

Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

Form Status: Approved

Overall Rating:	Satisfactory
Decision:	
Portfolio/Project Number:	00102372
Portfolio/Project Title:	Access to Justice 4 persons with disabilities
Portfolio/Project Date:	2018-03-01 / 2021-04-30

Strategic

Quality Rating: Exemplary

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

- ☒ 3: *The project team identified relevant changes in the external environment that may present new opportunities or threats to the project's ability to achieve its objectives, assumptions were tested to determine if the project's strategy was valid. There is some evidence that the project board considered the implications, and documented the changes needed to the project in response. (all must be true)*
- ☐ 2: The project team 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 did not fully integrate in the project. (both must be true)
- ☐ 1: The project team considered relevant changes in the external environment since implementation began, but there is no evidence that the project team considered these changes to the project as a result.

Evidence:

The COVID-19 pandemic threatens all members of society, but many persons with disabilities face inequalities that leave them more exposed. Seeing these threats to the project's efforts to uphold the rights of people with disabilities, the project discussed and mobilized additional resources to conduct the situational analysis and impact assessment of the situation of persons with disabilities, especially women and marginalized groups of persons with disabilities. The findings and recommendations were shared and discussed with the relevant policy-makers, DPOs, and development agencies that have been working to support persons with disabilities during and post-pandemic. In addition to this, the project also developed a national three-year recovery plan and an advocacy tool to implement the analysis's recommendations.

The National Policy on Legal Aid was the first inclusive legal aid policy that involved persons with disabilities at all stages of development. The recognition, value, and respect of the expertise of persons with disabilities provide the opportunity for them to be part of the discussions at the national and sub-national level.

A Practical Guideline on Legal Aid for Persons with Disabilities was developed in collaboration with Legal Aid of Cambodia (LAC), CDPO, and DPOs, including women with disabilities' forums to advance the promotion and protection of the rights of persons with disabilities. The Practical Guideline will not only guide persons with disabilities in terms of the Code of Criminal Procedure but also provide them with information on the available legal aid support services, as well as a guide for lawyers to work with persons with disabilities.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Recovery_plan_final_English_10115_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Recovery_plan_final_English_10115_301.pdf)	mao.meas@undp.org	10/27/2021 9:38:00 AM
2	AdvocacyToolkit_FINAL_10115_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/AdvocacyToolkit_FINAL_10115_301.pdf)	mao.meas@undp.org	10/27/2021 8:44:00 AM
3	FINAL_Nationalsituationalanalysis-fullreport_10115_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/FINAL_Nationalsituationalanalysis-fullreport_10115_301.pdf)	mao.meas@undp.org	10/27/2021 8:44:00 AM
4	PracticalGuidelineonLegalAidforPersonswithDisabilities_Eng_10115_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PracticalGuidelineonLegalAidforPersonswithDisabilities_Eng_10115_301.pdf)	mao.meas@undp.org	10/27/2021 9:38:00 AM

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

- ☐ 3: The project responded to at least one of the development settings as specified in the Strategic Plan (SP) and adopted at least one Signature Solution. The project's RRF included all the relevant SP output indicators. (all must be true)
- ☒ 2: *The project responded to at least one of the developments settings¹ as specified in the Strategic Plan. The project's RRF included at least one SP output indicator, if relevant. (both must be true)*
- ☐ 1: While the project may have responded to a partner's identified need, this need falls outside of the UNDP Strategic Plan. Also select this option if none of the relevant SP indicators are included in the RRF.

Evidence:

The project responded to the UNDP strategic plan (output 2.1.2 and indicator 2.1.2.1) in terms of building the voices and participation of persons with disabilities, for instance, organizations of persons with disabilities were invited to be a key working group at both national and sub-national mechanisms.

It contributed to UNDP's country programme output 3.4: Capacity of PwD organizations and network improved to advance the rights of PwDs (Indicators: 3.4.1: New National Disability Strategic Plan and other strategic documents developed with PwD organizations; 3.4.2: # of PwDs, disaggregated by gender, with access to justice through formal and informal systems).

