ASM-20760 - Quality Assurance - Closure

Procedure Year: 2025

Procedure Rating: Exemplary

Procedure Status: Approved

Procedure Name: ASM-20760

Procedure Department: CO - Serbia - Belgrade

Procedure Type: Closure

Record Owner: Smiljka Zivanovic

Created by: Smiljka Zivanovic,5/28/2026, 2:25 AM

Last Modified by: Zarko PETROVIC,5/31/2026, 1:15 PM

Portofolio/Project Type: Project

RELATED PORTFOLIOS/PROJECTS (1)

NAME	PORTOFOLIO/PROJECT NAME	DEPARTMENT	STATUS	ATLAS PROJECT NUMBER	START DATE	END DATE
01000350	Innovative and Just Green Transition as Tool for Securing Systemic Energy Security and Reducing Energy Poverty	CO - Serbia - Belgrade	Financially Closed		3/10/2023	3/31/2024

Approval Information

Approval Date: Sun May 31 00:00:00 GMT 2026

Approved By: Zarko PETROVIC <zarko.petrovic@undp.org>

APPROVAL HISTORY

STEP NAME	DATE	STATUS	ASSIGNED TO
Submitted for Approval	2026-05-31 13:15:27	Approved	Zarko PETROVIC
Approval Request Submitted	2026-05-28 06:37:08	Started	Miroslav Tadic

QA Questionnaire:

Strategic | Status: Complete | Quality Rating: Exemplary

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

- (selected) 3: The project team has identified relevant changes in the external environment that may present new opportunities or threats to the project's ability to achieve its objectives and the assumptions have been tested to determine if the project's strategy is still valid. There is evidence that the project board has considered the implications, and documented any changes needed to the project in response. (all must be true)
- 2: The project team has identified relevant changes in the external environment that may present new opportunities or threats to the project's ability to achieve its objectives. There is some evidence that the project board discussed this, but relevant changes may not have been fully integrated in the project. (both must be true)
- 1: The project team may have considered relevant changes in the external environment since implementation began, but there is no evidence that the project team has considered changes to the project as a result.

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

The project team completed a horizon scanning exercise including consultative process in the implementation phase of the project to identify new opportunities and changes in the development context. The results of the project activities are documented in the Final Narrative Report . Completed project activities are presented at the Project Steering Committee (PSC) Meetings and National dialogue as the final closing event of the project. Participants of the Dialogue were more than 100 representatives of stakeholders relevant to the process as well as local experts dealing with environmental and social protection. The following attachments are crucial for decision making on the project, including preparation and implementation of project activities and reporting:

1. Minutes of the 1st Project Steering Committee Meeting, 29th August 2023
2. Kick off meeting of the project Accelerator – 06th September 2023
3. Minutes of the 2nd Project Steering Committee Meeting, 3rd November 2023
4. Report on the final conference "National Dialogue on Just Green Transition and Energy Poverty in Serbia" 26th March 2024

High-level MEP representatives are members of the PSC and are actively involved in project activities, along with the NDA. In addition, project experts in architecture, mechanical and electrical engineering supported the Ministry of Mining and Energy in developing a public call for local self-governments (LSGO) to improve energy efficiency in public and residential buildings, through awarding subsidies to citizens for implementation of EE measures. The Public Call was developed and published. Project also provided technical support in implementation of energy efficiency and clean energy investment programmes of Energy Efficiency Administration (EEA) in 2023, in the field of architecture.

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

- (selected) 3: The project responds at least one of the development settings as specified in the Strategic Plan (SP) and adopts at least one Signature Solution and the project's RRF includes at all the relevant SP output indicators. (all must be true)
- 2: The project responds to one of the three areas of development work as specified in the Strategic Plan. The project's RRF includes at least one SP output indicator, if relevant. (both must be true)
- 1: While the project may respond to a partner's identified need, this need falls outside the UNDP Strategic Plan. Also select this option if none of the relevant SP indicators are included in the RRF.

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

The project responds to UNDP Strategic Plan 2022-2025 Signature solutions: resilience, environment and energy. Please see ProDoc section V Results Framework (attached under question 1) The activities of the project are fully aligned with the Climate Promise framework and its Pillar 1 Clean energy and just transition towards net-zero pathways and its global outputs: 1.1 Driving investment in clean energy; 1.2 Support to Ministries of Energy, Finance, Environment and Planning to address key energy-related decisions towards just transition; and 1.3 Alignment of energy targets in NDCs with net-zero pathways.

