

Procedure Year: 2024

Procedure Rating:  Highly Satisfactory

Procedure Status: Approved

Procedure Name: ASM-06024

Procedure Department: CO - Albania - Tirana

Procedure Type: Closure

Record Owner: Eno Ngjela

Created by: Abi Doddiba,4/4/2024, 9:07 AM

Last Modified by: Francisco ROQUETTE,11/6/2024, 8:55 AM

Portofolio/Project Type: Project

RELATED PORTFOLIOS/PROJECTS (1)

| NAME     | PORTOFOLIO/PROJECT NAME                         | DEPARTMENT               | STATUS                | ATLAS PROJECT NUMBER | START DATE | END DATE   |
|----------|-------------------------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|------------|------------|
| 00126420 | SDG Business Partnerships-<br>UNDP-ALB-00126420 | CO - Albania -<br>Tirana | Financially<br>Closed | 00134985             | 1/5/2022   | 12/31/2024 |

Approval Information

Approval Date: Wed Nov 06 00:00:00 GMT 2024

Approved By: Francisco ROQUETTE  
<francisco.roquette@undp.org>

APPROVAL HISTORY

| STEP NAME                  | DATE                | STATUS   | ASSIGNED TO        |
|----------------------------|---------------------|----------|--------------------|
| Submitted for Approval     | 2024-11-06 08:55:02 | Approved | Francisco ROQUETTE |
| Approval Request Submitted | 2024-11-06 06:34:58 | Started  | Eno Ngjela         |

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?

- ☒

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)

This UN Joint Project (JP) was focused on the collaboration with the private sector. In the poly-crisis context, this was a particularly challenging task. From the energy crisis to the lack of skilled workers, or raw materials, raising awareness and engagement of the Albanian private sector on SDGs requires a constant adaptation to the business approach.

For instance, a problem-solving approach with lengthier discussions with companies and a focus on subsector identification has

been used for the agro-processing sector so far.

As such, the identification of a set of incentives to ensure Albanian companies' initial participation as well as, and most importantly, their long-term engagement was envisaged through a project revision approved from Sida (the JP donor) in December 2022. This is strongly intertwined with the EU accession process, as well as with increasing the resilience of companies to the challenges of our times. It is crucial to understand their position and challenges in order to structure the activities in the best way.

Evidence

Project Reports

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 project was fully aligned UNDP Strategic Plan. Specifically, it directly contributed to "Structural transformation – including green, inclusive and digital transitions: working with countries to effect change in systems and structures that shape a country's sustainable development". It employs the Resilience Signature Solution.

With the work it delivered on both sectors (agro-processing and textile), it is set to contribute to SDGs: 1 through 10; 12, 13, 15, 17; thus the project responded to more than one of the development settings and adopted more than one Signature Solution.

Evidence

ProDoc

Project Reports

|          |                  |                                     |
|----------|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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 focus of the project was on assessing the situation on the ground for the two focus sectors (specifically chosen because of their impact on employment and livelihoods), including disaggregating the role of women and young people in their workforce. Their representation both in trainings and advocacy activities has been crucial throughout the project implementation. Thus, building on the lessons learned, these two groups will be more concretely engaged and their needs better addressed during the project's second phase.

Evidence

ProDoc

Project Reports

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)

Capturing knowledge and lessons learned has been one of the priorities of the project. Crucially, some of the reflections emerging from the discussions with Swedish partners include:

- Participating UN agencies carried out the assignment using different approaches, reflecting the different realities of the two sectors: proven and tested methodologies have been applied in the textile sector while a problem-solving approach with lengthier discussions with companies and a focus on subsector identification has been used for the agro-processing.
- Currently, Albanian companies have a low awareness of the Sustainable Development Goals as well as their impact on the environment and society at large. In some cases, they are unknowingly already implementing sustainability practices in their businesses but do not have the context to expand them further and hone into future sustainable investments.
- Partnerships with academia, sectoral associations and local experts have been chosen by the agencies, translating in high value for the implementation of the project. The opportunities for knowledge exchange and partnerships with Swedish businesses offer an additional advantage for Albanian companies in the road towards sustainability and SDG implementation.
- The identification of the set of incentives to ensure Albanian companies’ initial participation as well as, and most importantly, their long-term engagement is crucial. This is strongly intertwined with the European Union integration process as well as with increasing the resilience of companies to the challenges of our times, such as the energy crisis. It is crucial to understand their position and challenges in order to structure the activities in the best way.
- The agencies are open to learn from each other’s experience and lessons learned along the way during the project, for instance on how to better engage companies for the drafting of the Zero Roadmap.

Evidence  
Final Project Report

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)

The project has managed to reach out to a wide portion of the Albanian business community and engaged major government stakeholders and business association. The coverage of its activities was also widespread on national media. Hence, the project is considered sufficiently at scale, and most importantly there is concrete potential to scale up in the future. The positive feedback received from the donors and the approved cost extension of this project are direct examples.

