ASM-01862 - Quality Assurance - Closure

Procedure Year: 2023

Procedure Rating: Highly Satisfactory

Procedure Status: Approved

Procedure Name: ASM-01862

Procedure Department: CO - Georgia - Tbilisi

Procedure Type: Closure

Record Owner: Lia Sanikidze

Created by: Lia Sanikidze,11/16/2023, 5:55 AM

Last Modified by: Data Migration,8/11/2025, 3:41 AM

Portofolio/Project Type: Project

RELATED PORTFOLIOS/PROJECTS (2)

NAME	PORTOFOLIO/PROJECT NAME	DEPARTMENT	STATUS	ATLAS PROJECT NUMBER	START DATE	END DATE
00108806	Decentralization & Good Govern-UNDP-GEO-00108806	CO - Georgia - Tbilisi	Financially Closed	00109456	4/1/2018	6/30/2025
00125308	Decentralization COVID19-UNDP-GEO-00125308	CO - Georgia - Tbilisi	Financially Closed	00109456	1/1/2020	7/31/2024

RELATED SESPS (1)

PARENT PROCEDURE	PROCEDURE TYPE	PROCEDURE YEAR
ASM-01860	SESP (Social and Environmental Screening Procedure)	2023

Approval Information

Approval Date: Tue Nov 21 00:00:00 GMT 2023

Approved By: Anna Chernyshova <anna.chernyshova@undp.org>

APPROVAL HISTORY

STEP NAME	DATE	STATUS	ASSIGNED TO
Submitted for Approval	2023-11-21 13:49:22	Approved	Anna Chernyshova
Approval Request Submitted	2023-11-21 11:00:12	Started	Gigi Bregadze

QA Questionnaire:

Strategic | Status: Complete | Quality Rating: Exemplary

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

- (selected) 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)

Throughout the project implementation process, the project team was closely following all developments in the field and monitoring processes that could have had an impact on the project implementation process. The context analysis and assessment of political and economic as well as social factors were presented in annual progress reports. They were also reflected in the project annual working plans. The calendar of project activities such as networking, trainings, working meetings, advocacy etc. with municipalities and the central government was designed considering national/local elections and budget cycle. The project team also remained flexible to less anticipated challenges including global pandemic that had direct impact on day-to-day management of the project activities. Various managerial decisions were made and discussed during the Steering Committee meetings (the governing body of the project) to address new challenges and ensure delivery of the outputs: allocation of project funds to provide support to the vulnerable groups in the fight against the pandemic, conduction of needs assessment of target communities and adjustment of the project activities to their emerging needs, modification of the format of project activities and mainstreaming use of digital tools.

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)

Project is addressing issues linked to accelerating structural transformation for sustainable development and applies the following signature solution from SP plan: strengthen effective, inclusive and accountable governance. The project directly contributes to 2022-2025 output 2.3: Responsive governance systems and local governance strengthened for socio economic opportunity, inclusive basic service delivery, community security, and peacebuilding. Results for these indicators were reported annually through ROAR.

Relevant	Status: Complete	Quality Rating: Highly 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 activities are designed to engage vulnerable groups in the project implementation process and document their feedback. Through its Small Grants Schemes, the project supported local civil society organizations to actively participate in local decision-making process and advocate for, as well as voice the specific needs of vulnerable groups including women, ethnic minorities, youth and IDP population. All capacity building and awareness raising activities were implemented along with feedback mechanism to collect and document responses from direct beneficiaries. Information collected were used to adjust the focus and content of planned activities while assuring achievement of annual results.

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?

- (selected) 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 project used internal as well as external sources to collect evidence of the achievements and challenges faced during the project implementation process. The project collected the data and feedback from direct beneficiaries and partners in the field on regular bases and adjusted the content and focus of activities accordingly. Lessons learned were presented in the annual progress report (2022 annual progress report attached). The project also commissioned conduction of the interim and final evaluations of the project to the external evaluators. The evaluation reports were shared with the project donors. Following the interim evaluation, the main findings and recommendations were reflected in the management response document and the update of its implementation were reported on an annual basis. The lessons learned and recommendations presented in the final evaluation will be used for development of new interventions focused on local development and promotion of good governance practices.

