ASM-13013 - Quality Assurance - Closure

Procedure Year: 2024

Procedure Rating: Highly Satisfactory

Procedure Status: Approved

Procedure Name: ASM-13013

Procedure Department: CO - Georgia - Tbilisi

Procedure Type: Closure

Record Owner: Gulisa Kakhniashvili

Created by: Gulisa Kakhniashvili,12/19/2024, 4:02 PM

Last Modified by: Nils CHRISTENSEN,12/27/2024, 3:52 AM

Portofolio/Project Type: Project

RELATED PORTFOLIOS/PROJECTS (1)

NAME	PORTOFOLIO/PROJECT NAME	DEPARTMENT	STATUS	ATLAS PROJECT NUMBER	START DATE	END DATE
01000205	Rule of Law Georgia	CO - Georgia - Tbilisi	Financially Closed		1/1/2023	12/30/2025

RELATED SESPS (1)

PARENT PROCEDURE	PROCEDURE TYPE	PROCEDURE YEAR
ASM-01952	SESP (Social and Environmental Screening Procedure)	2023

Approval Information

Approval Date: Fri Dec 27 00:00:00 GMT 2024

Approved By: Nils Rune CHRISTENSEN <nils.christensen@undp.org>

APPROVAL HISTORY

STEP NAME	DATE	STATUS	ASSIGNED TO
Submitted for Approval	2024-12-27 03:52:13	Approved	Nils CHRISTENSEN
Approval Request Submitted	2024-12-27 02:31:26	Started	Gigi Bregadze

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 identified and shared with the Project Board relevant political and operational changes through 2023 and 2024. While the project exceeded some targets set for 2023, some of the indicators were not met due to the lack of stakeholder engagement. As a result, these indicators have been amended. Amendments were also made to the risk log. In particular, the likelihoods of the events materializing were changed from moderate to low regarding two risks. Amended logical framework as well as updated risk log have been shared with and approved by the Project Board (Project Board Meeting Summary annexed).

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 is in line with UNDP Strategic Plan, as demonstrated during Project Design QA.

Relevant	Status: Complete	Quality Rating: Satisfactory

3. Are the project's targeted groups, and particularly those marginalized, vulnerable and left further behind (LNOB), being systematically engaged, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized, to ensure the project leaves no one behind (LNOB) and remains relevant for them?

3: Systematic and structured feedback was collected over the project duration from a representative sample of beneficiaries, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized, as part of the project's monitoring system. Representatives from the targeted groups were active members of the project's governance mechanism (i.e., the project board or equivalent) and there is credible evidence that their feedback informs project decision making. (all must be true)

2: Targeted groups were engaged in implementation and monitoring, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized. Beneficiary feedback, which may be anecdotal, was collected regularly to ensure the project addressed local priorities. This information was used to inform project decision making. (all must be true to select this option)

1: Some beneficiary feedback may have been collected, but this information did not inform project decision making. This option should also be selected if no beneficiary feedback was collected

Not Applicable

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

The LNOB principle was applied throughout the project implementation process by addressing the needs of the most disadvantaged communities in Georgia. The project's target population besides population-at-large included persons with disabilities (PwDs), those living in rural and remote regions, ethnic and national minorities, women, young people, those fleeing conflict, violence and/or persecution, and conflict-affected communities, as well as those communities whose access to clean and healthy environment was under threat.

As an example, the project carried out renovation works to the Kutaisi City Court for adaptation of the sanitary facilities for PwDs and the implementation of tactile markings on the existing stairs, both outside and inside the court building. To ensure the observation of standards and inclusivity, the project involved a PwD rights expert in the process of implementation and monitoring (the expert's monitoring report with relevant recommendations is annexed).

4. Did the project generate knowledge, and lessons learned (i.e., what has worked and what has not) and has this knowledge informed management decisions to ensure the continued relevance of the project towards its stated objectives, the quality of its outputs and the management of risk?

- (selected) 3: Knowledge and lessons learned from internal or external sources (gained, for example, from Peer Assists, After Action Reviews or Lessons Learned Workshops) backed by credible evidence from evaluation, corporate policies/strategies, analysis and monitoring were discussed in project board meetings and reflected in the minutes. There is clear evidence that changes were made to the project to ensure its continued relevance. (both must be true)
- 2: Knowledge and lessons learned backed by relatively limited evidence, drawn mainly from within the project, were considered by the project team. There is some evidence that changes were made to the project as a result to ensure its continued relevance. (both must be true)
- 1: There is limited or no evidence that knowledge and lessons learned were collected by the project team. There is little or no evidence that this informed project decision making.

