ASM-19016 - Quality Assurance - Closure

Procedure Year: 2025

Procedure Rating: Satisfactory

Procedure Status: Approved

Procedure Name: ASM-19016

Procedure Department: CO - Georgia - Tbilisi

Procedure Type: Closure

Record Owner: Ivane Shamugia

Created by: Ivane Shamugia,12/25/2025, 3:29 AM

Last Modified by: Nils CHRISTENSEN,12/28/2025, 9:29 AM

Portofolio/Project Type: Project

RELATED PORTFOLIOS/PROJECTS (1)

NAME	PORTOFOLIO/PROJECT NAME	DEPARTMENT	STATUS	ATLAS PROJECT NUMBER	START DATE	END DATE
01002860	JP Strengthening SDG localization in Georgia	CO - Georgia - Tbilisi	Financially Closed		7/10/2024	7/10/2025

Approval Information

Approval Date: Sun Dec 28 00:00:00 GMT 2025

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

APPROVAL HISTORY

STEP NAME	DATE	STATUS	ASSIGNED TO
Submitted for Approval	2025-12-28 09:29:13	Approved	Nils CHRISTENSEN
Approval Request Submitted	2025-12-26 09:31:20	Started	George Nanobashvili

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?

- (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)

Civil unrest in Georgia has caused logistical challenges, particularly in communication and organizing activities including visibility of the Joint programme. The JP team has adapted by using virtual platforms for engagement and adjusting work schedules. Monitoring the situation and updating the workplan is essential. In the reporting period, effective monitoring of JP's implementation was provided by the Programme technical Steering Committee (PSC) in close coordination with the UN RC Office. As of 31 December 2024, in total four meetings were organized comprising of designated JP coordinators from UNDP, UNICEF and FAO to analyze the programme progress and discuss jointly any issues and/or relevant actions to be taken for further project implementation.

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)

UNDP, FAO and UNICEF JP "Strengthening SDG Localization in Georgia" enabled a collective response to propel the three out of six SDG transitions (digital transformation, food systems, and decent jobs and universal social protection) through the 2 'engine room' actions (shifts across policy and regulatory frameworks and capacity building at scale). The Joint Programme interventions are built on the strategic opportunity to unite efforts in the pursuit of SDG localization in Georgia and is expected to contribute to accelerating SDGs 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 12 as well as to UNSDCF Georgia's "Outcome 1: By 2025, all people in Georgia enjoy improved good governance, more open, resilient and accountable institutions, rule of law, equal access to justice, human rights, and increased representation and participation of women in decision making (output 1.1"; "Outcome 2: By 2025, all people in Georgia have equitable and inclusive access to quality, resilient and gender-sensitive services delivered in accordance with international human rights standards (output 2.3.) and "Outcome 3: By 2025, all people without discrimination benefit from a sustainable, inclusive and resilient economy in Georgia (output 3.2).

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)

JP supported the target municipalities to strengthen their policies, programmes and services to ensure the well-being of different socially vulnerable groups. Improved services for vulnerable groups especially children, women and youth - and the promotion of sustainable food systems transformation, remained as one of the main focuses of the Joint Programme.

By building the knowledge of young people, especially from the remote villages across the Administrative Boarder lines and municipal social workforce on SDG localization, the project has fostered youth participation in local decision-making and encouraged initiatives addressing community needs, such as library modernization and environmental protection. At the same time, targeted capacity development for municipal staff through needs assessment trainings, the development of a digital portal, child-centered budget analysis and child-centered social services mapping has equipped local governments with tools to identify gaps in education, health, and social services and to plan more inclusive, evidence-based programs ensuring that the specific needs of children are better reflected in public finance decisions. Inter-municipal dialogues have further strengthened the potential to address inequalities, as municipalities jointly explore cost-effective solutions—such as pooled procurement of school supplies and preventive medical screenings—that expand access for children from vulnerable families.

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)

SDG implementation is an effective convergence point between challenges and opportunities at all levels, as well as public-private partnerships, businesses and community needs. Joint Programmes have the potential to identify a wide array of policy options in response to the development challenges influenced by the unique political, economic, and social contexts; JPs, therefore, can generate innovative solutions for accelerating progress towards the 2030 Agenda with a focus on scaling-up the capacity of local partners and promoting the potential of SDG delivery at the local level as well as strengthening the national delivery system on SDGs. The Joint Programme team has collected and documented lessons learned and shared with the UN Joint SDG Fund.

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 seed funding provided through the Joint SDG Fund has served as a valuable catalyst for integrated local action in support of the 2030 Agenda in the Georgian municipalities. The JP’s strong track record is the most compelling evidence, which demonstrates a promising potential of scale-up that is replicable and transferable to other municipalities of Georgia. Voluntary Local Reviews (VLRs) have become JP’s flagship initiative to support institutional development of the Georgian cities and municipalities as a result of which strong commitments from the national and local government counterparts have been obtained and viable pathways for expansion secured.

Principled	Status: Complete	Quality Rating: Satisfactory

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

3: The project team has systematically gathered data and evidence through project monitoring on the relevance of the measures to address gender inequalities and empower women. Analysis of data and evidence were used to inform adjustments and changes, as appropriate. (both must be true)

2: The project team had some data and evidence on the relevance of the measures to address gender inequalities and empower women. There is evidence that at least some adjustments were made, as appropriate. (both must be true)

1: The project team had limited or no evidence on the relevance of measures to address gender inequalities and empowering women. No evidence of adjustments and/or changes made. This option should also be selected if the project has no measures to address gender inequalities and empower women relevant to the project results and activities.

