

Procedure Year: 2023

Procedure Status: Approved

Procedure Department: CO - Kazakhstan - Astana

Record Owner: Dosbol Tursumuratov

Procedure Rating: Satisfactory

Procedure Name: ASM-04409

Procedure Type: Closure

Created by: Dosbol Tursumuratov,2/27/2024, 1:16 AM Last Modified by: Eugene Hong,3/11/2024, 2:05 AM

Portofolio/Project Type: Project

RELATED PORTFOLIOS/PROJECTS (1)						
NAME	PORTOFOLIO/PROJECT NAME	DEPARTMENT	STATUS	ATLAS PROJECT NUMBER	START DATE	END DATE
00123511	Spotlight Initiative-UNDP-KAZ-00123511	CO - Kazakhstan - Astana	Financially Closed	00130010	7/1/2020	12/31/2023

Approval Information

Approval Date: Sun Mar 10 00:00:00 GMT 2024

Approved By: Eugene Hong <eugene.hong@undp.org>

APPROVAL HISTORY			
STEP NAME	DATE	STATUS	ASSIGNED TO
Submitted for Approval	2024-03-11 02:05:32	Approved	Eugene Hong
Approval Request Submitted	2024-03-11 02:02:59	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 team systematically monitored the external environment, including trends in gender development in Central Asian countries, regulatory changes, other development partners' programmes and initiatives, and socio-economic factors. Phase II of the Spotlight regional programme incorporated new developments identified in Phase I and addressed issues such as standards of services for survivors of violence and the criminalisation of domestic violence, correctional programmes for perpetrators,

professional training for police on referral and case management.

As the SI-RP entered Phase II of the project, it undertook to strengthen participatory implementation. This included consultations with regional stakeholders, in particular the UN gender thematic groups of all Central Asian countries, EU delegations, CSO networks, the Civil Society Regional Reference Group (CS-RRG), technical leads of UN participating agencies and the Spotlight Initiative country programmes in the region - the Kyrgyzstan SI Country Programme Team and the Tajikistan SI Country Programme Team.

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

- ☐ 3: The project responds to 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 Spotlight regional programme for Central Asia responds to “leaving no-one behind” direction of change and “gender equality” signature solution of the UNDP Strategic Plan for 2022-2025. The programme is based on the understanding that violence against women is the result of structural, deep-rooted discrimination that the state has an obligation to address. The human rights-based approach is at the core of the Spotlight regional programme. It addressed inequalities, discriminatory practices and unjust power relations, and contributed to the development of the capacities of 'duty-bearers' to fulfil their obligations and of 'rights-holders' to claim their rights. The project responds to UNDP Strategic Plan Outcome 1: Structural transformation accelerated, particularly green, inclusive and digital transitions and Output 6.2 Women’s leadership and participation advanced through implementing affirmative measures, strengthening institutions and civil society, and addressing structural barriers, in order to advance gender equality, including in crisis contexts

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)

Spotlight regional programme worked with a diverse network of organizations, including local and grassroots organizations. CSOs were not solely engaged as implementors but also as advisors and decision-influencers through regional reference group. The Civil Society Regional Reference Group (CS RRG) was established to ensure the integration of participatory, rights-based, and "Leave No One Behind" principles in both the design and implementation of the SI-RP. The composition of the group provided equal representation of Central Asian countries in the CS-RRG. At least 50 per cent of the members of the CS-RRG were leaders or members of regional/sub-regional women's rights organisations/networks, including grassroots organisations. This distribution enabled the CS-RRG to draw on interdisciplinary human rights, women's rights and protection expertise, which collectively contributed to the comprehensive and systematic engagement of civil society in the design and implementation of the SI-RP. The

programme paid particular attention to involving NGOs representing the interests and needs of women with disabilities and women living with HIV, rural grassroots NGOs and crisis centres for survivors of violence.

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 approval of Phase II of the Regional Spotlight Programme was preceded by a mid-term evaluation carried out by an independent consultancy. The assessment involved interviews with key stakeholders, including project team members, selected programme stakeholders and beneficiaries, and other relevant parties to gather their perspectives on design and implementation of the programme, existing challenges and lessons or Phase II. The findings of the MTA triggered several rounds of discussions at the level of the project team, the participating agencies and the respective regional offices to formulate the management response and follow-up actions. This process helped to ensure the quality of the Phase II programme document and its approval by the Spotlight Operational Steering Committee.

The MTA response actions, lessons learned from Phase I and the Phase II results framework, including refined objectives, stakeholder engagement strategy and risk assessment, were presented to the European Delegation in Kazakhstan as a persuasive argument for continued funding of the programme.