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

Lessons learned formed an integral part of the project's progress and final reports. Both of the reports were presented to the Project Board for their review and approval (Progress Report and Final Report of the project annexed).

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.
- (selected) 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)

While the project had 10,560 (including 7,710 women) direct beneficiaries, there is still a need to expand the response to the needs of the target groups. While the Ukrainian refugees continue to stay in Georgia, additional challenges have evolved which further negatively impact Georgia's rule of law landscape. As Georgia is becoming more fragile and undergoing political instability with external and internal tensions, the extension of the project aims to ensure that disadvantaged groups are not left behind in this period. The needs to further supporting PwDs, socially disadvantaged groups, remote and conflict-affected populations, women, minorities, and communities at risk of environmental harm in enhancing the access to justice remains. The Agreement has been signed between UNDP and the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany regarding Contribution to the UNDP Funding Window on Governance, Peacebuilding, Crisis and Resilience, ensuring continuity of the project at its phase II (Agreement annexed).

Principled	Status: Complete	Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory

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

- (selected) 3: The project team has systematically gathered data and evidence through project monitoring on the relevance of the measures to address gender inequalities and empower women. Analysis of data and evidence were used to inform adjustments and changes, as appropriate. (both must be true)
- 2: The project team had some data and evidence on the relevance of the measures to address gender inequalities and empower women. There is evidence that at least some adjustments were made, as appropriate. (both must be true)
- 1: The project team had limited or no evidence on the relevance of measures to address gender inequalities and empowering women. No evidence of adjustments and/or changes made. This option should also be selected if the project has no measures to address gender inequalities and empower women relevant to the project results and activities.

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

The project promoted gender equality during the implementation of each output. It ensured that women were not only beneficiaries, but also actively engaged in all activities and events organised. The project has been using a gender-responsive approach by identifying and addressing existing barriers faced by women and other disadvantaged groups, such as gender stereotypes, unequal access to resources (education, healthcare, economic opportunities, property), unpaid domestic and care work, discrimination and intersectionality.

The outputs related to mediation and cross regional CSO cooperation specifically include women and are designed to be gender-responsive. The positive outcomes for women judges, ethnic minority representatives, and women entrepreneurs highlight the advantages of inclusive approaches. Additionally, other outputs mainstream gender by incorporating gender-disaggregated data requirements into the indicators.

Gender-responsive approach was applied during project design, however some adjustments were also needed to be made to ensure further inclusivity at the operational level as well as at the output level: at the initial stage the project envisioned organising an international conference with a focus on environmental justice, youth, and women. After the feasibility evaluation, the focus of the conference shifted to building a network between legal aid service providers in the region, however, noting that the voices of disadvantaged groups and women needed to be heard more clearly in the access to justice domain. Thus, the Conference featured a separate panel on Gender Justice and Women's Rights (Agenda of the Conference annexed).

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 completed SESP during the project design, which forms an integral part of the project document. SESP identified two risks, which are part of the project's risk log (project Document with Annex III (SESP) annexed).

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)

Setting up the grievance mechanism was not required, as none of the activities affected individuals according to the Social and Environmental Screening. Therefore, this question is not applicable.

Management & Monitoring	Status: Complete	Quality Rating: Exemplary

9. Was the project's M&E Plan adequately implemented?

- (selected) 3: The project had a comprehensive and costed M&E plan. Baselines, targets and milestones were fully populated. Progress data against indicators in the project's RRF was reported regularly using credible data sources and collected according to the frequency stated in the Plan, including sex disaggregated data as relevant. Any evaluations conducted, if relevant, fully meet decentralized evaluation standards, including gender UNEG standards. Lessons learned, included during evaluations and/or After-Action Reviews, were used to take corrective actions when necessary. (all must be true)
- 2: The project costed M&E Plan, and most baselines and targets were populated. Progress data against indicators in the project's RRF was collected on a regular basis, although there was may be some slippage in following the frequency stated in the Plan and data sources was not always reliable. Any evaluations conducted, if relevant, met most decentralized evaluation standards. Lessons learned were captured but were used to take corrective actions. (all must be true)
- 1: The project had M&E Plan, but costs were not clearly planned and budgeted for, or were unrealistic. Progress data was not regularly collected against the indicators in the project's RRF. Evaluations did not meet decentralized evaluation standards. Lessons learned were rarely captured and used. Select this option also if the project did not have an M&E plan.

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

The project had a monitoring plan (evaluation was not applicable) incorporated into the project document. The project also recruited a Monitoring and Implementation Analyst to track the implementation process and capture the output targets. To this aim the logical framework with indicators and targets was agreed and performance against each indicator was measured. The monitoring process was regular. To better track the results and gather data, a system for sorting evidence has been created on a common drive. The project also held weekly team meetings to discuss the implementation process and apply mitigating measures timely, when needed.

