

Procedure Year: 2023

Overall Project Risk Categorization: ● Satisfactory

Procedure Status: Approved

Procedure Name: ASM-01446

Procedure Department: CO - Pakistan - Islamabad

Procedure Type: Implementation

Decision:

QA Summary/Project Board Comments:

RELATED PROJECTS(1)					
NAME	DEPARTMENT	STATUS	ATLAS PROJECT NUMBER	START DATE	END DATE
00126882	CO - Pakistan - Islamabad	On Going	00135717	7/1/2021	6/30/2024

APPROVAL HISTORY			
STEP NAME	DATE	STATUS	ASSIGNED TO
Submitted for Approval	2023-11-01 06:41:06	Approved	Thi Ngoc Van NGUYEN
Approval Request Submitted	2023-11-01 00:14:35	Started	Liu Wen

Identified Risks & Treatments

Category: 8. Safety and Security

Risk Significance: ■ Low

Risk Significance: ■ Low

Sub-Category: 8.8 Cyber security and threats

Event:

If there is not a digital or data technology solution in place in the project,

Causes:

Identify from QA question: 18. If there is a digital or data technology solution in the project: is the implementation in line with good practices to manage technology and data risks, like UNDP's digital standards and data principles

Description:

Impact:

then the implementation in line with good practices to manage technology and data risks would be difficult, like UNDP's digital standards and data principles.

QA Questionnaire:

Strategic

Status: Complete

Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory

1. Is the project pro-actively identifying changes to the external environment and incorporating 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.

***Note: Risk management must be done for criteria with score of 1.**

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

The project has invested in a number of assessments that inform the project strategy and risk mitigation measures including CSA (Control Self-Assessment) Risk Assessment; national viral load assessment; national HIV gender assessment; Legal and Environmental Assessment; National Assessment of HIV (which was UNDP's mid-term assessment). Under the current grant, the project has incorporated and implemented identified changes in activities where possible through the Global Fund (GF) approved re-programming budget (attached), including project activities proposed to support flood affected areas in Sindh province following the 2022 floods in Pakistan; Installation of Oxygen Generation Plants at Public Hospitals project under COVID-19 activities, which includes working on building the national capacity to handle this supply chain in future.(this is a separate UNDP GF funded project) Post-flood emergency response for persons living with HIV (PLHIVs) have been proposed for flood affected areas of Sindh, and proposed activities include renovation of 20 flood affected ART centres in Sindh, equipment support to flood-affected ART centers and health facilities in Sindh, provision of health commodities, LEDs, water dispensers and other equipment, in addition to provision of hygiene and sanitation kits for PLHIVs, pediatric nutritional support, and provision of safe drinking water (by providing aqua-tablets for purification of drinking water for affected communities. Also attached are post-flood response proposal (E1) document and budget. (E2)

2. Is the project aligned with the UNDP 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.

***Note: Risk management must be done for criteria with score of 1.**

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

*The project is well-aligned with the thematic focus of the UNDP Strategic Plan and contributes to the SP output 1.2.1 "Capacities at national and sub-national levels strengthened to promote inclusive local economic development and deliver basic services, including HIV and related services". It also adapts Signature Solution 2: Strengthen effective, inclusive, and accountable governance. Towards achievement of SP output 1.2.1, the project reports on the IRRF Indicator: Number of people who have access to HIV and related services, disaggregated by sex and type of service:

a) Behavioural change communication

- a1) Number of males reached
- a2) Number of females reached
- b) ARV treatment
- b1) Number of males reached
- b2) Number of females reached

Project Document(E3) ,AWPs(E 4) project implementation plan(E5); and risk management plan/risk register(E6) and Acceleration Plan(E7) has been attached as evidence.

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 has been collected over the past two years 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 are 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 have been engaged in implementation and monitoring, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized. Beneficiary feedback, which may be anecdotal, has been collected over the past year to ensure the project is addressing local priorities. This information has been used to inform project decision making. (all must be true)
- 1: Some beneficiary feedback may have been collected over the past year, but this information has not been used to inform project decision making. This option is also selected if no beneficiary feedback has been collected.
- Not Applicable

