

Procedure Year: 2024

Procedure Status: Approved

Procedure Department: CO - Kazakhstan - Astana

Record Owner: Dosbol Tursumuratov

Procedure Rating: Satisfactory

Procedure Name: ASM-13673

Procedure Type: Closure

Created by: Dosbol Tursumuratov,1/23/2025, 1:35 AM

Last Modified by: Sukhrob Khojimatov,2/7/2025, 2:10 AM

Portfolio/Project Type: Project

RELATED PORTFOLIOS/PROJECTS (1)

| NAME     | PORTOFOLIO/PROJECT NAME                          | DEPARTMENT               | STATUS             | ATLAS PROJECT NUMBER | START DATE | END DATE  |
|----------|--------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|------------|-----------|
| 00111145 | Reduction of greenhouse gas em-UNDP-KAZ-00111145 | CO - Kazakhstan - Astana | Financially Closed | 00112788             | 12/12/2019 | 2/28/2026 |

Approval Information

Approval Date: Thu Feb 06 00:00:00 GMT 2025

Approved By: Sukhrob Khojimatov <sukhrob.khojimatov@undp.org>

APPROVAL HISTORY

| STEP NAME                  | DATE                | STATUS   | ASSIGNED TO         |
|----------------------------|---------------------|----------|---------------------|
| Submitted for Approval     | 2025-02-07 02:10:17 | Approved | Sukhrob Khojimatov  |
| Approval Request Submitted | 2025-02-06 22:34:56 | Started  | Dosbol Tursumuratov |

QA Questionnaire:

Strategic

Status: Complete

Quality Rating: Highly 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's activities were organized in close cooperation with local executive bodies making decisions in the field of forestry. All decisions made were recorded. Also, project implementation was monitored by the Steering Committee. All changes to the logical

framework of the project were recorded.

In 2023 the company informed UNDP on the end its activities in Kazakhstan and suspension of the work of the Data Center. Therefore, according to the project document and the financial agreement between Bitfury and UNDP, funding for the project was finished due to the fact the company no longer consumes electricity from the Ekibastuz hydroelectric station and does not have a carbon footprint in Kazakhstan. Accordingly, logical framework has been revised to reflect budget reduction in 2023.

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 responds to UNDP Strategic Plan Outcome 1: Structural transformation accelerated, particularly green, inclusive and digital transitions and Output 4.1 Natural resources protected and managed to enhance sustainable productivity and livelihoods

|          |                  |                              |
|----------|------------------|------------------------------|
| 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)

During the project implementation, working meetings were held with the participation of stakeholders (Forestry and Wildlife Committee, Akimats of Pavlodar and East Kazakhstan regions, Forestry institutions of Pavlodar and East Kazakhstan regions, Yertys Ormany nature reserve). During the meetings the opinions of the stakeholders on the project implementation in these regions were considered.

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 project team has been working on systematization and analysis of lessons learned since the beginning of the project. The project team presented its comments and conclusions at the SC and Forestry and Wildlife Committee meetings. The project work plan was developed in accordance with the Project Document as well as agreed with all beneficiaries and approved at the SC meetings.

**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 the first pilot forestry project financed by the private sector and aimed at reducing carbon footprint. Although the project is not planned to scale up, the project demonstrated the possibility of realizing forest carbon offsets in Kazakhstan through strengthening the efficiency of forest management.

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 specifics of the project did not provide for in-depth research or activities on gender issues. At the same time, at all levels of discussion of the project activities, it was noted that the results of the project have a positive impact on the health and education of women, who make up 52% of the total population in the Pavlodar region, 53% in the East Kazakhstan region and 51% in the Abai region.

**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 was categorized as Low risk through SESP conducted

**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)**

Grievance mechanisms for people affected by the project have been available, no grievances have been made.

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)**

Throughout the project period, monitoring was carried out by several parties - the Steering Committee (SC), UNDP and the donor. The SC met at least once a year. The members of the SC, representing government agencies, actively participated in decisions on risks and project activities. UNDP, represented by the country office in Kazakhstan, carried out on-site monitoring of project results, meetings with partners and beneficiaries of the project. The tools for monitoring the implementation of the project were annual plans, which included an action plan, a procurement plan, a risk register and a communication plan. The project team submitted progress reports to the SC and UNDP twice a year. In addition, monitoring is carried out weekly at the project team level by reviewing the current year's work plan items in weekly online biodiversity portfolio meetings.

