ASM-05406 - Quality Assurance - Closure

Procedure Year: 2023

Procedure Rating: Satisfactory

Procedure Status: Approved

Procedure Name: ASM-05406

Procedure Department: CO - Cyprus - Nicosia

Procedure Type: Closure

Record Owner: Irini Anastassiou

Created by: Irini Anastassiou,3/22/2024, 4:05 AM

Last Modified by: Jakhongir Khaydarov,3/22/2024, 10:22 AM

Portofolio/Project Type: Project

RELATED PORTFOLIOS/PROJECTS (1)

NAME	PORTOFOLIO/PROJECT NAME	DEPARTMENT	STATUS	ATLAS PROJECT NUMBER	START DATE	END DATE
00087666	Restoration of the Holy Monastery of Apostolos Andreas	CO - UNDP Cyprus PFF	Financially Closed	00076127	9/13/2013	4/15/2025

Approval Information

Approval Date: Fri Mar 22 00:00:00 GMT 2024

Approved By: Jakhongir Khaydarov <jakhongir.khaydarov@undp.org>

APPROVAL HISTORY

STEP NAME	DATE	STATUS	ASSIGNED TO
Submitted for Approval	2024-03-22 10:22:36	Approved	Jakhongir Khaydarov
Approval Request Submitted	2024-03-22 04:25:58	Started	Irini Anastassiou

QA Questionnaire:

Strategic | Status: Complete | Quality Rating: Satisfactory

1. Did the project pro-actively identified changes to the external environment and incorporated them into the project strategy?

- ○ 3: The project team has identified relevant changes in the external environment that may present new opportunities or threats to the project's ability to achieve its objectives and the assumptions have been tested to determine if the project's strategy is still valid. There is evidence that the project board has considered the implications, and documented any changes needed to the project in response. (all must be true)
- ● 2: The project team has 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 may not have been fully integrated in the project. (both must be true)
- ○ 1: The project team may have considered relevant changes in the external environment since implementation began, but there is no evidence that the project team has considered changes to the project as a result.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

Changes to the external environment were considered by the project team, in consultation with the TCCH. For example, during implementation of works for Phase A, a few changes to the original designs had to be made, following the advices of the project's designed and consultation with the beneficiaries (see E1.Final report of Phase A, p.13). Moreover, for the implementation of the works for Phase B, due to the reduction of the available funds from the donors, the works scope was changed in consultation with TCCH, to fit the revised available budget (see E2. minutes meeting with Bishop – 7 July 2020; E3. Letter from Evkaf; E4. Email from Project Manager on procurement processes run between 2018 – 2022).

2. Was the project aligned with the thematic focus of the Strategic Plan?

- ○ 3: The project responds at least one of the development settings as specified in the Strategic Plan (SP) and adopts at least one Signature Solution and the project's RRF includes at all the relevant SP output indicators. (all must be true)
- ◉ 2: The project responds to one of the three areas of development work as specified in the Strategic Plan. The project's RRF includes at least one SP output indicator, if relevant. (both must be true)
- ○ 1: While the project may respond to a partner's identified need, this need falls outside the UNDP Strategic Plan. Also select this option if none of the relevant SP indicators are included in the RRF.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The project document was prepared in 2013 and has reference to the UNDP Strategic Plan applicable at that time. In respect to the current UNDP SP, the project fits under Signature Solution 3: Resilience; Result 3.2: Capacities for conflict prevention and peacebuilding strengthened at regional, national and sub-national levels and across borders. While the project's RRF did not explicitly refer to an SP output indicator, it contributed to the PMO's RRF for 2018 - 2021, towards SP output indicator 3.2.1.3 – Number of countries supported by UNDP, upon request, to establish or strengthen national infrastructures for peace. This was done through the implementation of a confidence building measure – the conservation of an important cultural heritage monument, as agreed by the bi-communal Technical Committee on Cultural Heritage. (See E5 – Project document Expected Key Results p.5; E6 - Cyprus RRF 2018-2021)

Relevant	Status: Complete	Quality Rating: Satisfactory

3. Are the project's targeted groups, and particularly those marginalized, vulnerable and left further behind (LNOB), being systematically engaged, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized, to ensure the project leaves no one behind (LNOB) and remains 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 (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The project was guided by representatives of the targeted groups. In particular, the project was conceptualized and guided by the Technical Committee on Cultural Heritage (TCCH), the members of which are appointed by the leaders of the two communities, while it is funded by the two religious institutions of the two communities - the Church of Cyprus and EVKAF.
All decisions about the project were taken in consultation with the TCCH. Meetings were also held with the two donors. (see E9 – E11 PSC minutes; E2, E7-E8 Minutes with Bishop; E12-E13 State of Play TCCH)