***Note: Risk management must be done for criteria with score of 1.**

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

*The entire project is focused on key and marginalized populations that are more at-risk to HIV and all project strategies include engagement of these communities in design, implementation and evaluation. Key and marginalized populations that the project is targeting include Transgenders (TGs), Female Sex Workers (FSWs), Men who have sex with Men (MSMs), in addition to supporting adults and children for HIV treatment across Pakistan, including KP and Balochistan provinces. Key populations are also members of the project's Country Coordination Mechanism (CCM), which is the project's governance board, and monitors and supports the implementation of projects financed by the Global Fund. The project also conducts quarterly Inter-Provincial Coordination Meetings with all partners, including key population groups, and serves as a coordination and consultation mechanism for all stakeholders under the HIV program. Furthermore, quarterly review meetings are also conducted separately by the project with all key population Community Based Organizations (CBOs), in order to review progress, discuss challenges and provide solutions. IPCM reports, sub-recipient (SR) quarterly review presentations. Other interventions and initiatives include the use of Stigma Index as a tool to gather evidence on how stigma and discrimination impacts the lives of people living with HIV in Pakistan, CLM Community Led Monitoring as an accountability mechanism for the improvement of service quality and access and development of Legal Aid desks
CCM meeting minutes/presentations and CCM constituency meeting minutes are attached as evidence(E8)

4. Is the project generating 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 have been 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, have been 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 have been collected by the project team. There is little or no evidence that this has informed project decision making.

***Note: Risk management must be done for criteria with score of 1.**

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

*The project conducts an annual retreat which goes through lessons learned to inform the next stage of implementation. The project holds quarterly review meetings with partners and conducts a bi-annual risk matrix review. The project activities and budget are continually updated through reprogramming, which has been done twice and agreed with the donor. The project also presents quarterly updates to the CCM (Country Coordinating Mechanism) and makes any updates/integrates recommendations from this oversight group. Quarterly IPCM Inter-Provincial Coordination Meetings (IPCMs) with all stakeholders are conducted to present and review progress on project activities and devise the way forward. The project has risk register which is updated bi-annually. In addition, the findings of the continuous monitoring visits conducted by the M&E are incorporated in the Performance letters to the SRs on quarterly basis. Quarterly SR Review Meetings Presentations (E9), Project Risk Register (E6), CCM Meeting Minutes(E8) and Inter-Provincial Coordination Meetings (IPCMs) reports(and presentations(E 10) are attached as evidence

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

- 3: There is credible evidence that the project is reaching a 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 is currently not 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 is not at scale, and there are no plans currently to scale up the project in the future.

***Note: Risk management must be done for criteria with score of 1.**

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

As part of the Global Fund HIV annual workplan, UNDP expanded its HIV prevention activities from January 2023 to include 16 Community Based Organizations (CBOs) in 19 cities, with 53 sites (from 16 sites previously) across Pakistan and in all four provinces. Under the prevention expansion, 11 new geographic areas including Peshawar and Quetta, were added for the first time for all Key Populations (KPs) (at risk for HIV). Key populations at risk for contracting HIV that the project is working with include Transgenders (TGs), Female Sex Workers (FSWs), and Males who have sex with Males (MSMs) across Pakistan. This expansion of CBOs has already been completed in 2023 for prevention component and is reflected in the semi-annual Progress Update & Disbursement Request (PUDR) for the period January-June 2023, submitted to the Global Fund (GF). The number of key populations reached by the project under its prevention programme are also provided in the attached PUDR report. During January-June 2023, the project reached 70,987 MSMs, 23,837 TGs, and 22,170 FSWs with HIV prevention programs across Pakistan. Progress Update & Disbursement Request (PUDR) for the period January-June 2023 (E 11)attached as Evidence.

Principled

Status: Complete

Quality Rating: **Highly Satisfactory**

6. Are the project's measures (through outputs, activities, indicators) to address gender inequalities and empower women relevant and producing the intended effect? If not, evidence-based adjustments and changes have been 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 has 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 has 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.

***Note: Risk management must be done for criteria with score of 1.**

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

*The vast majority of people impacted by HIV are male, although there are trans-women, female sex workers and women living with HIV as target populations as well. The project collects gender disaggregated data and invested in a national gender review of the HIV response implementation as part of its national program review (this also included the mid-term evaluation). The project has also designed interventions to address gender-related stigma, particularly funding gender desks in Balochistan and KP that work on gender-related discrimination including gender-based violence. The gender desks serve as all-encompassing service centers, catering to client registration and offering essential services, including legal support, psycho-social counselling, information dissemination, assistance, and referrals. Reports from Aurat Foundation (E 12); Progress Update & Disbursement Request (PUDR) reports(E 11); national HIV gender review (E 13) are attached as evidence.