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	RevisedEndofProjectReportTemplateA2J-V5-CLEANversion_10115_302 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/RevisedEndofProjectReportTemplateA2J-V5-CLEANversion_10115_302.pdf)	mao.meas@undp.org	10/27/2021 9:46:00 AM

Relevant**Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

3. Were the project's targeted groups systematically identified and engaged, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized, to ensure the project remained 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:

From the design to the implementation, the project pro-actively engaged and worked with persons with disabilities and their representative organizations. Specifically, a woman with a disability was a member of the project board. She played an important role in providing advice to the project to ensure the project addressed and responded to the needs and challenges faced by persons with disabilities and it applied the disability rights-based approach throughout the project design, implementation and monitoring.

Some of the project's activities were directly executed by the organization of persons with disabilities (OPD). In addition, the project facilitated a critical space for OPD to engage in the implementation and monitoring of the national law, policies, and strategic plans related to disability by including them as the core members in working groups of the national and sub-national mechanism, where they could raise their views and concerns to influence the legal and policy development process.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	signedLPACminute_10115_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/signedLPACminute_10115_303.pdf)	mao.meas@undp.org	10/27/2021 9:53:00 AM
2	Minuteof1stA2JProgrammeSteeringCommitteeMeeting-FINALversion_10115_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Minuteof1stA2JProgrammeSteeringCommitteeMeeting-FINALversion_10115_303.pdf)	mao.meas@undp.org	10/27/2021 9:53:00 AM
3	RevisedEndofProjectReportTemplateA2J-V5CLEANversion_10115_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/RevisedEndofProjectReportTemplateA2J-V5CLEANversion_10115_303.pdf)	mao.meas@undp.org	10/27/2021 9:54:00 AM

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:

In early 2021, the project conducted a project review to document good practices and lessons learnt. This exercise was to produce a knowledge management product to share with other countries working to promote the rights of persons with disabilities within the UNPRPD. The exercise also documented the impact of the project in promoting systemic change on access to justice and social protection of persons with disabilities during the COVID-19 pandemic.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	A2Jprojectreviewreport_v3FINAL_10115_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/A2Jprojectreviewreport_v3FINAL_10115_304.pdf)	mao.meas@undp.org	10/27/2021 10:05:00 AM

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:

Two pipelines are being developed - disability inclusion into the climate change sector - it is a regional project that will be implemented in 7 countries. The second pipeline is the UNPRPD round 4 which is a new UN joint programme.

Disability has been integrated into the UNDP social protection initiative for example the persons with disabilities access to ID poor programme as well as covid-19 relief. It is also mainstreamed in youth skill development and de-mining initiatives through improved access to skill development and livelihoods options.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Principled**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 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:

A gender lens was applied, which was monitored throughout its activities. Two approaches were introduced by the project: gender parity at the leadership and decision-making level and throughout the implementation of the activities.

Three women with disabilities forums (WWDF) were engaged in the project and worked closely with DPOs to ensure the voices and needs of women and children with disabilities were heard and addressed throughout the project's implementation, including for example, on the guidance on legal aid and at the reflection workshop. 20% of women with disabilities played leadership roles within DPOs/WWDFs and 40% of DPOs' governing board members are women. Two women with disabilities were nominated to be members of the DPO governing board in Banteay Meanchey, Kampong Cham, and Svay Rieng provinces, with the main responsibilities to monitor and approve the work-plan and budget; review and endorse the financial policy, human resources policy, and programme management; ensure a good governance system; promote gender equality; participate in all events related to disabilities hosted by DPOs, and carry out joint advocacy activities with CDPO.