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 (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The works for the second phase of the project have not commenced yet, therefore limited opportunities existed to collect knowledge and lessons learned since 2018. In relation to the procurement process that was launched, following tendering process that was inconclusive, revisions were made to the tender taking into consideration the challenges that were faced.
Lessons drawn from the overall portfolio of projects in support of the work of TCCH are also considered in the implementation of this project. Lastly, the decision to close the project – which had a project document first designed in 2013, and initiate a new project for Phase B of the works was partly as a result of ensuring that lessons learned and generated knowledge from cultural heritage projects, will be fully incorporated into the design and implementation of Phase B of the conservation works (see E14 - lessons learned CH6, CH7)

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 (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

This project was part of a portfolio of projects that commenced in 2010 with the aim to preserve cultural heritage monuments of great importance in Cyprus. Is has been sufficiently at scale and is reaching a sufficient number of beneficiaries who are visiting the monument in order to experience first hand the tangible results of the project (See E1 report for Phase A, photos od completion ceremony p.22). It was focused on the conservation of the Monastery of Apostolos Andreas, a monument of particular significance for Cypriots, as evident by the fact that it is the first monument to be conserved with funds coming directly from the two communities, i.e. the Church of Cyprus and EVKAF (see E15 – UN SG Report S201720 par 23 & 26, E1 – AAM Phase A final report, E17 – Press Release, Video: Apostolos Andreas Monastery: A Landmark for Peace https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Do54G-iIQTM).

Principled	Status: Complete	Quality Rating: Satisfactory

6. Were the project's measures (through outputs, activities, indicators) to address gender inequalities and empower women relevant and produced the intended effect? If not, evidence-based adjustments and changes were made.

3: The project team has systematically 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 (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The project was not designed as a gender responsive intervention as it is solely related to the physical restoration of Apostolos Andreas Monastery. Whilst the UNDP PMO has achieved parity amongst local staff, the construction sector tends to be male dominated. The project attempted to contribute to gender balance in the construction sector through the incorporation, in the

Invitation to Bid for the conservation works for Phase B of a requirement that the site supervision team includes 50% women (3 out of 6 persons) (see E16 – ItB pp 22, 34).

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 were conducted where required (i.e., Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) for high/substantial-risk projects and targeted assessments for moderate risk projects as identified through SESP). Relevant management plan(s) developed, implemented, and monitored for identified risks. Select this option for SESP exempted projects and/or 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 (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

SESP was completed. It included only 1 moderate risk which however falls outside the scope of the project and outside UNDP's control, as it relates to duty-bearers not being able to guarantee access to the monument of rights-holders due to the Cypriot political context. The rest of the SESP related risks were low and therefore no assessment or management plans were required. (see E18 - SESP)

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 have been informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism and how to access it. If the project is categorized as High Risk through the SESP, a project -level grievance mechanism is in place and project affected people informed. If grievances have been received they are responded to but face challenges in arriving at a resolution. Select this option for SESP Exempted projects.
- ○ 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 (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

Information concerning the possibility to submit a social or environmental complaint or to report fraud, abuse or misconduct were available on the website of the UNDP PMO in Cyprus.

Management & Monitoring	Status: Complete	Quality Rating: Satisfactory

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

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

1: The project had M&E Plan, but costs were not clearly planned and budgeted for, or were unrealistic. Progress data was not regularly collected against the indicators in the project's RRF. Evaluations did not meet decentralized evaluation standards. Lessons learned were rarely captured and used. Select this option also if the project did not have an M&E plan.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The project had an M&E Plan, based on the Project Document format in 2013. Targets were populated and progress data was collected on a regular basis, including through annual reporting in Atlas and as part of ROAR. Progress was also recorded through two report prepared for Phase A of the works. Lessons learned were captured under lessons learned exercises conducted for the overall cultural heritage umbrella of projects, while the annual work plan was reviewed and adjusted as needed at least on an annual basis (See E5 – Project Document, E1 – Phase A final report, E19 – E24 AWPs, E14 CH6 – CH7 Lessons Learned, E12-E13 State of Play, E10-E11 PSC Decisions, E7-E8 Meetings with Bishop)

10. Did 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 (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The Project Document did not explicitly mention the frequency of Project Board meetings. In 2021, the Project Board structure was reconfirmed and the Project Board met formally at least once, as per the UNDP corporate requirements. Moreover, since the Board consisted of representatives of UNDP and the two co-chairs of TCCH (representing the beneficiaries and the development partners), the members of the board met on an almost weekly basis to discuss the overall portfolio of TCCH related projects, include this project when needed. While a progress report was not formally submitted to the Project Board since 2017, due to the fact that works for Phase B had not commenced, progress of the project was discussed with the Board, which was also informed of lack of results, and appropriate mitigation measures were taken in consultation with TCCH co-chairs. (See E10-E11 PSC Decisions, E5 – ProDoc, E12-E13 – State of Play)

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 (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The project risk log had been reviewed periodically and updated annual in the corporate systems with relevant treatments as needed.

