

Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

Overall Project Rating: **Satisfactory**

Project Number : 00084715

Project Title : The project aims to overcome the consequences of the military conflict in Ukraine and to provide a foundation for a rapid transition to sustainable recovery of the conflict-affected regions

Project Date : 13-Nov-2014

Strategic

Quality Rating: **Satisfactory**

1. Did the project pro-actively take advantage of new opportunities and adapt its theory of change to respond to changes in the development context, including changing national priorities? (select the option from 1-3 which best reflects this project)

- 3: The project team regularly completed and documented a comprehensive horizon scanning exercise to identify new opportunities and changes in the development context that required adjustments in the theory of change. There is clear evidence that the project board considered the scanning and its implications, and documented changes to the project's RRF, partnerships, etc. made in response, as appropriate. (both must be true to select this option)
- 2: *The project team has undertaken some horizon scanning over the life of the project to identify new opportunities and changes in the development context. The project board discussed the scanning and its implications for the project, as reflected in the board minutes. There is some evidence that the project took action as a result, but changes may not have been fully integrated in the project's theory of change, RRF, partnerships, etc. (all must be true to select this option)*
- 1: The project team may have considered new opportunities and changes in the development context since implementation began, but this has not been discussed in the project board. There is limited to no evidence that the project team has considered changes to the project as a result. This option should also be selected if no horizon scanning took place during project implementation.

Evidence

All outputs under this component are part of the Recovery and Peacebuilding Programme (RPP) and are guided by the ToC underlined in the Programme Document (<http://www.ua.undp.org/content/ukraine/en/home/library/recovery-and-peacebuilding/recovery-and-peacebuilding-programme--report.html>). In addition to that, individual projects have undergone scanning and needs assessments.

Particularly, information about needs in infrastructure rehabilitation collected during the initial stage of the Project can be used by similar projects to avoid time consuming needs assessments in the future (Output 99817).

Output 00101191 (EU): The Project has initiated and supported the conduction of USE survey, based on SCORE methodology, an inter-agency initiative that allowed it to get access to the data on social cohesion, readiness for dialogue, perceptions of security and governance, and other indicators that are important for post-conflict recovery and peacebuilding. This information was used in the RRF, but also allowed the RPP to develop a new TOC for its joint multi-agency programme (together with UN Women, UNFPA and FAO) in eastern Ukraine.

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 responds to one of the three areas of development work as specified in the Strategic Plan - "2. inclusive and effective democratic institutions". Applicable Outputs from the UNDP Strategic Plan: "3.2.2. National and local systems enabled to ensure the restoration of justice institutions, redress mechanisms and community security" and "3.3.1. Evidence-based assessment and planning tools and mechanisms applied to enable implementation of gender-sensitive and risk-informed prevention and preparedness to limit the impact of natural hazards and pandemics and promote peaceful, just and inclusive societies"

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

Project results and analytics have been used to inform the strategy and action of the CPD Ukraine and UNDAF Ukraine. Both of them include separate pillars on recovery and peacebuilding, reflecting the key priorities of the RPP: 1) economic recovery; 2) governance and decentralization reforms; 3) community security and social cohesion.

Relevant

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

4. Were the project's targeted groups systematically identified and engaged, with a priority focus on the excluded and marginalized, to ensure the project remained relevant for them? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

- 3: Systematic and structured feedback was collected regularly from a representative sample of beneficiaries, with a priority focus on the excluded and marginalized, as part of the project's monitoring system. Representatives from the targeted group were active members of the project's governance mechanism (i.e., project board or equivalent) and there is credible evidence that their feedback informed decision making. (all must be true to select this option)
- 2: *Targeted groups were engaged in implementation and monitoring, with a priority focus on the excluded and marginalized. Beneficiary feedback, which may be anecdotal, was collected regularly to ensure the project addressed local priorities. This information was used to inform project decision making. (all must be true to select this option)*
- 1: Some beneficiary feedback may have been collected, but this information did not inform project decision making. This option should also be selected if no beneficiary feedback was collected.
- Not Applicable

Evidence

The programme was specifically designed to address the needs of conflict-affected women and men in eastern Ukraine, with a special focus on IDPs, people living in the grey zone and vulnerable groups. Outputs 00101191 (EU) and 00093367 (SIDA/SDC) also worked with local authorities to increase their capacity to provide quality and inclusive public services.

In all target communities there were established local development forums with community security working groups that brought together both authorities and conflict-affected population to jointly identify and solve existing development challenges in their communities.

