ASM-20393 - Quality Assurance - Implementation

Procedure Year: 2026

Procedure Rating: Highly Satisfactory

Procedure Status: Approved

Procedure Name: ASM-20393

Procedure Department: CO - Guatemala - Guatemala City

Procedure Type: Implementation

Record Owner: Samara Pellecer

Created by: Samara Pellecer,4/21/2026, 9:43 AM

Last Modified by: Rosenely DIEGUES PEIXOTO,4/21/2026, 4:27 PM

Portofolio/Project Type: Project

RELATED PORTFOLIOS/PROJECTS (1)						
NAME	PORTOFOLIO/PROJECT NAME	DEPARTMENT	STATUS	ATLAS PROJECT NUMBER	START DATE	END DATE
00129693	Sistema de Certificacion PCD-UNDP-GTM-00129693	CO - Guatemala - Guatemala City	On Going	00140593	12/15/2021	6/30/2026

RELATED SESPS (1)		
PARENT PROCEDURE	PROCEDURE TYPE	PROCEDURE YEAR
ASM-20391	SESP (Social and Environmental Screening Procedure)	2026

Approval Information

Approval Date: Tue Apr 21 00:00:00 GMT 2026

Approved By: Rosenely DIEGUES PEIXOTO <rose.diegues@undp.org>

APPROVAL HISTORY			
STEP NAME	DATE	STATUS	ASSIGNED TO
Submitted for Approval	2026-04-21 16:27:28	Approved	Nely Herrera
Submitted for Approval	2026-04-21 15:59:03	Reassigned	Nely Herrera

QA Questionnaire:

Strategic | Status: Complete | Quality Rating: Exemplary

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

*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)

La primera fase del proyecto culminó con la aprobación de la Ley Nacional de Certificación de la Discapacidad por el Congreso en febrero de 2024, la segunda fase buscará la ejecución, puesta en práctica e internalización de la nueva ley. Para ello, se continuará reforzando la implementación de los dos resultados más exitosos de la fase 1: el Resultado 2.1, que consiste en desarrollar, revisar y reformar marcos y sistemas legales conforme a las normas de la Convención sobre los Derechos de las Personas con Discapacidad (CDPD), y el Resultado 2.2, que busca fortalecer la participación y contribución de múltiples actores en el diseño, la reforma y la implementación de leyes, políticas y sistemas inclusivos para las personas con discapacidad. En cuanto al Resultado 2.1, se difundirá la ley y se presupuestará su implementación, la cual se pondrá a prueba mediante la asignación presupuestaria y la implementación del Manual de Certificación en tres municipios de los departamentos regionales de Sololá y Chiquimula, azotados por la pobreza, las sequías y las fuertes lluvias, e Izabal, una región marcada por el conflicto y la violencia relacionados con el narcotráfico. Se fortalecerá la coordinación interinstitucional entre las principales entidades gubernamentales que contribuyen a la implementación de la Ley de Certificación.

2. Is the project aligned with the UNDP Strategic Plan?

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

*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)

El Proyecto se alinea con el Marco de Cooperación/Plan Estratégico del PNUD 2026-2029: Strategic Outcome 2: By 2029, governance systems are more effective, inclusive, and accountable, enabling people, societies and economies to thrive. Data source: SDG 16.7.2
Además, el programa en Guatemala contribuye a generar las precondiciones institucionales, normativas y políticas necesarias para la implementación de la Convención sobre los Derechos de las Personas con Discapacidad (CDPD), en coherencia con la Agenda 2030, el Plan K'atun 2032 y con un enfoque transversal de género e inclusión de personas con discapacidad en situación de mayor marginalización.

Relevant	Status: Complete	Quality Rating: Exemplary

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?

- (selected) 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)

El Proyecto prioriza el trabajo con personas con discapacidad, especialmente el caso de mujeres indígenas que participan en procesos de diálogo y/o en temas de consulta. La formulación del proyecto se sustenta en una trayectoria de trabajo conjunto organizaciones de personas con discapacidad y personas con discapacidad, especialmente mujeres.

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?