10. Did the project's governance mechanism (i.e., the project board or equivalent) function as intended?

- (selected) 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 closely followed the governance mechanism envisioned in the project document. In particular, the Project Board met at the agreed frequency – in total twice. The first meeting was held on 15 January 2024 and the second on 27 September 2024 (Agendas and Minutes of the Project Board meetings annexed). At both meetings, progress and final reports (narrative and financial) were presented. Both documents incorporated progress data, knowledge and lessons learned. At the first board meeting in January 2024 relevant adjustments to the log frame and risk log were also made.

11. Were risks to the project adequately monitored and managed?

- (selected) 3: The project monitored risks every quarter and consulted with the key stakeholders, security advisors, to identify continuing and emerging risks to assess if the main assumptions remained valid. There is clear evidence that relevant management plans and mitigating measures were fully implemented to address each key project risk and were updated to reflect the latest risk assessment. (all must be true)
- 2: The project monitored risks every year, as evidenced by an updated risk log. Some updates were made to management plans and mitigation measures.
- 1: The risk log was not updated as required. There was may be some evidence that the project monitored risks that may affected the project's achievement of results, but there is no explicit evidence that management actions were taken to mitigate risks.

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

The project team actively monitored the relevance of the risks as well as remaining level of likelihood and impact based on the new information available throughout the implementation process. Project risk monitoring, informing the management, and proposing changes to the risks, where relevant, were carried out regularly. Additionally, the project held two ad hoc meetings (on 2 October 2023 and 11 June 2024) specifically dedicated to the risk monitoring and the risk log update. Updates have been entered in the Quantum (Minutes of the working meetings annexed). Updated risk logs were also part of the progress and final reports presented to the Project Board.

Efficient	Status: Complete	Quality Rating: Satisfactory

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

- (selected) Yes
- No

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

The project was fully funded by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany; therefore resources have been mobilised to achieve the intended results.

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

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

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

The project had a procurement plan that was updated annually to review operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs. Consequently, the project applied relevant management actions (procurement plan annexed).

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

- 3: There is evidence that the project regularly reviewed costs against relevant comparators (e.g., other projects or country offices) or industry benchmarks to ensure the project maximized results delivered with given resources. The project actively coordinated with other relevant ongoing projects and initiatives (UNDP or other) to ensure complementarity and sought efficiencies wherever possible (e.g. joint activities.) (both must be true)
- (selected) 2: The project monitored its own costs and gave anecdotal examples of cost efficiencies (e.g., spending less to get the same result,) but there was no systematic analysis of costs and no link to the expected quality of results delivered. The project coordinated activities with other projects to achieve cost efficiency gains.
- 1: There is little or no evidence that the project monitored its own costs and considered ways to save money beyond following standard procurement rules.

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

The project aimed to achieve maximum cost efficiency. One of the key initiatives of the project, which focused on renovating and adapting the State Care Agency for PwDs, involved collaboration with UNDP's Leadership, Equality, Advocacy, and Democracy Project, as well as the UN Joint Programme for Gender Equality. The project also negotiated lower costs for the renovation of the adaptation of the Kutaisi City Court, saving USD 13,110 (Pre-award Negotiation Meeting Minutes for RFP for Awareness Raising Campaign on Environmental Justice in Georgia annexed).

The project also shared office space with other projects under the Governance Portfolio. It also shared a driver with other projects. Additionally, the project used partner premises or UNDP facilities whenever feasible.

Effective	Status: Complete	Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory

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

- (selected) Yes
- No

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

Out of 36 indicators under six outcomes, the project delivered 34 indicators fully, one indicator mostly and one indicator partially (updated log frame with final results annexed).

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

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

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

The project developed annual work plans, which were integrated into a pre-designed Monitoring Tool. This tool ensured the project remained on track with implementation progress and facilitated the application of corrective measures when necessary. Additionally, the project updated financial expenses and the remaining budget in the annual work plan monthly. The revised budget and future plans for meeting the remaining targets were also presented to the Project Board on 15 January 2024 (Progress Report 2023 with the chapter on conclusions and the way forward annexed. Three versions of Annual Work Plans of the project, showcasing regular updates and applying relevant changes also annexed).

17. Were the targeted groups, and particularly those marginalized, vulnerable and left further behind (LNOB), systematically identified and engaged, prioritizing the marginalized and excluded, to ensure results were achieved as expected?

