

# Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

**Form Status: Approved**

<b>Overall Rating:</b>	Satisfactory
<b>Decision:</b>	
<b>Portfolio/Project Number:</b>	00085008
<b>Portfolio/Project Title:</b>	Inclusión niños/as con discapacidad en Estancias Infan
<b>Portfolio/Project Date:</b>	2015-06-02 / 2021-06-30

**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:**

El proyecto identificó los cambios más relevantes durante el proceso de implementación que derivó en ajustes importantes en el foco de atención del proyecto. El principal fue en relación con la desaparición del Programa de Estancias Infantiles para Apoyar a Madres Trabajadoras a partir de la transición de la Secretaría de Desarrollo Social a la Secretaría del Bienestar en 2018. Considerando que las Estancias Infantiles era el principal espacio de atención e implementación del Modelo, se decidió modificar el enfoque para llevar la capacitación al ámbito educativo. Así en 2019, se transita el modelo a una modalidad virtual y destinada a agentes educativos, lo cual se integra a través de una revisión sustantiva.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	00092776_3eraRevisionEstanciasInfantiles_9938_301 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/00092776_3eraRevisionEstanciasInfantiles_9938_301.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/00092776_3eraRevisionEstanciasInfantiles_9938_301.pdf</a> )	cynthia.martinez@undp.org	11/5/2021 2:31:00 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 settings<sup>1</sup> 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:**

El proyecto contribuyó al Plan Estratégico del PNU D, particularmente para “Erradicar la pobreza en todas sus formas y dimensiones”: orientado a proveer de una dinámica de “salida” de la pobreza para la población beneficiaria, ofrece “soluciones multisectoriales” permite brindar “protección social básica y servicios e infraestructura”, particularmente para personas con discapacidad y las personas de su entorno comunitario. Su diseño se relaciona con la Solución emblemática 2 del Plan Estratégico 2018-2021 (“fortalecer la gobernanza eficaz, inclusiva y responsable”) al procurar el fortalecimiento de las instituciones nacionales desde una perspectiva de empoderamiento y de inclusión de la niñez con discapacidad en su entorno. Lo anterior establecido en el PRODOC y en el marco de resultados del mismo.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	00092776_PRODOC1_9938_302 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/00092776_PRODOC1_9938_302.PDF">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/00092776_PRODOC1_9938_302.PDF</a> )	cynthia.martinez@undp.org	11/5/2021 2:17:00 AM
2	00092776_PRODOC6millones_2017_9938_302 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/00092776_PRODOC6millones_2017_9938_302.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/00092776_PRODOC6millones_2017_9938_302.pdf</a> )	cynthia.martinez@undp.org	11/5/2021 2:31:00 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:

El proyecto identifica como población objetivo beneficiaria de la capacitación a niños y niñas con discapacidad y se capacita a las personas que son responsables de su cuidado, atención y educación. En el proceso de implementación del proyecto, las diferentes entidades aliadas (SEDESOL, DIF, CONAFE, SEP, ISSSTE, IMSS, SEMAR, SEDENA, PEMEX) formaron parte activa.

#### List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	SNDIFPNUDyOPS_OMSimpulsanmodelo_9938_303 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SNDIFPNUDyOPS_OMSimpulsanmodelo_9938_303.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SNDIFPNUDyOPS_OMSimpulsanmodelo_9938_303.pdf</a> )	cynthia.martinez@undp.org	11/5/2021 2:38:00 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:**

Todas las lecciones aprendidas fueron contempladas en el rediseño del modelo de atención y cuidados inclusivos, principalmente para la transición en la capacitación para responsables de estancias infantiles a agentes educativos.

En ese periodo se realizó un documental sobre la importancia de contar con el MACI en las estancias infantiles.