The project encouraged partners to provide space and opportunities for participation of men, men with disabilities, women, and women with disabilities as panelists, speakers, and participants. There was a large number of female participants in the training for DPOs, including some of their leaders. The feedback and input from women with disabilities were included in the training programme evaluation visits and the consultative workshop on the development of a Practical Guideline on Legal Aid for Persons with Disabilities. Reasonable accommodation was provided to at least one woman member of a DPO to ensure her participation in training. About 60% of women and girls with disabilities who are members DPOs received information on legal aid.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	A2Jprojectreviewreport_v3FINAL_10115_306 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/A2Jprojectreviewreport_v3FINAL_10115_306.pdf)	mao.meas@undp.org	10/27/2021 10:56:00 AM
2	RevisedEndofProjectReportTemplateA2J-V5 CLEANversion_10115_306 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/RevisedEndofProjectReportTemplateA2J-V5 CLEANversion_10115_306.pdf)	mao.meas@undp.org	10/27/2021 10:56:00 AM

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 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 was 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:

The project was identified as a low risk on the social and environmental risk.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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 informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism and how to access it. If the project was categorized as High Risk through the SESP, a project -level grievance mechanism was in place and project affected people informed. If grievances were received, they were responded to but faced challenges in arriving at a resolution.*
- ☐ 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:

The project worked closely with the Disability Action Council and organizations of persons with disabilities, who are the responsible parties and aware of the accountability mechanism. The project is low risk and the feedbacks from persons with disabilities are regularly collected.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Management & Monitoring

Quality Rating: **Satisfactory**

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

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

Evidence:

The project M&E framework is costed. There were baselines and targets set. Data were regularly collected and progress was updated through the quarterly report, annual progress report, project completion reports, and project review report. Lessons learned were documented and informed subsequent work plan. As mentioned in question 4, a project review was commissioned to document good practices and lessons learned.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	A2Jprojectreviewreport_v3FINAL_10115_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/A2Jprojectreviewreport_v3FINAL_10115_309.pdf)	mao.meas@undp.org	10/27/2021 11:12:00 AM
2	RevisedEndofProjectReportTemplateA2J-V5 CLEANversion_10115_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/RevisedEndofProjectReportTemplateA2J-V5 CLEANversion_10115_309.pdf)	mao.meas@undp.org	10/27/2021 11:13:00 AM
3	AnnualProgressReportFINAL19.02.19_10115_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/AnnualProgressReportFINAL19.02.19_10115_309.pdf)	mao.meas@undp.org	10/27/2021 11:13:00 AM
4	UNPRPD_Annual_Report_Jan_Dec_2019.FINAL_10115_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/UNPRPD_Annual_Report_Jan_Dec_2019.FINAL_10115_309.pdf)	mao.meas@undp.org	10/27/2021 11:14:00 AM

10. Was 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:

The project's steering committee regularly met as per requirement and minutes were filed. Progress, challenges, and lessons learned were presented to the board and discussed. It informed the decision of the subsequent year's work plan.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Minuteof1stA2JProgrammeSteeringCommitteeMeeting-FINALversion_10115_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Minuteof1stA2JProgrammeSteeringCommitteeMeeting-FINALversion_10115_310.pdf)	mao.meas@undp.org	10/27/2021 11:19:00 AM
2	MinuteoftheVirtualProgrammeSteeringCommittee-A2J_10115_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MinuteoftheVirtualProgrammeSteeringCommittee-A2J_10115_310.pdf)	mao.meas@undp.org	10/27/2021 11:19:00 AM

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 was may be some evidence that the project monitored risks that may affected the project's achievement of results, but there is no explicit evidence that management actions were taken to mitigate risks.

Evidence:

Risks were regularly monitored and actions were taken to mitigate the risk. In addition, the project risk log was updated regularly (quarterly and annually). The board was also informed and discussed the risks and issues faced by the project.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	AnnualProgressReportFINAL19.02.19_10115_311 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/AnnualProgressReportFINAL19.02.19_10115_311.pdf)	mao.meas@undp.org	10/27/2021 11:23:00 AM
2	UNPRPD_Annual_Report_Jan_Dec_2019.FINAL_10115_311 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/UNPRPD_Annual_Report_Jan_Dec_2019.FINAL_10115_311.pdf)	mao.meas@undp.org	10/27/2021 11:23:00 AM
3	RevisedEndofProjectReportTemplateA2J-V5 CLEANversion_10115_311 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/RevisedEndofProjectReportTemplateA2J-V5 CLEANversion_10115_311.pdf)	mao.meas@undp.org	10/27/2021 11:23:00 AM