7. Are social and environmental impacts and risks being successfully managed and monitored?

- 3: Social and environmental risks are 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 has been a substantive change to the project or change in context that affects risk levels, the SESP is updated to reflect these changes. (all must be true)
- 2: Social and environmental risks are 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, implemented and monitored for identified risks. OR project is categorized as Low risk through the SESP.
- 1: Social and environmental risks have not been tracked in the risk log. For projects categorized as High or Moderate Risk there is no evidence that social and environmental assessments have been completed and/or management plans or measures development, implemented or monitored. There have been substantive changes to the project or changes in the context but SESP has not been updated. (any may be true)

*Note: Risk management must be done for criteria with score of 1.

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

* Project level risks are captured in project risks register online/offline which are monitored and updated on semi-annual basis (attached is project risk register) and SES as well. Besides this, the project has invested in a number of assessments that inform the project strategy and risk mitigation measures including: CSA Risk Assessment; national viral load assessment; national HIV gender assessment; Legal and Environmental Assessment; National Assessment of HIV (which was UNDP's mid-term assessment). Report of CSA Risk Assessment (E14); national viral load assessment(E15); national HIV gender assessment(E13); Legal and Environmental Assessment(E 16); National Assessment of HIV (which was UNDP's mid-term assessment(E17) attached as evidence.

8. Are grievance mechanisms available to project-affected people and are grievances (if any) addressed to ensure any perceived harm is effectively mitigated?

- 3: Project-affected people have been actively informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism (SRM/SECU) and how to access it. If the project is categorized as High or Moderate Risk through the SESP, a project - level grievance mechanism is in place and project affected people informed. If grievances have been received, they are 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.
- 1: Project-affected people not informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism. If grievances have been received they are not responded to. (any may be true)

*Note: Risk management must be done for criteria with score of 1.

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

*UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism has not been shared with the beneficiaries; however, a project level grievance mechanism is in place and project affected people are informed and aware of how to use the mechanism. Grievances received are routed/directed to the Office of Audit and Investigation (OAI) for investigation. The project has shared Prevention of Sexual Exploitation, Abuse & Harassment (PSEAH)

guidelines, PSEAH hotline number with project beneficiaries for reporting grievances. Two trainings on PSEAH have been conducted in 2022 and 2023 for project sub-recipients. Training reports/materials PSEAH (E18) and project level grievance mechanism (E19) details are attached as evidence. Communication material has been shared with all the SRs for reporting of wrongdoings under the project.

Management & Monitoring

Status: Complete

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

9. Is the project's M&E Plan sufficient and adequately implemented?

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

***Note: Risk management must be done for criteria with score of 1.**

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

The project has a project M&E Plan in place, along with a performance framework (PF) which includes fully populated baselines and targets for coverage, outcome, and impact indicators. The project M&E plan and performance framework also detail the indicator data collection methods, indicator disaggregation's including gender, frequency of data collection, data sources, and other relevant information. The project has also developed a national M&E plan for HIV for Pakistan, in consultation with all stakeholders; and includes a costed M&E workplan. A National Assessment of HIV (which also served as UNDP's mid-term assessment/evaluation) has been conducted under the project. Under the current grant, the project has incorporated and implemented identified changes in activities where possible through the Global Fund (GF) approved re-programming budget. Please see Project M&E Plan(E 20), project Performance Framework (PF)(E21), costed National M&E Plan for HIV(E22); national assessment/Program review assessment/program review(E17).

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

- 3: The project's governance mechanism is operating well, and is a model for other projects. It has met in the agreed frequency stated in the project document and the minutes of the meetings are on file. There is 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 reviews and uses 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 has met in the agreed frequency and the minutes of the meeting are on file. A project progress report has been submitted to the project board or equivalent at least once in the past year, covering results, risks and opportunities. (both must be true to select this option)
- 1: The project's governance mechanism has not met in the frequency stated in the project document over the past year and/or the project board or equivalent is not functioning as a decision-making body for the project as intended.

***Note: Risk management must be done for criteria with score of 1.**

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

* The project governance mechanism is well in place (Project organogram (E 23). Further AWP and implementation plan is approved by the CCM (National Oversight Board which functions as project board) annually. Quarterly updates by the project are given to the CCM on financial, programme, and key indicator updates. CCM minutes and GF PPTs to CCMs (E8) are attached as evidence.