El Modelo está sistematizado en PNUD y puede replicarse con otros agentes.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Libreta20Viajera20MACI_9938_304 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Libreta20Viajera20MACI_9938_304.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Libreta20Viajera20MACI_9938_304.pdf</a> )	cynthia.martinez@undp.org	11/5/2021 2:25:00 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:**

Durante la implementación del MACI se logró capacitar a más de 9,600 responsables de las estancias infantiles, beneficiando así a un total de 94.9 mil niños y 83 mil niñas con y sin discapacidad que asistían a las estancias infantiles. Asimismo se logró capacitar a más de 6,000 agentes educativos de las instituciones aliadas en la implementación y a más de 1,000 agentes del Gobierno del Estado de México. Se considera que con esto se han logrado cambios en las habilidades técnicas de las personas que han sido capacitadas para dar atención, cuidado y educación inclusivas.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	CAPACI2_9938_305 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CAPACI2_9938_305.PDF">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CAPACI2_9938_305.PDF</a> )	cynthia.martinez@undp.org	11/5/2021 2:29:00 AM
2	CapacitaráPNUDa6milagenteseducativosparala inclusión deniñosyniñascondiscapacidadEl PNUDenMéxico_9938_305 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CapacitaráPNUDa6milagenteseducativosparala inclusión deniñosyniñascondiscapacidadEl PNUDenMéxico_9938_305.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CapacitaráPNUDa6milagenteseducativosparala inclusión deniñosyniñascondiscapacidadEl PNUDenMéxico_9938_305.pdf</a> )	cynthia.martinez@undp.org	11/5/2021 2:27:00 AM
3	EstanciasInfantilesfinal_9938_305 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/EstanciasInfantilesfinal_9938_305.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/EstanciasInfantilesfinal_9938_305.pdf</a> )	cynthia.martinez@undp.org	11/5/2021 2:30:00 AM

**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:

Durante todas las capacitaciones se tuvo registro de las personas que participaron en las diferentes generaciones, tanto de estancias infantiles como con agentes educativos.

El MACI contribuyó al empoderamiento de las mujeres y la igualdad de género, en su intervención en las Estancias Infantiles, a partir de dos líneas:

1. El fortalecimiento de las habilidades técnicas de las personas responsables de los cuidados, la atención y la educación de las niñas y niños con y sin discapacidad. Cabe resaltar que el 95.3% de las personas participantes eran mujeres.
2. La provisión de servicios de cuidado infantil para madres que estaban incursionando en el mercado laboral y/o con la finalidad de mantenerse en el mismo.

#### List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/DocumentalMACI_9938_306.pptx">DocumentalMACI_9938_306 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/DocumentalMACI_9938_306.pptx)</a>	cynthia.martinez@undp.org	11/8/2021 4:18:00 PM

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:

No se realizaron actualizaciones de SESP. El proyecto data de 2015 a partir de la colaboración inicial del Fondo de las Naciones Unidas para Promover los Derechos de las Personas con Discapacidad (UNP RPD, por sus siglas en inglés). Se hizo análisis de riesgos, mismos que se identifican en el PRODOC.

#### 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:**

No se encontraron agravios en el periodo de implementación del proyecto. Todos las situaciones que representaban un cambio sustantivo al proyecto, se comentaron en el marco de la Junta de Proyecto.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

**Management & Monitoring****Quality Rating: Needs Improvement**

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:**

El plan de monitoreo y evaluación se fue ajustando conforme las implementaciones del proyecto y los escalamientos. Al respecto, el proyecto consistió en 5 fases:

Fase 1 (2015-2017): Desarrollo del modelo presencial (MACI) y prueba piloto en 50 estancias a partir de 1 capital semilla de la UNPRPD

Fase 2 (2017-2018): Escalamiento del proyecto a 19 estados partir del financiamiento por parte de SEDESOL

Fase 3 (2018): Incremento del financiamiento de SEDESOL para cubrir los 13 estados restantes

Fase 4 (2018-2020): UNPRPD proporciona financiamiento para la transformación del MACI a su versión digital y su adaptación para capacitar a agentes educativos

Fase 5 (2020-2021): Implementación del modelo para agentes educativo con el Gobierno del Estado de México

Durante este periodo se ajustaron los marcos de indicadores, se reportó información y se sistematizaron las buenas prácticas.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	JdP_cierre_MACI_201021_VF_9938_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/JdP_cierre_MACI_201021_VF_9938_309.pptx)	cynthia.martinez@undp.org	11/5/2021 2:39:00 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:**

La junta de proyecto funcionó de manera efectiva. Al respecto, hubo reuniones de LPAC para presentar los nuevos ajustes a los proyectos, así como sesiones de colaboración con los aliados estratégicos. Resalta la importancia del proyecto como un ejercicio interagencial exitoso, en donde participó también UNICEF y OMS/OPS.