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

The Joint Programme was marked as GEN2, therefore, gender related issues were considered in every stage of an activity, from planning to implementation and dissemination. The Joint Programme prioritized participatory and community-based development, firmly integrating the principles of gender mainstreaming and leaving no one behind, consistent with established SDG localization practices. The programme support concentrated on developing equitable and inclusive access to quality and gender-sensitive services, including rural women and youth. Tailored initiatives such as needs-based social programming and innovative inclusion systems and tools applied to holistically address their distinct needs. A needs-based, child-centered social programming methodology developed which included gender-sensitive assessment tools that capture the specific needs and satisfaction levels of women and girls through disaggregated data. The JP has been focusing on gender-responsive workshops and collaborating with Gender Specialists to increase women's leadership in food systems governance and other areas. The JP supported updates to Municipal Waste Management Plans, introducing the five-level food waste hierarchy in line with Georgia's new Law and mainstreaming gender to ensure equity and inclusion.

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 JP has adequately implemented environmental and social standards/safeguards to avoid and address adverse impacts on people and the planet. The JP is implemented with due consideration of environmental and social standards.

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)

Project-affected people have been informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism and how to access it. Grievances have not been received.

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

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)

All activities envisaged within the programme were implemented successfully, monitored by PSC.

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)
- (selected) 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)

Effective monitoring of JP's implementation was provided by the Programme Steering Committee (PSC) in close coordination with the UN RC Office. PSC meetings were organized comprising of designated JP coordinators from UNDP, UNICEF and FAO to analyze the programme progress and discuss jointly any issues and/or relevant actions to be taken for further project implementation. PSC meetings were also attended by representatives of the Ministry of Regional Development and Infrastructure (MRDI), SDG Secretariat, Administration of Government of Georgia, as well as representatives of target local governments and National Association of Local Authorities of Georgia.

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)
- (selected) 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 JP performance and risks were monitored against the JP results framework indicators as evidenced by the templates provided by the UN Join SDG Fund.

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)

Adequate resources have been mobilized to achieve 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 JP was a 12 months programme (2024-2025) focused on two Georgian municipalities, to enhance local stakeholder capacities and advance inclusive, resilient, and sustainable local development by accelerating progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG). The project regularly reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addresses them through appropriate management actions

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 JP coordinated activities withing UNDP FAO and UNICEF projects to achieve cost efficiency gains.

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)

The Joint Programme has delivered its expected outputs, reports with respective sources for verification were submitted to the Joint SDG Fund in September, 2025.

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)
- [x] 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)

There has been at least one review of the work plan per year to assess if project activities are on track to achieving the desired development results (i.e., outputs.).

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?

- [x] 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)

Meaningful and equal participation of women and those, who are left behind was crucial for the Joint programme. To ensure inclusiveness and equitable progress, the JP concentrated on those who have traditionally been left behind, especially in rural areas, and aimed to empower groups, living in vulnerable situations: children, women and youth. Tailored initiatives, information campaigns, needs-based programming, youth and women's equal participation and engagement, and local capacity building, digital solutions for quality service delivery applied to holistically address their distinct needs. JP-supported interventions have been prioritized to support the establishment of monitoring and reporting systems that bring local communities, minorities, and vulnerable groups closer to decision-making and help create a more transparent and inclusive policy-making process.

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?

- [x] 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)

JP will take into account the gender digital divide in its efforts for digital inclusion. Key results achieved with other UN agencies in support of the progress toward the SDGs and national development goals include: (1) a needs-based, child-centered social programming methodology and Digital Needs Assessment Portal (www.social.nala.ge) developed and launched in collaboration with the National Association of Local Authorities of Georgia (NALAG) enabling municipalities to collect, analyze, and compare data on children's needs across regions.

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 (selected)

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

The project was directly implemented by UNDP. However, representatives of the Ministry of Regional Development and Infrastructure (MRDI), SDG Secretariat, Administration of Government of Georgia, as well as representatives of target local governments and National Association of Local Authorities of Georgia - were fully and actively engaged in the process, playing an active role in project decision-making, implementation and monitoring.

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) (selected)
- 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)

Changes in capacities and performance of institutions and systems have been comprehensively assessed/monitored using clear indicators, rigorous methods of data collection and credible data sources.

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) (selected)
- 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)

Examples of the JP interventions that have demonstrated good practices and being replicated by other municipalities include, Child-centered budget analysis (CCBA) framework introduced in collaboration with the International School of Economics (ISET); Digital Needs Assessment Portal (www.social.nala.ge) developed and launched in collaboration with the National Association of Local Authorities of Georgia; Adoption of Municipal Waste Management Plans (2023-2027) introducing the five-level food waste hierarchy in line with Georgia’s new Law on Food Loss and Waste Reduction and mainstreaming gender to ensure equity and inclusion; and the Action-Oriented Voluntary Local Reviews (VLRs), showcasing the advantages of the VLR design process as a creator of demand for strategic innovation and strengthened capacities, and as a mechanism for ensuring a more robust buy-in of the government as well as for opting partnerships with local stakeholders. The JP event at the Regional Forum for Sustainable Development, held in June 2025, highlighted how multilevel governance and cross agency collaboration can drive meaningful local implementation of the SDGs. The Final Event of the JP took place on 25 June 2025. UN Resident Coordinator, UNDP Resident Representative, and UNICEF and FAO representatives undertook a field visit to see how global goals transform into real, local impact.