ASM-00107 - Quality Assurance - Closure

Procedure Year: 2023

Procedure Rating: Satisfactory

Procedure Status: Approved

Procedure Name: ASM-00107

Procedure Department: CO - Belarus - Minsk

Procedure Type: Closure

Record Owner: Anna Trubchik

Created by: Anna Trubchik,6/15/2023, 9:37 AM

Last Modified by: Data Migration,8/11/2025, 3:40 AM

Portofolio/Project Type: Project

RELATED PORTFOLIOS/PROJECTS (1)

NAME	PORTOFOLIO/PROJECT NAME	DEPARTMENT	STATUS	ATLAS PROJECT NUMBER	START DATE	END DATE
00108181	LED in Belarus-UNDP-BLR-00108181	CO - Belarus - Minsk	Financially Closed	00108243	2/1/2019	8/31/2023

Approval Information

Approval Date: Fri Jun 30 00:00:00 GMT 2023

Approved By: Armen Martirosyan <armen.martirosyan@undp.org>

APPROVAL HISTORY

STEP NAME	DATE	STATUS	ASSIGNED TO
Submitted for Approval	2023-06-30 03:41:20	Approved	Armen Martirosyan
Approval Request Submitted	2023-06-29 10:42:13	Started	Anna Trubchik

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)

The project team has proactively scanned the project external environment to identify new opportunities and challenges in the development context. The key changes the project encountered were as follows: shift to online format for capacity building activities during COVID, health of the project staff, partners and beneficiaries during COVID, political instability in the country, shut down of over 1000 NGOs in the country including the project's grantees, sanctions against the country and limited market space for the project procurement action, deterioration of relationships between EU (the donor) and the Government, additional conditionalities regarding the project implementation imposed by the donor. Project Board regularly deliberated on the project's progress and strategically steered the course of implementation while factoring in the challenging operational environment and associated risks. Over 2019-2023, 35 PB meetings took place. In addition to the Project Board sessions, regular inter-sessional consultations among the Board members took place to deliberate on operational and strategic issues related to the project implementation and associated risks. The mere fact, that the project carried on, remained relevant and delivered vital support to communities and SMEs is a testimony to proactive and agile project management against the backdrop of very unfavorable strategic and operational environment.

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 was commenced under the 2018-2021 Strategic plan and aligned with the Eradicate poverty in all its forms and dimensions (Signature solutions - Poverty (Output 1.1.2) and Governance (Output 1.2.1, 1.2.2)); Accelerate structural transformations for sustainable development (Signature solution - Governance (Output 2.2.2). The project contributed to a number of RRF indicators:
1.1.2.2 Number and proportion of additional people accessing financial services and non-financial assets;
1.1.2.3 Number of additional countries with an improved enabling environment for expansion of decent work and livelihoods;
1.2.1.2 Number of additional countries with inclusive local economic development (LED) strategies and plans in place;
1.2.2.1 Number of additional countries with an enabling environment in place leveraging additional resources from public and private sources for the SDGs;
2.2.2.5 Number of additional countries that adopt and implement, with UNDP assistance, legal and regulatory frameworks that enable civil society to function in the public sphere and contribute to sustainable development.
The project has kept the same level of alignment with the current SP 2022-2025 and contributed to RRF indicators as follows: 1.3.2 Number of people accessing financial services; 2.1.3 Number of multi-stakeholder mechanisms to strengthen public sector agility, collaboration, and the co-design, public and private financing and delivery of solutions for sustainable development; 6.2.2 Number of partnerships with women-led civil society organizations and other bodies and networks to advance women's leadership and participation and gender equality.

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 systematically engaged the target groups through the contests of local business initiatives (NGOs, local authorities and institutions, SMEs), facilitating public-private dialogue at the local level (support to local advisory councils), outreach and communication campaigns (dozens of anecdotal stories featured at UNDP website and social networks), onsite and online capacity-building activities available for the representatives of local communities.

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)
- [x] 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 project relied on the knowledge and lessons learned accumulated throughout the project implementation and proactively sought to introduce measures to make changes to the scope of activities and introduce new ones contributing to the continued relevance of the project. The project calls for proposals generated significant interest in the pilot regions resulting in over 140 local income and jobs generating initiatives. The project capacity-building activities, shifted to online format, allowed for easier leveraging of diverse expertise and were well attended. The project has also applied practice of disbursing funds for the grantees in several tranches, based on a thorough analysis of the grantees' AWPs. Significant funds returned to the project budget by the grantees that were liquidated were duly considered by the Project Board for reprogramming. The knowledge products generated by the project (e.g., formula calculating administrative burden on the legal entities, pilot regulatory impact assessment of national legislation, box solutions for SMEs, guidelines for advisory councils on entrepreneurship development, research on SMEs digitalization) were all well-received and put into use by the project national partners. The direct support component was challenged by the market shortages, poor reporting practices by the grantees and overall difficult operational environment in the country. Additional implementation period would have helped to rectify the challenges, however the project extension was not feasible because of the reasons beyond UNDP's control (expiration of agreement between EU and the Government with no prospects of prolongation).

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.
- [x] 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)

The knowledge products, know-how, and best practices developed or supported by the project bear great potential for scaling up and replication nationwide. Uptake by the national partners and thus sustainability is clear for such products as provisions of the support services to SMEs standard, index formula of administrative burden on business, "box solutions" for businesses; digital map of entrepreneurship support infrastructure, dozens of locally developed by the grantees innovative business and digital solutions. Moreover, thanks to the piloted performance-based payment modality to support microfinancing, the project laid the ground for a new generation of UNDP support to local economic development in Belarus that would leverage financing SMEs approach rather than granting and procurement.