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)
- (selected) 2: Targeted groups were engaged in implementation and monitoring, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized. Beneficiary feedback, which may be anecdotal, was collected regularly to ensure the project addressed local priorities. This information was used to inform project decision making. (all must be true to select this option)
- 1: Some beneficiary feedback may have been collected, but this information did not inform project decision making. This option should also be selected if no beneficiary feedback was collected
- Not Applicable

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

The project applies inclusiveness and the "leaving no one behind" approach and, takes special interests of vulnerable and marginalized groups into account directly through output 1 of project which enables access to clean and affordable energy for vulnerable population and output 3 Strengthened national capacities for monitoring and reducing the energy poverty and vulnerable consumers. UNDP applied the gender equality principle to ensure that initiatives contribute to gender equality and to increase the likelihood of women's led initiatives to participate in the competition. In particular Challenge call was designed not only in a way that provides equal opportunities for women but to stimulate their interest and encourage their participation. All awarded projects demonstrated gender equality considerations and impact. Dissemination activities ensured that best practices promoting women engagement in climate change action were part of the visibility campaign, including 6 workshops to motivate other women to consider engaging in similar actions. Three awarded projects directly contributed to new green jobs for women, total of twenty three new green jobs for women.

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)

Project was designed building on the lessons learned of the previous projects implemented by UNDP in Serbia, such as Climate Smart Urban Development (CSUD), Capacity Building Initiative for Transparency (CBIT), and Second Biannual and Third National Communication (2BUR-3NC), Just Green Transition and Decarbonization in Serbia in line with the country's priorities, as per the Country Programme Document. In the inception phase, the project team undertook a review of the project in terms of new opportunities and changes in the development context. The Project Framework and Indicators were designed during the project implementation and were approved by PSC in August 2023 (and applied in the latest progress report).
https://www.undp.org/serbia/projects/innovative-and-just-green-transition-tool-securing-systemic-energy-security-and-reducing-energy-poverty

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

- (selected) 3: There was credible evidence that the project reached sufficient number of beneficiaries (either directly through significant coverage of target groups, or indirectly, through policy change) to meaningfully contribute to development change.
- 2: While the project was not considered at scale, there are explicit plans in place to scale up the project in the future (e.g. by extending its coverage or using project results to advocate for policy change).
- 1: The project was not at scale, and there are no plans to scale up the project in the future.

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

The Project supported Government`s efforts against the energy poverty from the current energy crisis, by enabling affordable and clean energy for vulnerable population. The project organized/implemented comprehensive national and local stakeholder dialogues process on just transition in communities and regions most affected by increased climate ambition, reskilling of the workforce, as well as adjusting the education and social services in line with the green economy transformation.
UNDP became a member of the Government working group on just transition, which are gathering relevant national partners for developing Action Plan for Just Transition in Serbia. Based on the EBRD study "Diagnostic Study of Just Transition in Serbia with Action plan" and UNDP and other WG member`s comments, the Government is currently finalizing Action Plan. Furthermore, building on results of JSB2 project, Serbia became a part of regional initiative for further programming and unlocking the funds that could ensure timely policy implementation with the Just Transition action.
The successfully implemented pilot investments confirm the strong interest of both public and corporate sector in investing in low-carbon and green solutions. A particularly huge gap is revealed between green and standard commercial bank financing packages for the industry sector. Therefore, it is necessary to unlock access to finance for green investments and explore possibilities for blending donor`s funds and private capital with the IFIs, commercial banks, other donor funding, budgetary resources etc, which is potential for scale up activities in the future.

The Project implemented UNDP's Challenge Call mechanism for capacity building and guided mentorship, with the technical support for project development and co-financing of pilot project investments through Performance-based Payment Agreements.

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)

As mentioned in question 3, the project prepared gender responsive methodologies, procedures, screening tools and guidelines to assist sectorial technical planners and end users in integrating gender sensitive adaptation in national and sectorial plans and budgets. The project team monitored the share of women and men who were direct project beneficiaries, please see attachment under question 3 for more information.