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)

Spotlight is a comprehensive and multisectoral programming model towards ending violence against women and girls. The Initiative's theory of change was comprehensive, evidence-driven, and standardized across agencies and countries, with some flexibility to incorporate local and regional contexts. It was transformative because it defined VAWG as both a women's rights issue and one that affects all people in all spheres of life, including public health, education, and rule of law. This made the Initiative's work a systemic effort that magnifies the impact of each intervention in reinforcing other interventions. The Initiative works with communities, including men, boys, and religious and community leaders. In addition to addressing violence against women and girls—the Initiative's comprehensive model contributes to achieving many other SDGs (i.e. Good Health and Well Being; Reduced Inequalities; Sustainable Cities and Communities; Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions, etc.). It has made significant progress in changing how the UN partners with CSOs

Principled

Status: Complete

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

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

- ☒ 3: The project team has systematically gathered data and evidence through project monitoring on the relevance of the measures to address gender inequalities and empower women. Analysis of data and evidence were used to inform adjustments and changes, as

appropriate. (both must be true)

- ☐ 2: The project team had some data and evidence on the relevance of the measures to address gender inequalities and empower women. There is evidence that at least some adjustments were made, as appropriate. (both must be true)
- ☐ 1: The project team had limited or no evidence on the relevance of measures to address gender inequalities and empowering women. No evidence of adjustments and/or changes made. This option should also be selected if the project has no measures to address gender inequalities and empower women relevant to the project results and activities.

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

The project team systematically gathered data and evidence on the relevance of the activities through monitoring of legislative and institutional developments and regular interaction with civil society organisations. In addition, the regional programme sought to complement the activities of two national Spotlight programmes (in Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan) and ongoing programmes on gender equality and elimination of violence against women and girls in Central Asian countries by UN agencies. In this way, the work of the Initiative became a systemic effort, increasing the impact of each intervention in reinforcing the others.

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 the SESP.

8. Were grievance mechanisms available to project-affected people and were grievances (if any) addressed to ensure any perceived harm was effectively mitigated?

- ☐ 3: Project-affected people actively informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism (SRM/SECU) and how to access it. If the project was categorized as High or Moderate Risk through the SESP, a project -level grievance mechanism was in place and project affected people informed. If grievances were received, they were effectively addressed in accordance with SRM Guidance. (all must be true)
- ☒ 2: Project-affected people have been informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism and how to access it. If the project is categorized as High Risk through the SESP, a project -level grievance mechanism is in place and project affected people informed. If grievances have been received they are responded to but face challenges in arriving at a resolution. Select this option for SESP Exempted projects.
- ☐ 1: Project-affected people was not informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism. If grievances were received, they were not responded to. (any may be true)

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

UNDP Corporate Accountability Mechanism has been available for project-affected people, there have been no complaints.

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 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 Spotlight regional programme had a monitoring and reporting function within the coordination unit under the RC office. This unit liaised with the Spotlight Secretariat and the Monitoring Section and followed the guidelines and timeline for populating Spotlight's indicators dashboard on and other required actions. In addition, at the agency level, the participating UN agencies collected reporting data through progress reports, annual work plans, which included the risk logs, and annual reports.

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)

Enhanced coordination was achieved under the guidance of the UN Resident Coordinator in Kazakhstan, supported by UNDP, UNFPA, UNW offices and the SI-RP Programme Team. Engagement of a wide set of stakeholders improved alignment with the One UN reform, focusing on coherence, monitoring and evaluation practices and reinforced national ownership. As a result, the SI-RP expanded regional collaboration with special emphasis on deepening civil society engagement and programming of joint actions for addressing EVAWG and SGBV in the region.

The Regional Steering Committee (RSC), under the leadership of the UN Resident Coordinator performed coordinating, overseeing, decision-making, and accountability role within the framework of the SI-RP, in alignment with the core principles of the One UN reform.

The committee's composition includes European Union Delegations in CA countries, UN RC, UN Women Representative for Kazakhstan, UNFPA Representative for Kazakhstan, UNDP Resident Representative for Kazakhstan, as well as representatives from civil society drawn from the Civil Society Regional Reference Group. In 2021-2022, the RSC gathered once a year to endorse the annual reports, learn about implementation plans, programme budget delivery and to provide strategic oversight for the remaining period to the end of the programme. In 2023, the Joint RSC Meeting convened on its third and fourth meetings respectively on 27 June and 29 November to acknowledge the achievements and conclude the Spotlight Initiative Regional Programme for Central Asia and Afghanistan.

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 monitoring and reporting function, including risk monitoring and reporting for the Spotlight regional programme, was located in the Coordination Unit under the Office of the Resident Coordinator (RC). This unit worked with the Spotlight Secretariat and the Monitoring Section to meet the established timelines for updating the Spotlight risk matrix and other risk monitoring and reporting tasks. In addition, at the agency level, reporting on risks, mitigation actions and risk updates was done through quarterly progress reports, annual work plans (including risk logs) and annual reports in accordance with agency policies and procedures.

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)

The project mobilized sufficient amount of resources to fully implement all planned activities and achieve planned results. The project has achieved 100% utilization rate.