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

- 3: The project has actively monitored risks every quarter including consulting with key stakeholders, including security advisors, to identify continuing and emerging risks and to assess if the main assumptions remain valid. There is clear evidence that relevant management plans and mitigating measures are being fully implemented to address each key project risk, and have been updated to reflect the latest risk assessment. (all must be true)
- 2: The project has monitored risks every year, as evidenced by an updated risk log. Some updates have been made to management plans and mitigation measures.
- 1: The risk log has not been updated as required. There may be some evidence that the project has monitored risks (including security risks or incidents) that may affect the project's achievement of results, but there is no explicit evidence that management actions have been taken to mitigate risks. In the case of a deteriorating security environment, no consultation has occurred with the UNDP Security Office on appropriate measures.

***Note: Risk management must be done for criteria with score of 1.**

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

*The project has a risk log at central and SR level both. The PMU risk log is updated bi-annually, and the SR risk log quarterly. Security is briefed on all events and activities, and invited to project meetings. Project risks log(E6) and SR risks log(E 24) and management plans are attached as evidence.

Efficient

Status: Complete

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

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

- Yes
- No

***Note: Risk management must be done when the response is "No".**

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

Projects operating under Global Fund grants are provided with opportunities over the course of the grant to re-programme the grant budget and activities, subject to the Global Fund's priorities and approval. In this regard, the project has conducted reprogramming multiple times, to adjust Pakistan's HIV program according to the country's current needs and implementation context. This included the reallocation of identified savings in prioritized program areas ensuring the efficient utilization of resources, enabling the program to achieve its targets and contribute to the decrease in overall disease burden. Reprogramming has been done multiple times to adequately mobilize the resources. Approved reprogramming budget and proposal (E 25) are attached.

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

- 3: The project has an updated procurement plan. Implementation of the plan is on or ahead of schedule. The project quarterly reviews operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addresses them through appropriate management actions. (all must be true)
- 2: The project has an updated procurement plan. The project annually reviews operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addresses them through appropriate management actions. (all must be true)
- 1: The project does not have an updated procurement plan. The project may or may not have reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner, however management actions have not been taken to address them.

***Note: Risk management must be done for criteria with score of 1.**

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

* The project has an updated Procurement plan; actually we have 2 Procurement plan: Procurement plan for Health products, the plan developed based on approved HIV grant template(HPMT), PSM on semiannual base conduct Forecasting and quantification to review the quantities to be procured based on consumption trends, stock on pipeline and programmatic assumptions, the F&Q report shared with all stakeholders including National counterpart for their inputs and review, the reviewed reports shared with GFCT for their approval, then procurement start through HIST and GPU as per the SOPs, all core health products procured and delivered timely to the country.so far we are performing well although there is always a challenge of access to data and health information from the national counterpart. It is worthy also to mention that. Above plan is supported by well-developed quality assurance plan to monitor health products from the source

up to the final destination, Quality control testing were done through WHO prequalified laboratory and all the tests were passed successfully, PSM also supporting the plan with training, developing tools, SOPs, and reporting on KPI where we didn't records any stock out of the core items.

Some delays occurred because of lengthy process of getting MOFA approval, escalating to higher level showed some improvement.

The % of achievement is more than 92 % of the actual need, one item of OMAT was not procured, because of some national requirement that should be achieved by other stakeholder so that UNDP can procure the OMAT. There are some ARVs not procured since we don't have need at Health facilities. Attached 1) the latest F&Q report(HIV HP Quantification and supply Grant), 2/ PAK HPMT and 3/ Heath products tracking tool. Plus PPT of First semester showing achievement, challenges and recommendation (E26)

For the Non Health products: we have approved procurement plan for Jul 2021 December 2023, PSM managed to hire many CBOs covering 53 sites.

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

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

***Note: Risk management must be done for criteria with score of 1.**

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

*The project adheres to all procurement policies, including documenting competitive bids and accurate budgeting/pricing. The project is implementing with DHL to take advantage of the work that was already developed in Balochistan and KP. Value for money analysis is part of SR recruitment processes.Vfm attached as evidence (E 27)