**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 was implemented as part of the UNDP biodiversity portfolio projects. Accordingly, one SC was established to manage all biodiversity projects. During the implementation of the project, 7 meetings of the SC were held. During the pandemic, the meetings of the SC were held online.

**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 risks were monitored on an ongoing basis, project risk log was regularly updated in Quantum ERP

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)**

According to the project document and financial agreement, the total budget of the project initially was \$1,500,000. As indicated in the project document, the project is financed in proportion to the electricity used by the Data Center located in Pavlodar region. Since the beginning of the pandemic in 2020, the work of the Data Center has been unstable. In 2022, the Data Center did not work. This led to a deviation of the project financing from the tranche schedule and the postponement of the implementation of activities. In 2023 an official letter from Bitfury regarding the termination of the company's activities in Kazakhstan was received. Accordingly, the project budget was reduced to \$798,748.

**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 regularly updated its procurement plan. This document was updated weekly on the dates of ToR approval, announcement, completion of evaluation, CAP approval, and contract signing; on the status of implementation of the project's annual budget (updated weekly considering contracts signed and submitted to the department's management meeting); internal (project) summary of implemented and planned activities and procurements. The project effectively addressed operational issues affecting the timely implementation of procurement. The UNDP Country Office Procurement Unit, supported by the UNDP Regional Office, monitored, and responded to issues of concern in a timely manner.

**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)**

The project team monitored the costs of implemented and planned activities and procurement cases. Weekly project team meetings have been conducted to discuss the progress and timing of activities and procurements. Regular meetings have also been conducted at the Unit level. The implementation of the project within the UNDP biodiversity portfolio has allowed for optimal use of the project budget for administrative purposes.

Effective

Status: Complete

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

**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)**

The project was extended to December 2024 due to that project funding was unstable and some project activities required more time than planned. For example, procurement of the service for preparation of land survey acts was moved several times, as the reasons were related to data collection and expensive purchase of data. However, with the support of the project partner state bodies, the works have been completed. Also, due to the donor's withdrawal from the market of Kazakhstan and, accordingly, at the initiative of the donor, the financing of the project was reduced. The implementation of project activities was carried out in proportion to funding.

**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 project work plan was prepared in accordance with the schedule and target indicators of the project document. The monitoring of the implementation of the activities foreseen in the work plan was carried out on a weekly basis at the level of the project team and the country office.

As noted in question 15, some activities were extended due to changes in the donor's payment schedule and the length of the procurement process. Changes in the timing of activities were reflected in the revised RRF of the project.

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 pilot areas were defined by the Project Document. Geographically, the Project was implemented in 2 regions of the country, with different types of landscapes. The target groups of the project are: regional executive bodies, pilot PAs, pilot forestry enterprises. The Project regularly collaborated with all target groups. Target beneficiaries and partners of the project were involved in the activities of the Project in matters of inventory of unaccounted forests, improvement of material and technical equipment of pilot institutions.

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 main activity of the project was the inventory of unrecorded forests in the pilot regions. As a result, more than 100 thousand hectares of unrecorded forests were identified. This work included field surveys and clarification of the boundaries of unrecorded forests with verification of cartographic materials with satellite images. Coordinates of corner points were also determined for each forest area. The obtained field material was processed in the SOLI-N program. The data from the work was generated into the state's forest data record system.

|                                     |                  |                              |
|-------------------------------------|------------------|------------------------------|
| 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 based on a tripartite agreement between the Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources, UNDP, and the donor. Accordingly, the stakeholders were actively involved in the project implementation process by discussing project issues at the SC, agreeing on field work on inventory of unaccounted forests, agreeing on adjusting the work plan and making changes to the Agreement.

**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 arrangements<sup>8</sup> 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 was implemented using full support to NIM modality

**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 implementation was carried out in accordance with the allocated funds. In December 2024, the SC decision approved the exit strategy of the project, which indicates that the state body represented by the Committee of Forestry and Wildlife will continue the further process of inclusion of unaccounted forests into the State Forest Fund of Kazakhstan. The scaling of the project idea is reflected in the Concept on Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity of Kazakhstan until 2035 (on the instructions of the Prime Minister of Kazakhstan is expected to adopt the document in the 3rd quarter of 2025), which sets the task to formalize the areas of unregistered forests with their inclusion in the State Forest Fund until 2035 throughout the country.