

Procedure Year: 2026

Procedure Status: Approved

Procedure Department: CO - Tajikistan - Dushanbe

Record Owner: Yusufjon Kholov

Created by: Yusufjon Kholov,3/11/2026, 6:41 AM

Procedure Rating: Satisfactory

Procedure Name: ASM-19943

Procedure Type: Closure

Last Modified by: Lazima Onta-Bhatta,3/17/2026, 7:55 AM

Portofolio/Project Type: Project

RELATED PORTFOLIOS/PROJECTS (1)

NAME	PORTOFOLIO/PROJECT NAME	DEPARTMENT	STATUS	ATLAS PROJECT NUMBER	START DATE	END DATE
01003139	Youth Employment Support (YES) Program (PIP)	CO - Tajikistan - Dushanbe	Financially Closed		9/17/2024	3/18/2026

Approval Information

Approval Date: Tue Mar 17 00:00:00 GMT 2026

Approved By: Lazima Onta-Bhatta
<lazima.ontabhatta@undp.org>

APPROVAL HISTORY

STEP NAME	DATE	STATUS	ASSIGNED TO
Submitted for Approval	2026-03-17 07:55:44	Approved	Lazima Onta-Bhatta
Approval Request Submitted	2026-03-17 04:39:52	Started	Qosimjon Ismoilov

QA Questionnaire:

Strategic

Status: Complete

Quality Rating: 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 identified relevant changes in the external environment affecting youth employment in Tajikistan, including the persistent mismatch between graduates’ skills and labour market demands, increasing digitalization of workplaces, and socio-cultural barriers limiting young women’s participation in employment. In response, the project adapted implementation

approaches by strengthening partnerships with private sector employers, introducing pre-internship soft skills training, and expanding digital outreach and remote learning opportunities to improve accessibility for youth, including those in rural areas.

Please refer to the project report

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 aligns with the UNDP Strategic Plan by contributing to the development priority of inclusive economic growth and employment generation, particularly through strengthening youth employability and facilitating access to the labour market. The project focused on enhancing employability skills, providing structured internships, and fostering partnerships with private sector employers in sectors such as finance, ICT, and innovation, thereby supporting youth transition from education to employment. These interventions directly address unemployment and skills mismatch challenges faced by young people in Tajikistan and contribute to broader UNDP objectives related to sustainable livelihoods and economic opportunities.

Please refer to the attached PIP.

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 project engaged targeted youth beneficiaries throughout implementation, with particular attention to inclusivity and gender equality. The programme prioritized participation of young women and aimed to include persons with disabilities, while outreach activities through universities, digital platforms, and career development sessions ensured access to internship opportunities for diverse youth groups, including those from different regions. Interns were regularly contacted through monitoring visits, phone calls, and coordination with host institutions, allowing the project team to collect feedback on internship experiences and implementation challenges and adjust support mechanisms accordingly.

Please refer to the Project's Progress Report.

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

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

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

The project generated lessons learned during implementation through monitoring activities, feedback from interns and host institutions, and analysis of employment outcomes. These insights informed adjustments such as strengthening pre-internship soft skills training, expanding partnerships with private sector employers, and increasing the use of digital outreach and online learning modalities to reach youth in rural areas and address barriers to participation.

Please refer to the Project's Progress Report.

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

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

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

The project reached a significant number of beneficiaries relative to its scope and budget, directly supporting 356 internship placements with 347 youth successfully completing the programme, including strong participation of women, and facilitating employment for 301 graduates in sectors such as banking, ICT, and management. In addition, over 400 young people benefited from employability and soft skills development activities, while partnerships with multiple private sector institutions and universities expanded opportunities for youth to transition from education to employment.

Principled	Status: Complete	Quality Rating: Satisfactory
------------	------------------	------------------------------

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

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

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

The project incorporated gender-responsive measures by prioritizing women's participation in internship placements and capacity-building activities, targeting 60% female participation among beneficiaries and successfully engaging a significant

number of young women in internships and subsequent employment opportunities. Monitoring data collected during implementation tracked participation and employment outcomes disaggregated by gender, demonstrating strong female representation among interns and employed graduates.

In addition, the project adapted certain implementation approaches, including promoting remote learning and digital training opportunities, to address social and cultural constraints that limit women's participation in the workforce.

Please refer to the Project's Progress Report.