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)
- [x] 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 has put a strong focus on GEWE while supporting women-led businesses in Belarus regions. The project team has proactively engaged women in project-related discussions and activities. The project collected gender-disaggregated data for all the project activities. All the grantees' applications reflect on the gender elements of their initiatives and report on the results with gender-disaggregated data. The project has also been engaging women as experts for the capacity-building activities. The project contributed to the implementation of the National Action Plan for Gender Equality 2021-2025, provided financial assistance to 36 women-led SMEs; created 179 new jobs for women, raised the profile of women entrepreneurs through a number of stories released on media and social networks.

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)
- [x] 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)

The project is categorized as Low risk through the SESP (Annex 2 of the Project Document).

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)
- [x] 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)

N/A so far. The project is categorized as Low risk through the SESP (Annex 2 of the Project Document). If project-affected people raise concerns and/or grievances regarding the Project's social and/or environmental performance during implementation, project-level and/or national grievance mechanisms will be used. If requested, UNDP's Stakeholder Response Mechanism or the Social and Environmental Compliance Unit in OAI can also be used.

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 was implemented in line with the plan and in full agreement with the implementing partner, costs and activities were clearly planned and budgeted. RRF was regularly assessed in progress reports. Lessons learned were also captured regularly through the progress reports and were taken into account for corrective actions. The project evaluation was commissioned by EU, the results of the evaluation were shared with UNDP with restriction to make only an abstract publicly available. The project team constantly traveled to the project implementation sites for the purpose of monitoring and spot-checking.

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 progress has been regularly discussed during the Project Board meetings. Over 2019-2023, 35 Project Boards took place. Minutes are on file. In addition to the Project Board sessions, regular inter-sessional consultations among the Board members take place to deliberate on operational and strategic issues related to the project implementation and associated risks. Staring from 2022, EU (the donor) conditioned UNDP, that all the Project Board sessions should take place over email exchanges as EUD staff has restriction to participate in the meetings with the Government representatives. The conditionality complicated the project boards' proceeding and made UNDP holding separate lines of discussions with the Government and EUD on key project issues.

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 risk log is being regularly updated in corporate ERPs (atlas and starting from 2023 – quantum). Progress reports also capture the risks and management responses/treatments.

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.

- (selected) Yes
- No

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

Adequate resources have been mobilized to achieve intended results. In Y2019 Polish funds have been mobilized, in 2021 UNDP TRAC1 resources have been leveraged to fulfill commitments per the Project Document.

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)
- (selected) 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 procurement plan was maintained through the PROMPT online system and in Quantum since January 2023. It was updated on a regular basis. The project encountered number of challenges beyond UNDP control to deliver on the procurement plan – market shortage, inadequate number of technically qualified bids, not-readiness of suppliers to work without prepayments in rather challenging microeconomic environment (sanctions, and economic spill-overs of the war in Ukraine).

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)
- (selected) 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)

The project regularly monitored costs versus planned targets through progress reporting, donor reporting, and regular monitoring of the budget balance. The value for money principle was always respected in any procurement case. Shifting capacity-building to an online format because of COVID-19 restrictions proved a highly cost-efficient practice.

Effective	Status: Complete	Quality Rating: Needs Improvement

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

- (selected) Yes

No

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

Yes, as per the project RRF. Major outputs have been achieved against planned. However, the procurement action to support SMEs was completed, leaving around 20 preselected SMEs without direct support envisaged under the project AWP.

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)

Project progress has been regularly discussed during the Project Board meetings or email exchanges. AWPs have been regularly reviewed to address emerging challenges and opportunities as per respective Project Board decisions.

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 has targeted specific geographic areas: 12 pilot districts. The project had a systematic approach in identification and engagement of target groups– capacity assessment of pilot sites; Districts Development Plans; capacity-building for beneficiaries and partners on the ground; strategic discussions (representatives of the supported grantees were ad hoc invited to the Project Board meetings), calls for proposal. The project regional coordinators were in daily contact with the beneficiaries and partners on the ground. The grantees supported by the project had a reporting line on engaging marginalized and excluded – the progress has been monitored by the project team.

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)

Standard UNDP sustainability practices and project risk management are applied. Upon the decision of the Project Board # 24 d/d 22/10/2021 chaired by the National Project Partner the development of the web resource with its subsequent transfer to the Ministry of Economy of the Republic of Belarus was approved. The sustainability is insured by the partner.

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 has been implemented with UNDP in Belarus Country Office Support, leveraging UNDP's procurement, financial, and monitoring system. However, the national counterparts were fully and actively engaged in the process through regular consultations and Project Board meetings. All project TORs were reviewed and approved with the National Partners. All core activities (agenda of events, study tours, contest regulations, etc.) are also discussed and approved with the National Partner. National monitoring and evaluation were also exploited (reporting to the Ministry of Economy).

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)

The project has been implemented with UNDP in Belarus Country Office Support (NIMCO) and no changes in the modality introduced within the project implementation period.

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 project progress and sustainability measures were regularly monitored. However, the project is not fully on track in meeting the requirements set out by the plan in the Project Document, because of the conditionalities imposed by the donor, namely restrictions on transferring the project's assets to authorities and government institutions. The project is also pending some reports from grantees – these cases are duly documented, UNDP legal office and OAI are notified. 20 beneficiaries (SMEs) will not benefit from the project direct support, because of the procurement bottlenecks.