Effective

Status: Complete

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

15. Is the project is on track to deliver its expected outputs?

- Yes
- No

***Note: Risk management must be done when the response is "No".**

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

*The project is largely on track to deliver its expected outputs, which is evidenced in its progress against indicator targets as mentioned in detail in its semi-annual Project Update and Disbursement Request (PUDR) reports. The project's expansion of its HIV prevention component successfully covered four provinces of Pakistan and broadened its reach by partnering with 16 Community-Based Organizations (CBOs) operating in 53 different sites, a substantial increase from the initial 9 to 19 geographical locations. This represents a significant step forward in addressing the specific challenges faced by key populations in Pakistan and reducing the transmission of HIV. In addition, the project is also conducting the Integrated Biological & Behavioral Surveillance (IBBS) in 2023, which is a surveillance study, instrumental in understanding the dynamics of the HIV epidemic in Pakistan. UNDP along with UNAIDS and other technical partners, is conducting the Round VI of the IBBS covering 31 districts across Pakistan through a consortium firm, with the survey being last conducted in Pakistan in 2016-17. PUDR reports attached.(E11)

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

- 3: Quarterly progress data has informed regular reviews of the project work plan to ensure that the activities implemented are most likely to achieve the desired results. There is evidence that data and lessons learned (including

from evaluations and/or After Action Reviews) have been used to inform course corrections, as needed. Any necessary budget revisions have been made. (both must be true)

2: 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.) There may or may not be evidence that data or lessons learned has been 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 are delivered on time, no link has been made to the delivery of desired development results. Select this option also if no review of the work plan by management has taken place over the past year.

***Note: Risk management must be done for criteria with score of 1.**

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

* The project work plan and progress with the Country Coordinating Mechanism (CCM) (project oversight/governance body) is reviewed quarterly, with the national HIV review functioning as the project's mid-term evaluation. The project has also regularly gone through budget reviews resulting in 2 reprogramming exercises to adjust program activities and inform course correction. In addition, the quarterly Inter-Provincial Coordination Meetings (IPCMs) also function as the coordination and review mechanism to align on priorities, review progress against data, and function as an accountability mechanism against agreed actions. The project also conducts quarterly review meetings with Community Based Organizations (CBOs) to review the prevention data on a regular basis, identify and address any bottlenecks/issues, and help to inform course corrections in the workplan accordingly. CCM meeting minutes/presentations (E 17), reprogramming documents(E 25), IPCM reports/materials(E 10), quarterly review meeting presentations(E9), PUDR reports(E 11) are attached.Pulse check is conducted on quarterly basis

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

3: The project is targeting 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 are being reached as intended. The project has engaged regularly with targeted groups over the past year to assess whether they are benefiting as expected and adjustments were made if necessary to refine targeting. (all must be true)

2: The project is targeting 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 has been some engagement with beneficiaries in the past year to assess whether they are benefiting as expected. (all must be true)

1: The project does not report on specific targeted groups. There is no evidence to confirm that project beneficiaries are deprived and/or excluded from development opportunities relevant to the project area of work. There may have been some engagement with beneficiaries to assess whether they are benefiting as expected, but it has been limited or has not occurred in the past year.

Not Applicable

***Note: Risk management must be done for criteria with score of 1.**

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

*The entire project is focused on key and marginalized populations that are more at-risk to HIV and all project strategies include engagement of these communities in design, implementation, and evaluation. Key and marginalized populations that the project is targeting include Transgenders (TGs), Female Sex Workers (FSWs), Males who have sex with Males (MSMs), in addition to supporting adults and children for HIV treatment across Pakistan, including KP and Balochistan provinces. Key populations are also members of the project's Country Coordination Mechanism (CCM), which is the project's governance board, and monitors and supports the implementation of projects financed by the Global Fund. The project also conducts quarterly Inter-Provincial Coordination Meetings with all partners, including key population groups, and serves as a coordination and consultation mechanism for all stakeholders under the HIV program. Furthermore, quarterly review meetings are also conducted separately by the project with all key population Community Based Organizations (CBOs), in order to review progress, discuss challenges and provide solutions. IPCM reports (E 10), sub-recipient (SR) quarterly review presentations(E9), PUDR (E 11), CCM meeting minutes/presentations and CCM constituency meeting minutes (E 17) are attached as evidence.

18. If there is a digital or data technology solution in the project: is the implementation in line with good practices to manage technology and data risks, like UNDP's digital standards and data principles

- 3: Yes, a) the implementation follows good practices to manage technology and data risks, such as: closing the digital divide and balancing information asymmetries; driven by user demand; b) sustainability and scalability are considered from the start; c) re-using proven technologies where possible and data is managed across the lifecycle in line with the UNDP data guiderails. (All must be true)
- 2: Technology and data risks are managed appropriately. UNDP's digital standards and data principles are followed as much as possible, and deviations can be justified.
- 1: Standard UNDP project risk management is applied but no specific practices to address technology risks are followed.
- The project does not utilize a data or digital technology solution.