Efficient	Status: Complete	Quality Rating: Satisfactory

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 (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

Initially, adequate resources were mobilised to achieve intended results. However, both donors reduced their contribution to the project which impacted intended results. Management decisions were taken to change the scope of the works for Phase B within the available budget.

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 (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The project had a procurement plan and updated at least annually. For Phase B of the works, the project's procurement plan, which consisted of 1 procurement process was kept on the PROMPT platform as part of the office-wide procurement plan and reviewed on an annual basis. The last 3 tender processes did not conclude in signature of the contract and management decisions were taken accordingly (see E4, E25-E26 Procurement Plans)

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 (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

UNDP estimate was prepared for each tender, with input from beneficiaries/experts in this field. Costs were reviewed based on technical specificities and local market benchmarks, as well as against relevant comparators including other UNDP Cyprus ongoing or past projects. Given that procurement is mainly provided by local suppliers, there are no comparators from other country offices.

Effective	Status: Complete	Quality Rating: Needs Improvement

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

Yes

No

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

There were delays in implementation of Phase B of the project, related to unsuccessful procurement processes, provision of technical documents (revised project designs), required for the tender by the donor, reduction to the committed resources by the donors as well as the impact of the covid-19 pandemic. As the project has been running for over 10 years, with no progress since 2017, it has been decided to close this project and open a new one for Phase B of the works.

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 (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The work plan was formally updated annually. Monthly reviews of financial reports were done, which supported quarterly discussions on the progress related to the work plan and it was adjusted as needed (See E19 – E24 AWPs).

17. Were the targeted groups, and particularly those marginalized, vulnerable and left further behind (LNOB), systematically identified and engaged, prioritizing the marginalized and excluded, to ensure results were achieved as expected?

- ○ 3: The project targeted specific groups and/or geographic areas, identified by using credible data sources on their capacity needs, deprivation and/or exclusion from development opportunities relevant to the project's area of work. There is clear evidence that the targeted groups were reached as intended. The project engaged regularly with targeted groups over the past year to assess whether they benefited as expected and adjustments were made if necessary, to refine targeting. (all must be true)
- ◉ 2: The project targeted specific groups and/or geographic areas, based on some evidence of their capacity needs, deprivation and/or exclusion from development opportunities relevant to the project's area of work. Some evidence is provided to confirm that project beneficiaries are members of the targeted groups. There was some engagement with beneficiaries in the past year to assess whether they were benefiting as expected. (all must be true)
- ○ 1: The project did not report on specific targeted groups. There is no evidence to confirm that project beneficiaries are populations have capacity needs or are deprived and/or excluded from development opportunities relevant to the project area of work. There is some engagement with beneficiaries to assess whether they benefited as expected, but it was limited or did not occurred in the past year.
- ○ Not Applicable

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The project was implemented in full consultation with the Technical Committee on Cultural Heritage (TCCH) which includes among its members representatives from both the Turkish-cypriot and Greek-cypriot communities. The project was funded by the Church of Cyprus and Evkaf, which are key stakeholders and representatives of the target groups. UNDP held frequent meetings with TCCH, where project progress was discussed and decisions taken jointly. (see E7-8 notes of meetings with bishop, E9-11 PSC meetings)

18. If there is a digital or data technology solution in the project: have technology and data risks been addressed specifically for closure, or continued use by partners or UNDP?

- ○ 3: Yes, a) the implementation and closure followed good practices, such as UNDP's digital standards and data principles; b) technology sustainability risks are addressed: hosting, licenses, intellectual property, data ownership, code documentation, or partner capacity (operations, maintenance and continued improvement); and c) post project scalability has been considered: digital public goods or reusability for other UNDP units. (All must be true)
- ○ 2: Specific technology and data risks have been partially addressed for project closure, next to Standard UNDP sustainability practices and project risk management.
- ○ 1: Standard UNDP sustainability practices and project risk management are applied, but no specific practices to address technology or data risks are followed.
- ◉ The project did not utilize a data or digital technology solution.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The project was focused on physical conservation works and did not utilise data or digital technology solutions.

Sustainability & National Ownership	Status: Complete	Quality Rating: Satisfactory

19. 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 (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The project was implemented by UNDP PMO in Cyprus under Direct Implementation Modality, with close collaboration with the Technical Committee on Cultural Heritage (TCCH). Support was provided by the UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub when necessary. TCCH was fully involved in the project's decision-making, implementation and monitoring, apart from administrative and financial matters for which UNDP is the responsible party.

20. 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 were 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 (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

This project has been fully implemented by UNDP under DIM.

21. 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 (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The projects methodology was specifically designed to strengthen capacities and ensure local ownership. The TCCH was appointed at the highest level by the Leaders of both the communities and is made up of both Turkish Cypriots and Greek

Cypriots. The TCCH defined the overall strategy. UNDP implemented the project in close collaboration with the TCCH and on completion the site was formally handed over to TCCH, who then handed it over to the caretaker.