7. Were social and environmental impacts and risks successfully managed and monitored?

- (selected) 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)

Two out of three project outputs directly support resilience and sustainability of societies and ecosystems: 1. Innovative business models that reduce import dependency, diversify electricity generation mix, reduce energy intensity of the economy or enable access to clean and affordable energy for vulnerable population, intended for individual households (prosumers), public and private business sector, identified and deployed and 2. Strengthened national capacities for monitoring and reducing the energy poverty and vulnerable consumers. By energy diversification and improved energy efficiency, the project will further accelerate green business transformation thus ensuring their sustainability and maintain stability of job markets. Project has not experienced neither unanticipated social and environmental risks nor grievances.

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)
- (selected) 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)

Project did not experience any unanticipated social and/or environmental risks or grievances during the project implementation.

Management & Monitoring | Status: Complete | Quality Rating: Exemplary

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

3: The project had a comprehensive and costed M&E plan. Baselines, targets and milestones were fully populated. Progress data against indicators in the project's RRF was reported regularly using credible data sources and collected according to the frequency stated in the Plan, including sex disaggregated data as relevant. Any evaluations conducted, if relevant, fully meet decentralized evaluation standards, including gender UNEG standards. Lessons learned, included during evaluations and/or After-Action Reviews, were used to take corrective actions when necessary. (all must be true)

2: The project costed M&E Plan, and most baselines and targets were populated. Progress data against indicators in the project's RRF was collected on a regular basis, although there was may be some slippage in following the frequency stated in the Plan and data sources was not always reliable. Any evaluations conducted, if relevant, met most decentralized evaluation standards. Lessons learned were captured but were used to take corrective actions. (all must be true)

1: The project had M&E Plan, but costs were not clearly planned and budgeted for, or were unrealistic. Progress data was not regularly collected against the indicators in the project's RRF. Evaluations did not meet decentralized evaluation standards. Lessons learned were rarely captured and used. Select this option also if the project did not have an M&E plan.

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

The project costed M&E work plan, based on the standard UNDP requirements, including clear identification of responsibilities and accountabilities, which was revisited and endorsed during the project inception phase. Progress data against indicators is being reported regularly (biannually to the donor) using credible data sources and collected according to the frequency stated in the Plan, including sex disaggregated data as relevant. Moreover, the project monitoring and evaluation budget supported the collection of gender disaggregated data that are being collected by the project. Please see Final Narrative Report attached under question 3.

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

3: The project's governance mechanism operated well, and was a model for other projects. It met in the agreed frequency stated in the project document and the minutes of the meetings were all on file. There was regular (at least annual) progress reporting to the project board or equivalent on results, risks and opportunities. It is clear that the project board explicitly reviewed and used evidence, including progress data, knowledge, lessons and evaluations, as the basis for informing management decisions (e.g., change in strategy, approach, work plan.) (all must be true to select this option)

2: The project's governance mechanism met in the agreed frequency and minutes of the meeting are on file. A project progress report was submitted to the project board or equivalent at least once per year, covering results, risks and opportunities. (both must be true to select this option)

1: The project's governance mechanism did not meet in the frequency stated in the project document over the past year and/or the project board or equivalent was not functioning as a decision-making body for the project as intended.

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

The project’s governance mechanism is defined in the project document. The Project Steering Committee (PSC) will provided overall guidance and was responsible for making management decisions for the project. It was a critical role in project monitoring and evaluation by assuring the quality of these processes and associated products, and by feeding in learned lessons into the project implementation for improved performance, accountability and learning. The Project Steering Committee ensured that required resources are committed. Based on the approved Annual Work Plan, the Project Steering Committee reviewed and approved the quarterly plans as well as any substantive deviations from the original plans. Members of the Project Steering Committee: the Ministry of Mining and Energy, the Ministry of Environmental Protection and UNDP and they met at twice during project implementation period of one year. UNDP established a Project Implementation Unit (PIU) comprising permanent staff

including Project Manager (PM), Project Coordination Associate. The PM was responsible for overall project management, coordination of project activities with relevant government institutions and held regular consultations with other project stakeholders and partners, including UNDP's relevant projects. Quarterly Progress reports were submitted to the HQ Climate Promise JSB 2 Project Implementation Unit.
Please see PSC minutes attached under question 1.

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)

Risks were monitored regularly, proposing adjustment to the management plan and mitigation measures. Risk monitoring included review of risks in the inception phase as documented in Final Narrative Report, review of risks in the field monitoring exercise and updating of risk logs in Quantum, raising new risks and providing management responses.

Efficient	Status: Complete	Quality Rating: Exemplary

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

- (selected) Yes
- No

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

Project has sufficient resources to achieve planned results. Please see AWPs attached.