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

- ☐ 3: The project had a procurement plan and kept it updated. The project quarterly reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addressed them through appropriate management actions. (all must be true)
- ☒ 2: The project had updated procurement plan. The project annually reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addressed them through appropriate management actions. (all must be true)
- ☐ 1: The project did not have an updated procurement plan. The project team may or may not have reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs regularly, however management actions were not taken to address them.

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

The project had a procurement plan for each year, detailing the procurement needs on the basis of the annual work plan. Procurement was carried out in accordance with the competitive procurement strategy as outlined in the UNDP procurement policy and regulations and standard operating procedures. Contracted services accounted for 71% of the total project budget (USD 1,101,342).

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 regional programme monitored its own costs and, on several occasions, negotiated with the country Spotlight project in Tajikistan to share the costs of organising capacity building events, with travel costs for Tajik participants covered by Spotlight Tajikistan. All the events had online and offline participation options to accommodate additional participants from CA countries. Speakers from abroad mostly delivered their presentations online to reduce the costs related to international travel. In addition, research into existing market prices and rates, existing experiences and practices were used in all internal cost estimates for contracting.

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 on track to complete Phase 1, receive funding for Phase 2 in 2023 and implement all planned outputs by 31 December 2023.

16. Were there regular reviews of the work plan to ensure that the project was on track to achieve the desired results, and to inform course corrections if needed?

- ☐ 3: Quarterly progress data informed regular reviews of the project work plan to ensure that the activities implemented were most likely to achieve the desired results. There is evidence that data and lessons learned (including from evaluations /or After-Action Reviews) were used to inform course corrections, as needed. Any necessary budget revisions were made. (both must be true)
- ☒ 2: There was at least one review of the work plan per year with a view to assessing if project activities were on track to achieving the desired development results (i.e., outputs.) There may or may not be evidence that data or lessons learned were used to inform the review(s). Any necessary budget revisions have been made.
- ☐ 1: While the project team may have reviewed the work plan at least once over the past year to ensure outputs were delivered on time, no link was made to the delivery of desired development results. Select this option also if no review of the work plan by management took place.

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

The work plan was regularly monitored to provide quarterly updates to the UNDP Regional Office (IRH) and inputs to the SI Implementation Dashboard as requested by UNDP HQ. The results of the work plan monitoring were also used to update the RC office on programme issues and budget utilisation, including for donor reporting purposes.

Monthly reports to UNDP CO on budget execution and implementation estimates were also used to ensure that the project was on track to achieve the desired results and to identify better options for achieving the desired results.

In addition, each annual work plan was revised at least twice a year to incorporate the next tranche of funding from the donor and changes to the activity plan to accelerate project implementation.

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)

Spotlight regional programme worked with a diverse network of organizations, including local and grassroots organizations. The Civil Society Regional Reference Group (CS RRG) was established to ensure the integration of participatory, rights-based, and "Leave No One Behind" principles in implementation of the SI-RP. The composition of the group provided equal representation of Central Asian countries in the CS-RRG. At least 50 per cent of the members of the CS-RRG were leaders or members of regional/sub-regional women's rights organisations/networks, including grassroots organisations. This distribution enabled the CS-RRG to draw on interdisciplinary human rights, women's rights and protection expertise. The programme paid particular attention to involving NGOs representing the interests and needs of women with disabilities and women living with HIV, rural grassroots NGOs and crisis centres for survivors of violence.

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)

N/A

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 DIM

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 was DIM

21. Were the transition and phase-out arrangements were reviewed and adjusted according to progress (including financial commitment and capacity).

- ☐ 3: The project's governance mechanism regularly reviewed the project's sustainability plan, including arrangements for transition and phase-out, to ensure the project remained on track in meeting the requirements set out by the plan. The plan was implemented as planned by the end of the project, taking into account any adjustments made during implementation. (both must be true)
- ☒ 2: There was a review of the project's sustainability plan, including arrangements for transition and phase-out, to ensure the project remained on track in meeting the requirements set out by the plan.
- ☐ 1: The project may have had a sustainability plan but there was no review of this strategy after it was developed. Also select this option if the project did not have a sustainability strategy.

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

The Spotlight Sustainability Strategy was developed through consultations with various stakeholders, including government institutions, civil society organisations and experts, to provide a roadmap for sustainability of results in country and regional contexts. This strategy was endorsed by the final Regional Steering Committee. It is based on the assumption that project achievements will be sustained and further developed through programming and funding by UN agencies at the country level. In addition, the systematic involvement of civil society organisations in the implementation of the programme served to prepare them to adopt the methodologies, training packages, other knowledge products and networks to continue the work of eliminating violence against women and girls. Last but not least, the Central Asia Alliance to End GBV - one of the main outcomes of the Spotlight - received funding from the Government of Kazakhstan to continue as the ERAW platform to work with civil society and government institutions.