2019_MOM_10490_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/01November2019_MOM_10490_310.docx)	xhevrije.berisha@undp.org	11/11/2021 11:34:00 AM
2	24Jan2020_MOM_10490_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/24Jan2020_MOM_10490_310.docx)	xhevrije.berisha@undp.org	11/11/2021 11:34:00 AM
3	26August2020-MOM_10490_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/26August2020-MOM_10490_310.docx)	xhevrije.berisha@undp.org	11/11/2021 11:35:00 AM
4	08June2021-MoMAdministrativeBoardPGGC_10490_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/08June2021-MoMAdministrativeBoardPGGC_10490_310.docx)	xhevrije.berisha@undp.org	11/15/2021 11:52:00 AM

11. Were risks to the project adequately monitored and managed?

- *3: The project monitored risks every quarter and consulted with the key stakeholders, security advisors, to identify continuing and emerging risks to assess if the main assumptions remained valid. There is clear evidence that relevant management plans and mitigating measures were fully implemented to address each key project risk and were updated to reflect the latest risk assessment. (all must be true)*
- 2: The project monitored risks every year, as evidenced by an updated risk log. Some updates were made to management plans and mitigation measures.
- 1: The risk log was not updated as required. There was may be some evidence that the project monitored risks that may affected the project's achievement of results, but there is no explicit evidence that management actions were taken to mitigate risks.

Evidence:

The project has regularly monitored the risks, based on the initial risk analyses, and an issue log and risk log were activated and regularly updated by reviewing the external environment that may affect the project implementation. The tracking and resolution of potential problems or requests for change were conducted. To mitigate risks the project worked closely with the Municipality of Prizren and other relevant institutions to ensure proper implementation of project activities. The project also organized regular coordination cross-sectoral mechanism in consultation with decision-making authorities. During the COVID-19 pandemic, the project team effectively switched to working remotely, limiting movement, reducing staff presence at the office, and shifting priorities to respond to COVID-19 emergencies. The implementation of some of the project activities has been adapted to online platforms. Overall, planned activities were implemented as planned, except for the construction work for Urban NAMAs pilot interventions which was delayed due to the restrictive measures set by the Kosovo authorities. As a consequence, a non-cost extension was approved with an end date of the new project set at 30 June 2021. The approved non-cost extension enabled the completion of all project activities successfully

Project Board Meeting's minutes uploaded under question 8. and Project Atlas risk log and issue log.

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 innovative smart green solution triggered a private business to engage with green urban solutions by providing space and co-financing for the pilot project. The UNDP’s regional program funds allocated additional funds that allowed for an increase of the number of smart urban solutions modules to be implemented – to demonstrate the effectiveness of such solutions in promoting resilient urban development as a model in the region.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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

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

Evidence:

The project was executed directly by UNDP applying UNDP’s rules and procedures for project management and a results-based management approach. UNDP uses IPSAS standards for the management of finances and follows internationally-recognized procurement standards. The inputs procured were delivered on time and have contributed efficiently to achieving results. On the annual basis was produced the procurement Plan and uploaded it to the PROMT platform, which was monitored and updated during the project implementation.

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 project has performed regular monitoring and recording of the cost efficiencies, taking into account the quality of the results. The comparison with price estimates and market prices was made with other relevant projects and initiatives of UNDP and partners, developing the estimated cost of the bill of quantities by an independent contractor.

Evidence: Evaluation Reports for RFQ/PFPs/ICs.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Effective

Quality Rating: Exemplary

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

- Yes
- No

Evidence:

The foreseen targets for the outputs were achieved including the implementation of all pilot NAMAs. The project actually exceeded the expected results – given the additional funding mobilized and, consequently, the increased number of pilots that could be implemented. The project has clearly focused on practical capacity development supporting reaching the objectives in terms of the involvement of the MWG of PGGC in drafting the GHG Inventory and the CSIP as well, implementation of the pilot NAMAs. For more details see the Project Evaluation ERC <https://erc.undp.org/evaluation/documents/detail/19450>

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 performed a mid-term review of the work plan to ensure that the project was on track to achieve the desired results and relevant budget revisions were made.

For evidence see the Project AWP and Mid-term review of AWP.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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 occur in the past year.
- Not Applicable

Evidence:

The project systematically identified and engaged with targeted groups has prioritized the marginalized and excluded, to ensure results were achieved as expected. The project conducted a public discussion with citizens for activities, consultations through workshops, listed the priorities of marginalized and excluded into policy papers such as the Climate Cross Sectorial Plan, implemented green interventions in the city of Prizren which enabled inclusions of the target groups and the marginalized people. For more details see the Final Project Report uploaded under question 4 and CSIP <https://www.ks.undp.org/content/ksvo/en/home/projects/support-for-sustainable-prizren-initiating-urban-namas--national.html>

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Sustainability & National Ownership**Quality Rating: Highly 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 stakeholders and national partners were fully engaged in the decision-making, implementation, and monitoring of the project through the Project Board. The monitoring of the project was by both quantitative and qualitative indicators outlined in the Logical Framework. The Prizren municipality departments and Prizren Green Growth Center were fully and actively engaged in the process of developing the CSIP, GHG inventory, etc, and drafting the scope of work for pilot projects. Also, the monitoring, evaluation of the project activities, and acceptance of completed works were conducted jointly with municipal authorities and endorsed by Board.

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 project worked closely with Prizren Green Growth Centre Working Group to monitor changes in capacities and performance of institutions and systems relevant to the project. Implementation arrangements were formally reviewed and adjusted in agreement with PGGC working groups as assessed capacities, i.e. second capacity building on MRVs. For more details see the Final Project Report uploaded under question 4

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 Board regularly reviews the project sustainability plan. The Board in close consultation with UNDP and donors recommended the continuation of the project and expanding to rural green development and other municipalities. The next phase of the project will continue building on the results of the successful project “Urban NAMAs” in Prizren while extending the approach to the neighboring Municipality of Suharekë/Suva Reka. The project was approved fully by LPAC.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments

The institutional capacities developed by the project in Prizren city by the initiation of implementation of the urban N AMAs and the lessons learned during the implementation of the project have impacted local government as well as other Kosovo municipalities and cities. This project is well-aligned with the Kosovo, EU, UNDP, and Austrian priorities and strategies. The project has contributed to the implementation of the Climate Change Strategy through the CSI P and the implemented NAMAs. The results of the project were achieved as per the project plan and sustainability overall is secured. The Prizren Municipality as the beneficiary has the ownership of the documents and local development policies delivered by the projects well as the implementation of NAMAs. The project has to a large extent helped the positive change in understanding the important role of the cities in reducing vulnerability to climate change.