- (selected) 3: The project targeted specific groups and/or geographic areas, identified by using credible data sources on their capacity needs, deprivation and/or exclusion from development opportunities relevant to the project's area of work. There is clear evidence that the targeted groups were reached as intended. The project engaged regularly with targeted groups over the past year to assess whether they benefited as expected and adjustments were made if necessary, to refine targeting. (all must be true)
- 2: The project targeted specific groups and/or geographic areas, based on some evidence of their capacity needs, deprivation and/or exclusion from development opportunities relevant to the project's area of work. Some evidence is provided to confirm that project beneficiaries are members of the targeted groups. There was some engagement with beneficiaries in the past year to assess whether they were benefiting as expected. (all must be true)
- 1: The project did not report on specific targeted groups. There is no evidence to confirm that project beneficiaries are populations have capacity needs or are deprived and/or excluded from development opportunities relevant to the project area of work. There is some engagement with beneficiaries to assess whether they benefited as expected, but it was limited or did not occurred in the past year.
- Not Applicable

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

The project targeted marginalized and vulnerable groups such as PwDs, people living in remote and rural areas, representatives of ethnic minorities, communities facing environmental threats and forcibly displaced groups, including refugees and Ukrainian nationals residing in Georgia including women and youth. The project addressed the social and economic needs of the refugees, including Ukrainians residing in Georgia by a small-grant scheme for entrepreneurial activities, as well as by offering integration and referral services, and business and legal consultations. The project also conducted the needs assessment and satisfaction survey for Ukrainians using social services at the Ukrainian House established with the support of the project. The project also set up a Georgian language online self-learning course for Ukrainians and ethnic minority groups.

The project targeted ethnic minorities further through legal consultations by the Mobile Legal Aid Clinic, awareness raising on alternative dispute resolution mechanisms, and increasing access to legal databases by translating laws and services into ethnic minority languages (Final Report of the project annexed).

18. If there is a digital or data technology solution in the project: have technology and data risks been addressed specifically for closure, or continued use by partners or UNDP?

- ( ) 3: Yes, a) the implementation and closure followed good practices, such as UNDP's digital standards and data principles; b) technology sustainability risks are addressed: hosting, licenses, intellectual property, data ownership, code documentation, or partner capacity (operations, maintenance and continued improvement); and c) post project scalability has been considered: digital public goods or reusability for other UNDP units. (All must be true)
- (•) 2: Specific technology and data risks have been partially addressed for project closure, next to Standard UNDP sustainability practices and project risk management.
- ( ) 1: Standard UNDP sustainability practices and project risk management are applied, but no specific practices to address technology or data risks are followed.
- ( ) The project did not utilize a data or digital technology solution.

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

The project developed a new webpage for the Training Center of Justice of Georgia (https://eacademy.tcj.gov.ge/) and updated the electronic case processing system for the Legal Aid Service of Georgia. Both of the portals are operated by the government institutions and follow national safety regulations.

Sustainability & National Ownership	Status: Complete	Quality Rating: Exemplary

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)

This has been a DIM project, thus, the functions mainly dwelled within UNDP. However, the stakeholders and national parties were certainly consulted as needed.

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 partners holding LOAs and RPAs were subject to HACT. Spots checks were done by the UNDP recruited audit office to assess compliance with previous findings and the validity of accounting records that support cash transfers from UNDP. The performance of four institutions has been assessed: the Legal Aid Service of Georgia, the Digital Governance Agency of Georgia, Care Caucasus and the Mediators Association of Georgia (Reports on evaluation of the findings in the previous Micro Assessment Reports and Spot Check Reports evaluating the validity of accounting records that support cash transfers from UNDP, and Report on Factual Findings of RPA holder evaluating the functioning of internal controls and program expenditures, are annexed).

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

- (selected) 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)

Sustainability was a cornerstone of the project. The majority of the activities ensured institutions were supported in a manner to ensure the institutionalisation of the results achieved.

For instance, the project provided essential support to the Legal Aid Service of Georgia to establish the Mobile legal Aid Clinic. The Legal Aid Service continued to operate the mobile legal clinic after the end of the partnership agreement with UNDP in December 2023. Since then, the Legal Aid Service has independently completed 77 visits to towns and villages in Georgia, conducting a total of 489 individual consultations (including for 191 women) and raising awareness of 1,630 beneficiaries (including 1,299 women) through public lectures on legal aid services, access to justice, property rights, and women’s rights.

Already in September 2024, the Project Board discussed the sustainability vision, including the plan to secure the funding for Phase II to build upon the results of Phase I (Minutes of the Project Board meeting of 27 September 2024 annexed).