**Management Response:**

Las sesiones de Junta de proyectos se realizaron en momentos para la toma de decisiones y para el seguimiento del proyecto. No se realizaron de forma anual.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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:**

Los documentos de proyecto y revisiones sustantivas cuentan con un ejercicio de monitoreo de riesgos. No obstante estos no fueron actualizados de manera anual, ya que las colaboraciones desde el inicio contemplaban implementación en diferentes años.

**Management Response:**

Al igual que con las juntas de proyecto, si bien los riesgos se consideraron para la toma de decisiones, estos no se actualizaron de forma anual.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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:**

Se realizaron diferentes movilizaciones de recursos en los diferentes años de implementación. Inicialmente se contaron con los recursos exclusivos del UNPRPD y posteriormente se sumaron recursos de SEDESOL y del Gobierno del Estado de México.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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:**

El proyecto realizó planes de adquisiciones de manera anual conforme lo estipulado en la normativa del PNUD.

## List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PlandeAdquisiciones_Estancias_2021_9938_313.pdf">PlandeAdquisiciones_Estancias_2021_9938_313 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PlandeAdquisiciones_Estancias_2021_9938_313.pdf)</a>	cynthia.martinez@undp.org	11/8/2021 4:38:00 PM

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:

El proyecto constantemente hizo procesos para optimizar los recursos y tener un alcance con un número importante de población objetivo. Un ejemplo fue la transición del modelo presencial al digital, logrando así llegar a un número importante de personas capacitadas.

## 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:**

El proyecto generó todos los productos comprometidos, superó las metas propuestas de acuerdo a los indicadores establecidos, y según las valoraciones emitidas en los cuestionarios de satisfacción también se alcanzó el objetivo de promover cambios y desarrollar capacidades en las personas participantes.

**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:**

El proyecto realizó planes anuales y presentó informes anuales y al ROAR. Los informes fueron realizados por la coordinación del proyecto, revisados por la Oficial Nacional, quien emitió recomendaciones cuando fue necesario, los ajustes al presupuesto se aprobaron en la revisión sustantiva.

### List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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:

El proyecto identifica como población objetivo beneficiaria de la capacitación a niños y niñas con discapacidad y se capacita a las personas que son responsables de su cuidado, atención y educación. El proyecto además sistematizó la información en el caso de niños y niñas con discapacidad de escasos recursos.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	NotaSEPPNUDMACI_9938_317 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/NotaSEPPNUDMACI_9938_317.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/NotaSEPPNUDMACI_9938_317.pdf</a> )	cynthia.martinez@undp.org	11/8/2021 4:28:00 PM
2	2017_12Informedeevaluacióndeimpacto_9938_317 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2017_12Informedeevaluacióndeimpacto_9938_317.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2017_12Informedeevaluacióndeimpacto_9938_317.pdf</a> )	cynthia.martinez@undp.org	11/8/2021 4:29:00 PM

**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:**

Se logró establecer alianzas importantes con dependencias públicas, fondos internacionales y otras agencias del Sistema de Naciones Unidas.

Todas tuvieron una participación importante, tanto en el diseño como en la implementación.



**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SNDIFPNUdyOPS_OMSimpulsanmodelo_9938_318.pdf">SNDIFPNUdyOPS_OMSimpulsanmodelo_9938_318 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SNDIFPNUdyOPS_OMSimpulsanmodelo_9938_318.pdf)</a>	cynthia.martinez@undp.org	11/8/2021 4:32:00 PM

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](#)<sup>8</sup> 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:**

El proyecto tomó en cuenta las necesidades puntuales de algunos sistemas de cuidados, en específico a través de las capacitaciones presenciales. Asimismo el proyecto se fue adaptando a las condiciones nacionales para la implementación del modelo, tanto en su traducción a medios digitales como para su adaptación a agentes educativos.

**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:**

El proyecto tuvo una duración de 6 años, periodo en el cual se fue revisando su sostenibilidad con los aliados en la implementación. Se concluye el proyecto de manera exitosa.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

**QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments**

AMEXCID solicitó se le informe al Estado de México mediante oficio respecto del recurso remanente del proyecto y su destino para que forme parte del expediente de cierre.

Se realizará el proceso de transferencia del equipo existente, de acuerdo con la normativa del PNUD. De no estar a pto para su utilización, se hará del conocimiento oficial de la contraparte para obtener su anuencia de baja.