***Note: Risk management must be done for criteria with score of 1.**

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

*This is an area where the project can improve. The project is working with Centre for Economic Research in Pakistan (CERP) to develop a digital health platform for targeting and reaching with one of the key populations at risk for contracting HIV (Males who have sex with Males (MSMs)), which is in the process of being developed by 2024. For project reporting on HIV indicators the data extracted from the national MIS which is managed by the National AIDS Control Programme (NACP), as part of the national HIV response. Development of a human centred digital platform(E 28): to improve health seeking behaviour towards key HIV services report attached as Evidence.

Sustainability & National Ownership

Status: Complete

Quality Rating: **Satisfactory**

19. Are 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.) are used to fully implement and monitor the project. All relevant stakeholders and partners are 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.) are used to implement and monitor the project, but other support (such as country office support or project systems) may also be used if necessary. All relevant stakeholders and partners are fully and actively engaged in the process, playing an active role in project decision-making, implementation and monitoring. (both must be true)
- 1: There is relatively limited or no engagement with national stakeholders and partners in the decision-making, implementation and/or monitoring of the project.
- Not Applicable

***Note: Risk management must be done for criteria with score of 1.**

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

*The entire project is designed by the government and national stakeholders, including community groups. As already noted above, communities and partners are actively engaged through various coordination and reporting mechanisms include the Country Coordination Mechanism (CCM), Inter-Provincial Coordination Meetings (IPCMs), quarterly reviews, and other meetings (IPCM(E 10), CCM(E 17), quarterly SR reviews(E9), regular government briefings attached as evidence). Oversight committee of CCM regularly holds meetings and also conducts quarterly visits of service delivery points for monitoring and supervision.

20. There is regular monitoring of changes in capacities and performance of institutions and systems relevant to the project, as needed. The implementation arrangements have been adjusted according to changes in partner capacities.

- 3: In the past two years, 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 including relevant HACT assurance activities. Implementation arrangements have been formally reviewed and adjusted, if needed, in agreement with partners according to changes in partner capacities. (both must be true)
- 2: In the past two years, aspects of changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems have been monitored by the project using indicators and reasonably credible data sources including relevant

HACT assurance activities. Some adjustment has been made to implementation arrangements if needed to reflect changes in partner capacities. (both must be true)

- 1: Some aspects of changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems may have been monitored by the project, however changes to implementation arrangements have not been considered. Also select this option if changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems have not been monitored by the project.
- Not Applicable

***Note: Risk management must be done for criteria with score of 1.**

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

*The project regularly monitors the capacity of its sub-recipient (SR) implementing partners through capacity assessments (two assessments conducted since project inception in 2021), imposition of special conditions on contracts which are monitored, issuance of quarterly management/performance letters to SRs, and quarterly review meetings with SRs. The project has modified implementation arrangements based on the outcome of reviews and a competitive procurement process. The project will be further adjusting implementation arrangements, based on the results of the mid-term evaluation, and a PMU operational review that is planned for Q4 2023. The project implement SR audits according to HACT policies. The assessment reports and management plans(E 29) are attached as evidence. This year an extensive capacity development exercise was undertaken and both ART and CBOs staff were provided trainings.

21. The transition and phase-out arrangements are reviewed regularly and adjusted according to progress (including financial commitments and capacity).

- 3: The project's governance mechanism has reviewed the project's sustainability plan, including arrangements for transition and phase-out, to ensure the project is on track in meeting the requirements set out by the plan. The plan has been adjusted according to progress as needed. (both must be true)
- 2: There has been a review of the project's sustainability plan, including arrangements for transition and phase-out, to ensure the project is on track in meeting the requirements set out by the plan.
- 1: The project may have a sustainability plan, but there has not been a review of this strategy since it was developed. Also select this option if the project does not have a sustainability strategy.

***Note: Risk management must be done for criteria with score of 1.**

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

*The project has a capacity building plan with CBOs (Community Based Organizations) to try and institutionalize the knowledge and skills needed for implementation. With the government, the project is negotiating the institutionalization of a transition plan which would be funded in the next grant. CBOs capacity assessment plan attached as evidence (E 30). The project has provided IT equipment, furniture and electronics items (refrigerators, generators ,motor bikes) to the service providers (CBOs). We are also working on renovation of selected ART centers for greater sustainability and improvement of services.