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

Output 00099817 (Japan): Project team took into account lessons learned to improve current activities. For example, preparation works, tenders, were carried out during the cold period of the year, and main part of construction works was done in warm season it allowed avoiding additional costs associated with work under unfavorable weather conditions and improved quality of works done.

Output 00101191 (EU): The project continuously collected and analyzed lessons learned with a view to adapt the project implementation strategy and future activities. The project budget revision is one of the evidences. That was confirmed by the external mid-term evaluation.

Output 00093367 (SIDA/SDC): within the framework of the project, several needs assessments were conducted, and best practices were collected (please see the attached report from Community Development Forum). As a result, four working groups were created, and multiple recommendations produced, which were incorporated into project's AWP.

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

Output 00099817: The project restored four daycare facilities for children which provide different types of services, namely the rehabilitation center for children with disabilities, an orphanage, a child development center, and a kindergarten. It made possible for both IDP and local women to find a job or actively participate in the social life of the communities they live.

Output 00101191 (EU): Within a framework of a joint UNDP-UN Women project, the team has systematically collected, analysed and used gender disaggregated data and evidence through monitoring and sociological survey to address gender inequalities and empowering women. One of the Project's specific focus is to ensure women's active participation in local decision making.

Output 00093367 (SIDA/SDC): the majority of project's beneficiaries are women. UNDP also empowered women's NGO Beregynia to administer a citizens' advisory bureau in Mariupol, that provided legal and psychological assistance to conflict-affected women.

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

Example: 00099817: The implementation period of Project was finished 31.10.2017. As a result, more than 980,000 conflict-affected women and men received access to rehabilitated infrastructure facilities (including roads, hospitals, water pumping stations, etc.) that were significantly damaged by the conflict.

Output 00101191 (EU): Due to the project, over 500,000 conflict-affected people received access to quality administrative and social service in 14 newly created or rehabilitated administrative service centers. These results will be scaled up during the second phase of Recovery and Peacebuilding Programme by supporting the establishment of mobile administrative service centers that will be able to provide quality service in remote and rural areas, especially those in the “grey zone” and close to the contact line.

Output 00093367 (SIDA/SDC): the project established a network of citizen advisory bureaus (CAB) that covers 285 cities and villages in two conflict-affected regions in eastern Ukraine. Since 2017 these CABs provided over 55,000 psychological, legal and social services to conflict-affected population. In 39 communities there were established Public Councils (PC) that aim to increase citizens' participation in the decision-making.

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

Example: 00099817: the Project furthers the realization of human rights by improving living conditions and access to social and medical services for IDPs and conflict-affected population.

Output 00101191 (EU): HRBA is one of the principles set in the Project Document and mainstreamed across all its activities.

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

Projects has no environmental risks. Social risks (violation of the ceasefire, tensions between IDPs and members of host communities, etc.) and possible influence on the Project implementation are considered in all planning exercises (AWP, Project Implementation Plan). When dealing with IDPs and people coming from non-government-controlled area, the project tried to mitigate all potential risks that could affect personal security and wellbeing of these people.

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

Projects had not faced unanticipated social and environmental risks.

Management & Monitoring

Quality Rating: Highly 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

M&E framework has been revised in 2017 based on lessons learned and relevance to the project implementation. Comprehensive system of data collection has been set up. Security and Justice and USE surveys were used to identify the long-term impact of project’s actions. Programme evaluation, conducted at the end of 2017, fully met decentralized evaluation standards, and management responses were provided and implemented.

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 taken place twice a year (it should be at least once a year in the project document) to report regular progress. The project board reviewed progress data, included lessons, risks and evaluations.

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 on a regular basis, as evidenced by an updated Risk Log, semi-annual work plan reviews and board meeting minutes.

Efficient

Quality Rating: Highly 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

All needed resources have been mobilized to achieve intended results.

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

Example: 00099817: All procurements of the Project were conducted according regularly updated Procurement Plan. To expand the number of participants in the tenders for the construction work, the project team, together with the procurement unit of UNDP CO, conducted 2 information sessions for construction companies in Kyiv and Kharkiv.
 Output 00101191 (EU): The Project procurement plan is updated on a quarterly basis addressing any upcoming issues.
 Output 00093367 (SIDA/SDC): The Project procurement plan is updated on a quarterly basis addressing any upcoming issues.

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

The procurement of goods and services required for project implementation was undertaken strictly following the procedures and principle 'Best value for money'. The project procured all services through competitive tenders. Some recourses (f.e. vehicles, etc.) were shared with other projects to ensure effective utilization. All projects are included into a unifying multi-donor and multi-project Recovery and Peacebuilding Programme (RPP) that operates in conflict-affected areas of eastern Ukraine. Programme's activities are fully synchronized and implemented. RPP spent significant amount of time to ensure that procured services and goods are maximizing the value for money.