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

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

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

Annual procurement plan prepared through the UNDP global procurement platform that was updated on regular basis, to accommodate bottlenecks as necessary. Implementation of the plans was generally in line with the schedule, so that goods and services were delivered in a timely manner.

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

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

1: There is little or no evidence that the project monitored its own costs and considered ways to save money beyond following standard procurement rules.

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

The project regularly reviewed costs against relevant comparators, such as other projects, especially in regard to the CO Serbia organization, where costs were shared across portfolio of projects. In line with the office standard operating procedures, project uses LTAs and rosters for better efficiency of procurement processes. Apart from coordination and use of synergies in implementation of activities with related UNDP projects, such as the EU for Green Agenda in Serbia, the project also cooperated with numerous relevant organizations, such as the Standing Conference of Towns and Municipalities. Cooperation with these organizations, which have strong existing networks among key stakeholder groups, and that support the project in using their premises, allows the project to maximize its resources. For regular internal monitoring reports, please see attached field monitoring reports and Final Narrative Report attached under question 3.

Effective	Status: Complete	Quality Rating: Exemplary

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

- (selected) Yes
- No

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

The project delivered its expected outputs. Please see the Final Narrative Report uploaded under question 3, Quarterly Progress Reports under question 10 and Field Monitoring Reports under question 14.

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)

In line with the UNDP CO policies, the project had regular reviews of the work plan with senior management, with a view to assessing if project activities were on track to achieving the envisaged results, and when possible, lessons learned were used to adjust the work plan. Field monitoring exercise performed by the UNDP CO was used for ensuring efficient project management implementation and capturing lessons learned. Moreover, the project conducted regular reviews and consultations with national partners in order to ensure achievement of desired results and maximizing of the impact. Also, the project implementation team was in constant communication with the Ministry of Environmental Protection, as a member of the PSC.

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)

Given its cross-cutting nature, the project was focused on both capacity building and enabling environment for climate change adaptation implementation, but also on developing documents and other tools that would assist not only decision makers but also wider audience. Apart from organization of local and national dialogues for Just Green Transition and energy poverty that gathered representatives of local self-government and representatives of national institutions and civil sector, the project also supported Ministry of mining and energy in analysis of available solutions for Just transition of the energy sector and reduction of energy poverty, including development of recommendations for these topics. As previously mentioned, the project organized local and National dialogues with focus on change-related issues with all state stakeholders from relevant ministries, as well as experts in various fields. Conclusions of the dialogues serve as inputs for recommendations for the preparation of the legislative framework for the just green transition process in Serbia, with a focus on the social dimension representatives of local and national institutions, civil sector, and academia, also gathered international finance institutions, representatives of embassies and other international organizations and UN agencies. Please refer to the Final Narrative Report attached under question 3.

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)

Although the project did not develop a standalone digital platform, data and knowledge management aspects were addressed in line with UNDP standards. Project-generated analyses, surveys, reports, methodologies, and monitoring recommendations were documented and shared with relevant institutions to support continued use, policy development, and future scalability of project results and approaches.

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)

Although this was DIM implementation project, national systems were used in combination with UNDP country office support to implement and monitor the project (through procurement, monitoring, regular consultations), as appropriate and needed. In line with Project document and UNDP country office standards national implementing partner is represented by the PSC and play an active role in project decision making, implementation and monitoring. Please see PSC minutes under question 1

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?

- (selected) 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)

Capacity assessment of national partners was undertaken, as well as a thorough analysis of current situation of the sectors in Serbia. Existing barriers, needs and options were discussed in consultations with all relevant stakeholder institutions. The project’s objectives and activities are based on national priorities and a series of national legislative and strategic documents in the sector of energy.

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)

The project was on track in meeting the requirements set out by the Project Document and project implementation plan. Apart from Ministry of Mining and Energy, Ministry of Environment, project close cooperation was established with other national partners, such as Standing Conference of Towns and Municipalities, contributing thus to strong national ownership. Financial commitments were being reviewed monthly. Financial planning tool had been regularly updated. Project was on track in meeting the requirements set out by the Project Document.

The PSC were regularly organized, whose members regularly review the sustainability plan, including arrangements for transition and phase out to ensure the project is on track. The plan was adjusted according to the implementation timeline developed at the beginning of the project implementation and progress. Financial planning tool was regularly updated.