- (selected) 3: Knowledge and lessons learned from internal or external sources (gained, for example, from Peer Assists, After Action Reviews or Lessons Learned Workshops) backed by credible evidence from evaluation, corporate policies/strategies, analysis and monitoring 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)

Las tres agencias participantes en el proyecto han estado acompañando tanto al gobierno como a las organizaciones de sociedad civil de personas con discapacidad como a las personas con discapacidad.
El programa evolucionó desde una lógica de asistencia técnica y fortalecimiento de capacidades hacia la producción de herramientas técnicas y marcos operativos orientados a incidir directamente en políticas públicas, sistemas institucionales y procesos de planificación. Como resultado, consolidó un portafolio de productos de conocimiento que operacionalizan los estándares de la CDPD en el contexto guatemalteco.
Las instituciones públicas tradujeron el fortalecimiento de sus capacidades en decisiones y resultados institucionales concretos. El Congreso y sus equipos asesores avanzaron en la incorporación de las normas de la CDPD en el análisis legislativo, particularmente en materia de capacidad jurídica, mientras que el Ministerio de Salud Pública y Asistencia Social (MSPAS) mejoró su preparación técnica para la implementación piloto del sistema de certificación de discapacidad mediante la actualización del uso de la CIF y la preparación de las Juntas de Evaluación. Al mismo tiempo, la CONADI reforzó su función de coordinación y dirección mediante el desarrollo y la validación de directrices prácticas sobre participación y accesibilidad, que clarificaron cómo organizar consultas inclusivas con organizaciones de personas con discapacidad (OPD) y cómo aplicar medidas de accesibilidad física, comunicativa y procedimental, lo que resultó en procesos de participación más estructurados, basados en derechos y accesibles, alineados con las normas de la CDPD.

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

- (selected) 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)

Los resultados de 2025 confirman que el Programa Conjunto está contribuyendo a cambiar la agenda de la discapacidad desde compromisos normativos hacia condiciones más sólidas para una implementación efectiva. Si tiene el potencial de contribuir al cambio en el desarrollo.
Se cuenta con la experiencia y las capacidades técnicas necesarias para implementar y cumplir de manera efectiva las metas establecidas en el proyecto. Esta trayectoria permitirá orientar una intervención más estratégica y articulada con las entidades de gobierno y con las organizaciones de personas con discapacidad.

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.

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

2: The project team 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)

El proyecto ha fortalecido la incidencia política de las organizaciones de mujeres con discapacidad, promoviendo un enfoque interseccional de género y discapacidad, generando un cambio cualitativo en sus capacidades técnicas, de liderazgo y acción colectiva.
Este fortalecimiento se tradujo en resultados concretos, incluyendo contribuciones sustantivas al Anteproyecto de Ley de Igualdad y Derechos de las Personas con Discapacidad, participación activa en espacios de consulta convocados por el CONADI, y el posicionamiento de temas prioritarios —como violencia, discriminación y acceso a servicios— en el diálogo de políticas públicas. El proceso evidenció una transición desde acciones dispersas hacia una incidencia más coordinada, visible y basada en evidencia.

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 are 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 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)

El Proyecto integra los principios de derechos humanos, igualdad de género, no discriminación y acceso a servicios. Aborda la aplicación del Convenio para las Personas con Discapacidad.

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. Select this option for SESP Exempted projects.

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)

El mecanismo de reclamación disponible es el Consejo Consultivo, espacio en donde las organizaciones de personas con discapacidad han estado representadas y han podido presentar cualquier reclamo.

Management & Monitoring	Status: Complete	Quality Rating: Highly 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)

El proyecto cuenta con un Plan de monitoreo y evaluación el cual fue aplicado. Se realizó un seguimiento sistemático a los indicadores del proyecto.

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)

La Junta de Proyecto constituye el mecanismo de toma de decisiones estratégicas y rendición de cuentas. Ante la Junta se han presentado informes de avances programáticos y financieros del proyecto y se han tomado medidas estratégicas relacionadas a la implementación del proyecto.

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)

Se ha realizado el monitoreo de los riesgos a partir del inicio de la implementación del proyecto.
Los riesgos programáticos, institucionales y contextuales fueron actualizados en la última solicitud de ampliación del proyecto.
Esta es la sección 13.

Efficient	Status: Complete	Quality Rating: Highly 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.

- (selected) 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)

El Proyecto se ha implementado en coordinación con OACHNUD y UNFPA. Para asegurar su eficiencia, el presupuesto se elaboró de manera conjunta en el marco de las competencias y jurisdicción de cada agencia. Los recursos asignados permitieron el alcance de los resultados propuestos, logrando el avance satisfactorio de sus metas. Las actividades para el primer semestre de 2026, están definidas con base al principio de costo-efectividad para generar los mejores resultados a partir de la planificación de los recursos. Se implementará un mecanismo de transparencia para la distribución de recursos, asegurando que lleguen directamente a las personas beneficiarias.

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)
- (selected) 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)

Se revisó y actualizó el plan de adquisiciones para garantizar el desarrollo de las acciones previstas.

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

- (selected) 3: There is evidence that the project regularly 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)

El presupuesto cubre todos los costos del proyecto, incluidos los servicios de gestión de programas y eficacia, como finanzas, adquisiciones, recursos humanos, seguridad, viajes, servicios generales, información y comunicaciones de acuerdo con las políticas vigentes del PNUD.