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 presented relatively low social and environmental risks given its focus on capacity development, internships, and employability support rather than infrastructure or environmentally sensitive activities. Relevant risks were monitored through the project risk register, which identified implementation challenges such as limited job opportunities and skills mismatches, and mitigation measures were implemented through strengthened partnerships with employers and targeted training interventions. Given the nature of the activities, no significant environmental impacts were expected, and project implementation focused primarily on social inclusion, including engagement of young women and disadvantaged youth. As such, the project falls within the low-risk category under UNDP Social and Environmental Standards, and monitoring and mitigation measures were applied proportionately to the project's risk profile.

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)

The project maintained regular communication with beneficiaries and host institutions through monitoring visits, phone follow-ups, and coordination with company focal points and HR departments, which enabled interns to raise concerns related to internship conditions, stipend payments, or implementation issues. These interactions allowed the project team to address operational challenges in a timely manner and ensure appropriate support to participants during the internship period. No grievances or cases of harm were reported during implementation, and issues raised by beneficiaries were addressed through routine project monitoring and coordination mechanisms

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

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

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

The project implemented monitoring and evaluation activities through regular tracking of internship placements, employment outcomes, and participation in training activities, with data collected from host institutions and project monitoring processes. Progress against indicators such as the number of youth completing internships and securing employment was documented, including gender-disaggregated data, and monitoring activities included site visits, phone follow-ups, and review of implementation reports.

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

- ☐ 3: The project's governance mechanism operated well, and was a model for other projects. It met in the agreed frequency stated in the project document and the minutes of the meetings were all on file. There was regular (at least annual) progress reporting to the project board or equivalent on results, risks and opportunities. It is clear that the project board explicitly reviewed and used evidence, including progress data, knowledge, lessons and evaluations, as the basis for informing management decisions (e.g., change in strategy, approach, work plan.) (all must be true to select this option)
- ☒ 2: The project's governance mechanism met in the agreed frequency and minutes of the meeting are on file. A project progress report was submitted to the project board or equivalent at least once per year, covering results, risks and opportunities. (both must be true to select this option)
- ☐ 1: The project's governance mechanism did not meet in the frequency stated in the project document over the past year and/or the project board or equivalent was not functioning as a decision-making body for the project as intended.

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

The project governance mechanism worked well as intended. As the project was directly implemented by the UNDP Country Office, overall oversight and strategic guidance were provided through UNDP's internal governance structure. The project was anchored within the Governance and Sustainable Economic Development Cluster under the supervision of the Cluster Team Leader, while operational management, administrative, and financial support were ensured through UNDP's existing programme and operations teams, including the Finance Unit and Programme Management Support Unit. Implementation was carried out in collaboration with relevant partners, including the Aga Khan Foundation acting as the Responsible Party for the youth internship programme. UNDP senior management also provided strategic direction and supported partnership development, including engagement with development partners to

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

- ☐ 3: The project monitored risks every quarter and consulted with the key stakeholders, security advisors, to identify continuing and emerging risks to assess if the main assumptions remained valid. There is clear evidence that relevant management plans and mitigating measures were fully implemented to address each key project risk and were updated to reflect the latest risk assessment. (all must be true)
- ☒ 2: The project monitored risks every year, as evidenced by an updated risk log. Some updates were made to management plans and mitigation measures.
- ☐ 1: The risk log was not updated as required. There 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)

Project risks were identified and monitored during implementation through the project risk register, which highlighted key risks such as limited job opportunities and the mismatch between graduates' skills and labour market demands. Mitigation measures were implemented, including strengthening partnerships with host institutions and employers to expand internship placements and integrating targeted soft skills training to better prepare interns for the labour market. The risk log was updated and mitigation measures were applied during the project lifecycle

Please see APR table on project risks

Efficient

Status: Complete

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

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

- ☒ Yes
☐ No

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

The project had sufficient resources to implement planned activities and achieve its intended results. With a total budget of USD 210,500 funded through UNDP TRAC and TRAC 2 resources, the project successfully delivered key outputs including the facilitation of 356 internship opportunities, completion of internships by 347 youth, and employment of 301 graduates, alongside capacity-building activities that reached over 400 young people.

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

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

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

Project inputs were delivered in a timely and efficient manner, in accordance with UNDP procurement and financial procedures. The use of UNDP's established operational systems, including support from the Finance Unit and Programme Management Support Unit, ensured that procurement processes, contracting of partners, and delivery of required services were completed as planned.

