

Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

Overall Project Rating: Needs Improvement (The lessons learned report is required for all projects. See question 25)

Project Number : 00073029

Project Title : It aims to strengthen capacities of local huals to fulfil their representational and oversight mandates for improved accountability of local governments and local service delivery.

Project Date : 15-Mar-2013

Strategic

Quality Rating: Highly 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 Annual project progress reports captured institutional and policy changes that occurred in that year. For example, the introduction of the Local Development Fund in 2013 has provided local councils with the opportunity to meaningfully engage in local development issues. The project provided grants to selected councils to oversee the implementation of LDF in their respective aimags (provinces). The Government established Citizens' Halls in every aimags and soums since 2013. The project provided grants to selected councils to effectively use these halls for improving public participation in council decision making. Following the approval of the Law on Legislation and the General Administrative Procedures, a local governance NGO was provided with a grant to develop a training material for local councils to ensure their compliance with these laws. The newly updated version of the Induction training manual reflects changes in legislative environment, including requirements these laws. Document uploaded: Annual report 2015, pages 7-8, 15-20. The CSLSB project Terminal report is to be uploaded in January 2017.

List of Uploaded Documents

File Name	Modified By	Modified
CSLSB_Annual Report 2015_Eng.pdf	barkhas.losolsuren@undp.org	11/20/2016 8:46:48 AM

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

The project developed a handbook/tool for local councils on how to oversee extractive operations. The training manual for local councils addressed specific needs of urban councils by incorporating cases that are relevant to them. The project implementation was consistent with the Issues-based analysis of the prodoc – downward accountability, oversight functions of local councils, institutionalization of the training programmes, The project RRF relates to SP output indicators 2.1.1; 2.1.3; 3.2.2; and 4.4.2. Document uploaded: AWP 2016, PPP on development of handbook on oversight by local councils over extractives. Document to be uploaded: CSLSB project Annual report 2016.

List of Uploaded Documents

File Name	Modified By	Modified
NGO grant_Local Council Role in Extractives.ppt	barkhas.losolsuren@undp.org	11/20/2016 10:04:34 AM
Revised AWP_2016_CSLSB_Eng_signed.pdf	barkhas.losolsuren@undp.org	11/20/2016 8:51:04 AM

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

Evidence generated through the project was explicitly used to confirm the CPD theory of change during implementation; a) political empowerment of women to participate in decision making (CPD) – leadership training for female councilors, national forum on women in decision making; b) increased openness and transparency in public institutions (CPD) – local council decisions being made available online at khural.mn integrated local council portal website, some councils are holding their meetings open to public or interested citizens; c) capacity

development of local authorities in financial management and sustainable environment management (CPD) – induction training for all local councilors included these two topics, selected local councils which received grants improved their their oversight over the expenditure of locally administered development funds. Document uploaded: CPAP evaluation report Document to be uploaded: CSLSB project Annual report 2016.

List of Uploaded Documents

File Name	Modified By	Modified
Final_Report_CPAP_Evaluation.pdf	barkhas.losolsuren@undp.org	12/7/2016 1:57:21 PM

Relevant

Quality Rating: Highly 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

Five key target groups were identified and engaged to ensure the project remained relevant for them. i) Local council secretariats – as the key target institutions, they took part in validation of all training manuals and curricula, in actual organization of trainings, in monitoring the quality of trainings; many local trainers were also from council secretariats. They were also main participants of thematic workshops, and experience sharing seminars; ii) 331 soum councils as the lowest level councils are close to people and needed more capacity development. As such specific cases relevant to soums were included in the induction training manual. The majority of local council grants were provided to soum councils (compared to aimag councils); iii) women councilors – leadership training for female councilors was provided, national forum on women in decision making was held; iv) local governance NGOs – they took part in almost all project activities, either as organizer or participant, including trainings, development of tools for local councils, national conferences, website content update, and preparation of legislative change proposals; v) local council website admins – they are council staff maintaining their own sub-sites. A series of trainings were organized for them, and grants for content development was provided on competitive basis. Council website admins developed the site standards

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

Several knowledge and lessons learned generated by the project informed decisions for ensuring continued relevance: i) focus on urban councils – while the number of urban councils is only 10 compared to 352 rural councils, the urban population is more than half of the country's total population. This was discussed at the board meeting, and closer cooperation was established with the capital city councils; ii) development of tools for local councils through open bids was one the main objectives, however, open tendering was not effective as many applicants did not have any experience of working with local councils. Therefore, local governance NGOs were involved more actively in this task to improve effectiveness, but also to further build capacity and specialized expertise of them. This was also discussed at board meetings; iii) it was revealed that local councils were learning most from each other, therefore, more experience sharing meetings were organized, and the khural.mn integrated local council website was also instrumental in disseminating good practices. Links to local council good practice page: <http://www.khural.mn/m/rc4o>

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

The share of female councilors is only around 27%, therefore, leadership training for female councilors was conducted to assist them to overcome specific barriers they face in fulfilling their roles. Grants to local councils had a specific category to work with women as target groups. Communications training for website admins had a topic on how to ensure gender equality when reporting council activities, both visually and content wise, and to feature activities initiated by female councilors and young councilors. National forum on women in decision making level co-organized with women MPs was conducted in 2016 ahead of parliamentary and local elections, and was attended by all women councilors and 1 woman from soum councils. Handbook on leadership of women councilors was developed in 2013 and updated in 2016. Link to the Handbook on leadership of women councilors: http://www.mn.undp.org/content/mongolia/en/home/library/democratic_governance/WomenLeadershipTrainingManual.html Document to be uploaded: CSLSB project Annual report 2016.