Effective	Status: Complete	Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory

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

- (selected) 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)

Los resultados logrados confirman que el Programa Conjunto está contribuyendo a cambiar la agenda de la discapacidad, avanzando hacia el total cumplimiento de los resultados propuestos.

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)
- [x] 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)

Se realizaron revisiones del plan de trabajo anual y se ha dado seguimiento a su implementación mediante informes de avance.

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?

- [x] 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)

Desde el inicio, el programa adoptó un enfoque intencional y proactivo de la participación, identificando y abordando las posibles barreras que pudieran limitar la plena y efectiva participación de las personas con discapacidad. Las consideraciones de accesibilidad se integraron en la etapa de diseño de las actividades, en lugar de tratarse como ajustes puntuales durante la implementación.
Los procesos de capacitación y consulta se planificaron con una perspectiva inclusiva y basada en los derechos, asegurando la mitigación de las barreras físicas, de comunicación, actitudinales y relacionadas con la edad. Este enfoque se reflejó en la elaboración de convocatorias accesibles para la participación, la selección de espacios adecuados y sin barreras, y la provisión de adaptaciones razonables a las necesidades de los participantes, incluyendo interpretación en lengua de señas guatemalteca, materiales de lectura accesibles y metodologías multisensoriales.

El programa hizo especial hincapié en abordar las barreras interseccionales que enfrentan las mujeres con discapacidad y los niños, niñas y adolescentes con discapacidad. Para las actividades dirigidas a mujeres con discapacidad, como la formación y los procesos de sensibilización relacionados con la violencia y la discriminación de género, el programa garantizó formatos accesibles, metodologías participativas y la implicación directa de mujeres con diferentes tipos de discapacidad como ponentes y colaboradoras, reconociendo la diversidad de experiencias y formas de discriminación a las que se enfrentan.
Asimismo, las consultas con niños, niñas y adolescentes con discapacidad se diseñaron siguiendo los principios del diseño universal para la participación, incorporando metodologías inclusivas, creativas y adaptadas a la edad. Estos procesos tuvieron en cuenta las

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

- [x] 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)

Se fortalecieron los sistemas de datos e información como base para políticas públicas inclusivas. Se lograron avances en la armonización de los registros administrativos con el conjunto breve del Grupo de Washington en instituciones como el MINECO y el MINGOB, en el fortalecimiento de la función estadística de la CONADI y en la incorporación de normas alineadas con la CDPD en los instrumentos nacionales. A nivel territorial, el municipio de San Juan Ermita operacionalizó este enfoque mediante la implementación de su registro municipal de discapacidad y la adopción de la Estrategia Municipal "No Tenemos Límites", demostrando cómo la evidencia puede traducirse en decisiones de planificación local y políticas públicas.

Sustainability & National Ownership	Status: Complete	Quality Rating: Highly 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)

Socios nacionales participan activamente y de manera sustantiva en la implementación del proyecto. Organizaciones de Personas con Discapacidad (OPD), incluidas organizaciones de mujeres con discapacidad, así como titulares de obligaciones del Estado (CONADI, MSPAS, COPADEH y el Congreso de la República), se han involucrado de forma progresiva en procesos de análisis técnico, diálogo estratégico y co-construcción normativa.

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)

El proyecto identificó instituciones y sistemas clave, en particular el Ministerio de Salud Pública y Asistencia Social (MSPAS) y el Consejo Nacional de Atención a las Personas con Discapacidad (CONADI). Con base en diagnósticos y evaluaciones de capacidades institucionales, se definió una estrategia de fortalecimiento diferenciada, orientada a la implementación del sistema de certificación biopsicosocial, la mejora de procesos institucionales y el uso de información para la formulación de políticas públicas, con atención específica a mujeres con discapacidad y personas en territorios alejados.

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

- (selected) 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)

El proyecto ha definido arreglos de transición y sostenibilidad en coordinación con los actores clave, particularmente el Ministerio de Salud Pública y Asistencia Social (MSPAS) y el Consejo Nacional de Atención a las Personas con Discapacidad (CONADI). Si bien no se cuenta con un plan formal de phase out, la estrategia de sostenibilidad se basa en el fortalecimiento de capacidades institucionales, la institucionalización del sistema de certificación biopsicosocial dentro de las funciones regulares del Estado y el uso de plataformas digitales que facilitan su continuidad y escalabilidad. Asimismo, la generación de datos nacionales sobre discapacidad constituye una base estratégica para la movilización futura de recursos y la formulación de políticas públicas, acompañada de acciones de comunicación orientadas a gestionar expectativas y fortalecer la apropiación institucional y social del proceso.