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

- (selected) 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)

The project reached, and in case of some indicators exceeded the target numbers. The number of direct and indirect beneficiaries also exceeded the targets set in the project document. The progress was confirmed by the external midterm and final external project evaluations.

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.

- (selected) 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 team gathered the data on women participation in decision-making process at the local level throughout the project implementation process. Special resources were allocated to support newly established Gender Equality Councils in municipalities to strengthen their capacity and assist implementation of annual Gender Equality Action Plans. The project continued its support to target municipalities to introduce Gender Budgeting principles and make sure that gender inequalities were properly addressed through municipal programs. All relevant project indicators were also reported disaggregated by gender in annual progress reports. Engagement of women in project activities were paid special attention and the project assessment indicators confirm that the targets for women representation were exceeded: for example, out of 2,038 public officials trained as part of capacity building activities 1,261 (62%) were female.

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)

The project SESP was carried out at the design stage and was assessed as Low Risk.

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)

The project is assessed as Low Risk via SESP and the grievance mechanism is not directly applicable in this case.

Management & Monitoring	Status: Complete	Quality Rating: Highly 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 M&E Plan included in the project document was implemented and guided monitoring and data gathering process. The progress towards the reaching pre-set targets and assessment against the baseline was reported on annual basis (according to the indicator and pre-defined methodology). Data obtained from official sources such as the National Statistics Office of Georgia, the Ministry of Regional Development and Infrastructure, the Ministry of Finance were used for reporting along with the data collected in the field by the project team. The project also reported data gathered through the biennial national wide survey (commissioned by UNDP Georgia) studying the level of citizens' satisfaction with public services and perception of public participation in decision-making process at the local level (the project's main focus). All data, where relevant, were reported disaggregated by sex, age, type of settlement (urban-rural and mountainous/other), and ethnic affiliation. External interim and final evaluations of the project were carried out as planned. The evaluations were conducted by international experts according to UNDP Guidelines. The findings of both evaluations were shared with the donors and respective managerial response has been initiated after the interim evaluation. Implementation of the managerial response and progress of set objectives was monitored by UNDP Georgia evaluation focal point.

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 Steering Committee composed of the project's Manager, UNDP RR, UNDP DRR, UNDP Democratic Governance Leader, Deputy Minister of Regional Development and Infrastructure of Georgia, and representative of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark served as the project's governance mechanism. Steering Committee meetings were held an annual basis (except for the year of global pandemic) where achievements of the project were discussed, challenges were identified, and all major managerial and strategic decisions were made (2023 Steering Committee meeting minutes attached).
The project also submitted annual reports presenting progress by activities, outputs and outcomes, documenting lessons learned and progress towards achievements of its objectives and contribution to the overall goal (2022 annual progress report attached).

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 team updated the risk log on annual basis reflecting on political, strategic and operational factors that might have affected the project implementation process. The analysis was reflected in the managerial decisions when necessary including the adjustment of the project action plan and regular update of the activities' calendar.

Efficient	Status: Complete	Quality Rating: Exemplary

12. Adequate resources were mobilized to achieve intended results. If not, management decisions were taken to adjust expected results in the project's results framework.

- (selected) Yes
- No

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

The adequate resources were mobilized to deliver all expected outputs. Minor adjustments to the pre-defined budget were made when additional funds were secured from one of the donors (Ministry of Regional Development and Infrastructure of Georgia) and funds were re-allocated to meet the emerging immediate needs of direct beneficiaries affected by the global pandemic.

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

- (selected) 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 prepared a procurement plan on annual bases. The plan was uploaded in the UNDP system in December and updated on quarterly basis after the consultation with the project team and in close cooperation with the procurement unit of the UNDP Country Office.

14. Was there regular monitoring and recording of cost efficiencies, taking into account the expected quality of results?