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

By its design, the project was supposed to work with all local councils, without selecting a few as target areas. The implementation followed the design, and engaged all aimag and city councils. As it was not feasible to engage all soum councils, competitive expressions of interest was used to provide equal chance for them to participate. The Induction training was offered for all local councilors (over 8000), the other trainings, such as thematic trainings was attended by over half of councilors. The second round of Induction training for all councilors, including those newly elected in 2016, started in November 2016. Document to be uploaded: CSLSB project Annual report 2016.

Social & Environmental Standards

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

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

The
Induction training for all councilors had a session on human rights and gender to raise their awareness. Councils make decisions that have effects on human rights enjoyment in their provinces. The training manual on council roles in extractive industry is an example. Selected councils which received grants undertook monitoring of access and quality of service delivery by local agencies. Most grant recipients used a survey to reveal public perception about the quality and access of public services.

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

No
risk.

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

No
risk.

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 project conducted Public Perception study to establish baselines on citizens' understanding and knowledge about local self-governing bodies. M&E data were collected by the project directly from local councils, as there is no overarching body to collect such information. The mid-term evaluation as carried out, its results were discussed at the board meeting with follow up actions. The monitoring visits were used to collect qualitative data. Document uploaded: Mid term evaluation report 2015.

List of Uploaded Documents

File Name	Modified By	Modified
final report MTR CSLSB_Eng.docx	barkhas.losolsuren@undp.org	11/20/2016 10:22:27 AM

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

The project board was composed of representatives of the implementing partner, local councils, the National Academy of Governance as the main government training institutions, local governance NGOs. The Board regularly met twice a year, reviewing progress, approving workplans and making decisions on issues raised. Document uploaded: Project board meeting minutes June 2015.

List of Uploaded Documents

File Name	Modified By	Modified
PBM_June 2015_signed.pdf	barkhas.losolsuren@undp.org	11/20/2016 10:27:21 AM

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

The project monitored risks regularly and updated them. The risk management actions reported in annual reports.

Efficient

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

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

Budgets approved by the AWP's were adequate for implementing the planned activities.

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

Each year, the project developed its procurement plan and delivered mostly on time. Document uploaded: Procurement Plan 2014.

List of Uploaded Documents

File Name	Modified By	Modified
Procurement plan 2014 signed CSLSB.pdf	barkhas.losolsuren@undp.org	11/20/2016 10:31:26 AM

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

Two factors contributed to cost efficiency; use of government rates and use of the local council secretariats in many of the logistical arrangements. All procurement actions had consistency of price offers with the market rates. Document to upload: CSLSB Project Annual report 2016

Effective

Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory

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

Yes

No

Evidence

Local councils became stronger decision making institutions more capable to fulfill their representational and oversight roles. Document to be uploaded: CPD Evaluation report.

18. The project delivered its expected outputs.

- Yes
- No

Evidence

1. A National Training Programme for local elected representatives is developed and institutionalized 2. Improved downward accountability of elected representatives through promoting citizen participation in decision making 3. Increased oversight capacity of local hural 4. Lessons integrated into legal and policy framework for local self-governance.

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

Detailed half-yearly project progress reports were prepared and submitted to the project board, providing links to the desired results. There have been amendments to AWP in 2014 and 2016.

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

to
be added when terminal report is
finalized.

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

- Yes
 No

Evidence

to
be added when terminal report is
finalized.

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

All
project staff were recruited by the Implementing Partner,
using national rules and regulations. Procurement actions
followed national procurement law. Procurement panels were
established by the Implementing Partner. UNDP CO served as
Responsible Party for certain activities such as recruitment
of international
consultants.

List of Uploaded Documents

File Name	Modified By	Modified
AWP_CSLSB_Feb 2015_Eng_signed.pdf	barkhas.losolsuren@undp.org	11/20/2016 10:47:40 AM

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

Document
to be uploaded: Terminal
report

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 mid-term evaluation report conducted in 2015 provided
assessment and recommendations on ensuring sustainability and
institutionalization, which were taken into account in 2015
AWP. Document to upload: Project Board meeting
minutes.

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

Summary/Final Project Board Comments:

Three reports are to be uploaded
in Jan 2017: Annual report for 2016, Terminal report, and Lessons learned
report.