Evidence  
Final Project Report

**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 focus of the project was on assessing the situation on the ground for the two focus sectors, including disaggregating the role of women and young people in their workforce. Their representation both in trainings and advocacy activities has been crucial throughout the project implementation. While logframe indicators did not always include gender disaggregation, outputs always accounted for the gender dimension. Thus, building on the lessons learned, these two groups will be more concretely engaged and their needs better addressed during the project's second phase, including through gender-disaggregated indicators.

Evidence

Project Reports

**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 is not assessed as a high risk one. Project risks were identified and included in the Project Document, as well as a SESP questionnaire.

Evidence

SESP

Project Reports

**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)**

**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)**

Please, see enclosed M&E Plan, Chapter VII of the ProDoc.

**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 four Participating UN agencies and RCO met on a monthly basis (starting in 2023) to coordinate on project implementation. Minutes are available for all these meetings.

In addition, UNDP, as lead agency for the joint project, met with the donor on a monthly basis. These meetings were complemented with ad hoc coordination and/or reporting meetings as per donor requests.

Annual reporting was submitted (due to the duration of the project, this includes one annual report and one final report).

**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.

Project risks were identified and constantly monitored and managed.

Annual Report 2023

Quality Rating: Exemplary

☒ Yes  
☐ No

The project team, led by UNDP, cooperated with national and international consultants and institutions to ensure high-quality service delivery in all technical aspects. UNDP, as leading agency in this joint project, cooperated closely with the three other UN agencies (ILO, UNIDO and FAO), organizing several joint activities with them, making use of their respective areas of expertise and maximizing.

Moreover, the project has synergies with other UNDP Albania projects, namely Economic Recovery and Resilience Programme (the SDP methodology) and SD4E project.

☒ 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.

The project maintained an up-to-date procurement plan, in strict compliance with UNDP standards and rules. Throughout the project implementation, inputs were procured and delivered and efficiently contributed to result.

Evidence

Annual Work Plan 2023

Project Reports

- ☒ 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.

The project followed UNDP standards for procurement, monitoring and reporting, as well as the UNSDG guidance on joint programmes (dated Oct 2022).

This allowed the project team to ensure high-quality service delivery in all technical aspects. UNDP, as leading agency in this joint project, cooperated closely with the three other UN agencies (ILO, UNIDO and FAO), organizing several joint activities with them, making use of their respective areas of expertise and maximizing.

Moreover, the project has synergies with other UNDP Albania projects, namely Economic Recovery and Resilience Programme (the SDP methodology) and SD4E project.

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 saw an initial delay that was eventually made up for during implementation. Furthermore, two extensions were granted by the donor (both cost and no-cost), which extended the implementation time and allowed for activities to be more carefully planned, responding to the results of the research undertaken in the early months of the project life.

By the end of the project, all outputs agreed with the donor were delivered. The donor satisfaction with the results served as the basis for securing the funding for a second phase.

Evidence

Project reports

**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)**

Specific implementation workplans have been regularly reviewed (ad hoc as per donor's request) and progress reports submitted on a yearly basis. Additionally, during 2023 monthly technical team meetings were organized for a better coordination in between the four participating UN agencies.

**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)**

This was an exploratory phase of the project so there was no direct reporting for marginalized groups, but rather the focus was on specific economic sectors, particularly chosen because of their impact on employment and livelihoods. However, the lessons learned have been used to create appropriate reporting for the following phase.

Evidence  
Final Project Report

**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 nature of the project did not require a digital technology solution.

|                                     |                  |                                     |
|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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)**

Project implementation did not necessitate the use of any national systems. However, the project team maintained regular consultation processes with all relevant stakeholders and partners. Both central and local institutions were consulted and engaged in the project implementation. A particular relevant role was granted to the local private sector and local sectoral associations. National and international partners as well as national stakeholders were actively involved in the implementation of the project and shared crucial feedback for aligning project activities with private sector needs.

Evidence  
Project Reports

**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 joint project was implemented under a Direct Implementation 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 sustainability plan was crucial since the aim of the project was to increase awareness about SDGs and sustainable practices. The work of awareness raising on sustainability to local companies is a long process and adaptation was a priority along the whole project implementation. The sustainability of results could only be ensured through a tailoring to the local context finalized at ultimately transferring ownership at a national level, both on the side of the government and of the business sector. For this reason, various co-creation meetings and consultations between donors, agencies and relevant stakeholders on the topic were organized to identify a variety of strategies to achieve this. The discussions along with the lessons learned through the implementation, laid the foundation for the project design of the second phase, which included an updated and enhanced sustainability plan.

Evidence

Final Report