- (selected) 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)

All purchases of services and goods were conducted according to the UNDP guidelines. Procurement of major services and goods were coordinated with the UNDP Country Office procurement unit considering offers from already signed LTAs. Hiring of expert services were conducted following the consultations with national and international roster databases. When necessary, open competitions for procurement of services and goods were conducted, for example: RFP to purchase training services for 63 municipalities, RFP to conduct nation-wide survey on citizens' satisfaction with public services, RFP to provide support to municipalities to develop municipality development plans. The project team also used canvasing and market research when planning to purchase services and goods. When relevant and applicable, the project team joined resources with other UNDP projects to ensure complementarity and effectiveness of its interventions, for example: signing a joint contract with PMCG together with UNDP project FRLD 2 to develop performance management system for waste management and public area cleaning services.

Effective	Status: Complete	Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory

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)

The project reached all its expected outputs. The project reached, and in case of some indicators exceeded the target numbers. The number of direct and indirect beneficiaries also exceeded the targets set in the project document. Though the targets set to assess the project's overall impact (such as citizen's satisfaction with municipal authorities) were affected by external factors including global pandemic, economic crisis and political polarization.

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?

- (selected) 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)

Reviews of the work plan were conducted on regular bases. The project team meetings (staff meetings) were scheduled every two weeks to share lessons learned from carried out activities, review the annual work plan (AWP) and adjust the calendar of activities if needed and initiate respective budget allocations.

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?

- (selected) 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 operated in three regions of Georgia: Kvemo Kartli, Mtskheta-Mtianeti and Imereti. Project baseline and expected targets for citizen participation in decision-making process and satisfaction level with public service delivery were set based on the data from official sources (GeoStat - National Statistics Office of Georgia, Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Regional Development and Infrastructure) and nation-wide survey commissioned by UNDP Georgia. Feedback from the project direct beneficiaries, partners and stakeholders were also collected on regular basis through evaluation forms. All the data collected was used by the project team to tailor project activities to the needs of its direct beneficiaries and efficiently contribute to development process in its target regions. In addition to gathering evidence in the field, the external interim evaluation was commissioned by the project to serve as a guide for adjusting its future activities. A special managerial response was drafted to address issues raised by the external interim-evaluation and its implementation was monitored by the UNDP CO M&E focal point on regular bases.

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 utilized data and digital technology solutions per standard UNDP practices.

Sustainability & National Ownership	Status: Complete	Quality Rating: Highly 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 is NIM with CO support and therefore it followed UNDP guidelines for procurement, monitoring and evaluation, and HR to implement project activities and achieve expected results. All major stakeholders including the Ministry of Regional Development and Infrastructure, respective committee of Parliament of Georgia, Civil Service Bureau of Georgia, National Association of Local Authorities of Georgia, Administration of Government of Georgia, Administrations of State Representatives and Municipalities in target regions were actively involved in planning and implementation of main project activities including capacity enhancement trainings and public service delivery improvement efforts. Information sharing meetings were held with the Deputy Minister of the Regional Development and Infrastructure on monthly basis to monitor and assess joint efforts in regions of Georgia. In order to discuss achievements and challenges in promoting decentralization and enhancing democratic practices at the local level, biannual donor coordination meetings (in the framework of donor coordination platform established and led by UNDP) with participation of relevant project leads from USAID, European Union, SIDA, SDC, ADC were also hosted by the project management.

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)

Throughout the project implementation process, HACT assurance activities were carried out and Partner Capacity Assessment Tool (PCAT) was used prior to signing any cooperation agreements with national institutions. Update of HACT and Spot Checks were also commissioned when necessary.

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 Steering Committee meeting during the project's final year was used to discuss the phase-out as well as the opportunities of initiating a new phase of the project. During the final meeting of the Steering Committee the necessity, relevance and possible focus of the new phase were discussed. Following the meeting, the decision to have a new project focused on local development and promoting good governance principles at the local level was made. Thus, the final months of the project implementation process were dedicated to finalizing remaining activities and conducting final project evaluation to document achievements and lessons learned. The project team also engaged in development of a new project document to be supported by the donor and to have a start date soon after the current project end date and maintain smooth transition of cooperation with its stakeholders and long-term partners.