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

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

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

The project monitored financial delivery and expenditure throughout implementation, ensuring that available resources were used efficiently. Financial monitoring included review of delivery rates and implementation progress, while operational coordination with host institutions and training partners helped optimize the use of resources and avoid duplication of efforts.

Effective

Status: Complete

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

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

- ☒ Yes
☐ No

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

Please refer to the attached Project Report.

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

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

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

The project implementation progress and activities were periodically reviewed to ensure that planned activities were progressing as expected. Monitoring activities, including site visits, communication with interns and host institutions, and review of implementation and financial reports, allowed the project team to assess progress and address operational challenges when necessary.

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

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

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

The project targeted youth, particularly recent graduates and NEET youth, with attention to gender inclusion and participation of persons with disabilities. Outreach activities through universities, digital platforms, and regional career development sessions were used to reach youth in different regions and facilitate access to internship opportunities in sectors such as finance, ICT, and management.

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 focused primarily on capacity development, internship placements, and employability support for youth through partnerships with private sector institutions and universities. Activities included outreach campaigns, pre-internship training, internship facilitation, and monitoring of employment outcomes, rather than the development or deployment of a dedicated digital platform or data technology solution. While digital channels and social media were used for outreach and communication, these tools supported project implementation rather than constituting a core technology solution requiring specific digital sustainability or data risk management measures at closure.

Sustainability & National Ownership

Status: Complete

Quality Rating: **Satisfactory**

19. Were stakeholders and national partners fully engaged in the decision-making, implementation and monitoring of the project?

- ☐ 3: Only national systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) were used to fully implement and monitor the project. All relevant stakeholders and partners were fully and actively engaged in the process, playing a lead role in project decision-making, implementation and monitoring. (both must be true)
- ☒ 2: National systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) were used to implement and monitor the project (such as country office support or project systems) were also used, if necessary. All relevant stakeholders and partners were actively engaged in the process, playing an active role in project decision-making, implementation and monitoring. (both must be true)
- ☐ 1: There was relatively limited or no engagement with national stakeholders and partners in the decision-making, implementation and/or monitoring of the project.
- ☐ Not Applicable

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

The project was implemented through active collaboration with national stakeholders, including private sector employers, universities, and training institutions, which played an important role in internship placement, capacity-building activities, and monitoring of participants' progress. Partnerships with host organizations such as financial institutions, ICT companies, and innovation-oriented enterprises enabled the creation of internship opportunities and supported supervision and evaluation of interns during implementation. Universities and training providers also contributed to outreach, preparation of candidates, and delivery of employability training.

While national partners were actively engaged in implementation and monitoring of project activities, project management and operational functions were supported by UNDP project systems.

20. Were there regular monitoring of changes in capacities and performance of institutions and systems relevant to the project, as needed, and were the implementation arrangements⁸ adjusted according to changes in partner capacities?

- ☐ 3: Changes in capacities and performance of national institutions and systems were assessed/monitored using clear indicators, rigorous methods of data collection and credible data sources including relevant HACT assurance activities. Implementation arrangements were formally reviewed and adjusted, if needed, in agreement with partners according to changes in partner capacities. (all must be true)
- ☐ 2: Aspects of changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems were monitored by the project using indicators and reasonably credible data sources including relevant HACT assurance activities. Some adjustment was made to implementation arrangements if needed to reflect changes in partner capacities. (all must be true)
- ☐ 1: Some aspects of changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems were monitored by the project, however changes to implementation arrangements were not considered. Also select this option if changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems were not monitored by the project.
- ☒ Not Applicable

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

The project was implemented under the Direct Implementation Modality and focused primarily on delivering internship placements, capacity-building activities, and partnerships with private sector entities rather than strengthening or transferring

institutional capacities of a designated implementing partner. While coordination with stakeholders such as employers and universities was maintained throughout implementation, these relationships were operational rather than institutional capacity development arrangements.

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

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

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

The project incorporated sustainability considerations by strengthening partnerships with private sector employers, universities, and training institutions to support continued internship and employment opportunities for youth beyond the project lifecycle. Collaboration with host institutions and the Coalition of Employers helped establish practical mechanisms for linking graduates to labour market opportunities and sustaining internship pathways through institutional partnerships. Monitoring of internship outcomes and engagement with employers during implementation also helped ensure that project activities remained aligned with labour market needs and could continue beyond the project period.