Effective

Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory

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

Yes

No

Evidence

The project outputs contributed to the achievement of programme outcomes as evidenced by ROAR and mid-term Recovery and Peacebuilding Programme evaluation.

18. The project delivered its expected outputs.

Yes

No

Evidence

The project delivered its expected outputs

19. Were there regular reviews of the work plan to ensure that the project was on track to achieve the desired results, and to inform course corrections if needed? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

3: *Quarterly progress data informed regular reviews of the project work plan to ensure that the activities implemented were most likely to achieve the desired results. There is evidence that data and lessons learned (including from evaluations) were used to inform course corrections, as needed. (both must be true to select this option)*

- 2: There was at least one review of the work plan each year with a view to assessing if project activities were on track to achieving the desired development results (i.e., outputs.) There is no evidence that data or lessons learned were used to inform the review(s).
- 1: While the project team may have reviewed the work plan at least once per year to ensure outputs were delivered on time, no link was made to the delivery of desired development results. Select this option also if no regular review of the work plan by management took place.

Evidence

The implementation of the wokplan has been adjusted based on lessons learned, M&E plan has been revised accordingly. Mid-term evaluation has been used and management response has been provided. All projects also used USE and Security and Justice data as the main sources of monitoring information.

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

Example: 00099817: The Project was targeted on Donetsk and Lugansk oblast affected from the conflict. 2 out of 10 restored facilities are situated very close to the contact line (map of restored facilities attached).

Output 00101191 (EU): The Project is targeted on Donetsk and Lugansk oblast -affected from the conflict - and all vulnerable groups (IDPs, elderly, victims of SGBV, marginalized, etc.). Also the Projects supports and build the capacity of the NGOs/CSOs representing men and women from vulnerable groups. Several activities on advocacy and rights awareness were implemented for vulnerable groups.

At the macro-level, the project benefitted from the data, provided by Security and Justice and USE surveys. That information was also used to identify the specific target groups and specific security issues for conflict-affected population of Donetsk and Luhansk oblasts.

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

- Yes
- No

Evidence

Over 42% of programme staff are women (32 out of 76). Source: Atlas Executive Snapshot.

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

Example: 00099817: To ensure that the Project actions meet the communities' needs and lay the ground for future ownership of the results, UNDP made all possible efforts to communicate its plans and progress on infrastructure rehabilitation

Output 00101191 (EU): To ensure that the Project actions meet the beneficiaries' needs and requirements and lay the ground for future ownership of the results, the Project Team coordinates, approves and adjusts (if necessary) all annual working plans with national stakeholders during regular board meetings.

National stakeholders are engaged in the decision making process, including monitoring (via regular reports to the line Ministry and local administrations). Procurement is done according to UNDP rules and regulations. The project was a subject to a standard national monitoring and evaluation under the Regulation of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine #153 "On establishment of the unified system of attraction, usage and monitoring of the international technical assistance" of 15 February 2002.

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

Example: 00099817: Project team during all implementing period worked in close collaboration with Luhansk and Donetsk oblast administrations as well as with recipients (Joint Action Plans attached). Information about existing needs in infrastructure rehabilitation was collected and carefully analyzed through participatory consultations process with authorities and representatives of local communities.

Output 00101191 (EU): Relevant institutions (National Police, State Court Administration, State Service for Emergency Situations) have been monitored by the Project. As an evidence of reacting and adjusting of Project activities to the changes in partners capacities the procurement of satellite communications equipment for upgrading of the video-conferencing system for Donetsk oblast

could be mentioned.

Output 00093367 (SIDA/SDC): UNDP organized an assessment of 15 local government bodies to analyze their functions, capacity, staffing needs and budgets. This information allowed to identify strategic areas for improvement in target administrations and design UNDP's programmatic response.

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 Recovery and Peacebuilding Programme phase two will embed many of the activities covered by the projects in this award.

Output 00099817: after completing of construction works all restored facilities were handed to respective state and local authorities.

Output 00101191 (EU): The Project conducts regular (annually) regional and national forums to ensure that national stakeholders are involved in decision making, are informed about activities, results and achievements of the Project and to ensure that national stakeholders are ready for transition of concrete activities and/or work streams of the Project. All administrative service centers created by UNDP are now supported by respective local authorities.

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

Summary/Final Project Board Comments:

This project covers the activities implemented by all three components of the Recovery and Peacebuilding Programme. Its key achievements are fully integrated and informed the design of the new phase of the Programme.