Efficient**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:

The project mobilized more resources from the Australian Government through DFAT and UNPRPD - an additional funds to respond on Covid-19.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Standard_Joint_Program_Document_UNDP_UNFPA_UNWOWEN_10_June_21._10115_312 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Standard_Joint_Program_Document_UNDP_UNFPA_UNWOWEN_10_June_21._10115_312.pdf)	mao.meas@undp.org	10/27/2021 11:30:00 AM
2	UNPRPDCOVID-19CE-A2J_10115_312 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/UNPRPDCOVID-19CE-A2J_10115_312.docx)	mao.meas@undp.org	10/27/2021 11:30:00 AM

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:

The procurement plan was developed and updated in PROMPT. It was regularly monitored on a quarterly basis.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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:

The project used UNDP's procurement system which follows cost-efficiency principle. It also collaborated with other disabilities related projects to cost-share staff.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Effective**Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory**

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

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

Evidence:

The project was on track and delivered its outputs.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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:

The project developed multi-year work plan and annual work plan which was reviewed and endorsed by the Board. The project also undertook a monthly review of its progress and bottleneck. The budget revision took place as needed.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Signed_BRV_G06-A2J_Project_10115_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QA/FormDocuments/Signed_BRV_G06-A2J_Project_10115_316.pdf)	mao.meas@undp.org	10/27/2021 11:38:00 AM

17. Were the targeted groups 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:

The project's target groups were identified and engaged throughout the design and implementation. As previously mentioned, some of the project's activities were executed by disabled people organizations and key project activities (training, legal aid supports, and policy design) involved them either as participants, trainers, beneficiaries of the legal aid service, or contributors to the policy design.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	A2Jprojectreviewreport_v3FINAL_10115_317 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/A2Jprojectreviewreport_v3FINAL_10115_317.pdf)	mao.meas@undp.org	10/27/2021 11:41:00 AM
2	RevisedEndofProjectReportTemplateA2J-V5 CLEANversion_10115_317 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/RevisedEndofProjectReportTemplateA2J-V5 CLEANversion_10115_317.pdf)	mao.meas@undp.org	10/27/2021 11:41:00 AM

Sustainability & National Ownership

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

18. 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:

The project was directly implemented by UNDP (DI M). UNDP system of procurement, monitoring, and evaluation was used. However, the project closely worked with the Government (Ministry of social Affairs Veterans and Youth Rehabilitation, Disability Action Council, Ministry of Justice) and with CSO as well as UNOHCHR at both decision making and execution levels. The Board which made major decisions for the project included representatives from the government, donors, and CSOs representing people with disabilities.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

19. Were there regular monitoring of changes in capacities and performance of institutions and systems relevant to the project, as needed, and were the implementation [arrangements](#)⁸ 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 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*

Evidence:

The project was DIM.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

20. 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:

The project conducted a project review to document lessons learned and recommendations for the next phase. Some remaining activities are being handled by the Government and others will be taken care of by UNDP's other projects to ensure a smooth transition.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	A2Jprojectreviewreport_v3FINAL_10115_320 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/A2Jprojectreviewreport_v3FINAL_10115_320.pdf)	mao.meas@undp.org	10/27/2021 11:54:00 AM

QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments

The project continued its efforts on resource mobilization to complement the project where possible to ensure a more comprehensive response for access to justice for persons with disabilities. In 2019 and 2020, the project successfully mobilized funds from development partners, such as DFAT and UNPRPD to support the inclusive COVID-19 pandemic responses and aimed at putting in place a stronger coordination mechanism between national and sub-national level in promoting disabilities rights through access to basic social and legal services, the establishment of legal aid mechanism and provide reasonable accommodation facility for persons with disabilities.