

Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

Form Status: Approved

Overall Rating: Needs Improvement

Decision:

Portfolio/Project Number: 00126723

Portfolio/Project Title: Anticorrupción e igualdad INFONAVIT

Portfolio/Project Date: 2020-04-06 / 2021-06-15

Strategic

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

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

- ☐ 3: The project team 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:

Constan las distintas reuniones entre PNUD y el INF ONAVIT durante la implementación que propiciaron algunos ajustes en la operación del proyecto, sin qu e derivaran en revisiones sustantivas.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	PRODOCInfonavit_9692_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PRODOCInfonavit_9692_301.pdf)	alejandrogonzalez@undp.org	10/1/2021 4:38:00 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:

El proyecto responde al área de trabajo número 2: Acelerar las transformaciones estructurales para el desarrollo sostenible mediante el fortalecimiento de los sistemas de gobernanza del país. Está alineado con las soluciones emblemáticas 2: fortalecer la gobernanza eficaz, inclusiva y responsable y 6: fortalecer la igualdad de género y el empoderamiento de las mujeres y las niñas. Se detalla en la sección Estrategia.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	PRODOCInfonavit_9692_302 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PRODOCInfonavit_9692_302.pdf)	alejandrogonzalez@undp.org	10/5/2021 5:58:00 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:

Los grupos objetivo se encuentran definidos en la subsección Participación de las partes involucradas. Se definen con base en su pertenencia a una organización, no características individuales o socioeconómicas. Si bien algunas personas pueden pertenecer a grupos excluidos, no participan en el proyecto en función de esa pertenencia. Además, como parte de las actividades del proyecto, se realizó una Encuesta de Denuncias con sección de sociodemográficos para obtener datos desagregados por género, condición de discapacidad, grupos etarios, escolaridad, discriminación o pertenencia a comunidades originarias y diversidades sexuales.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	PRODOCInfonavit_9692_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PRODOCInfonavit_9692_303.pdf)	alejandro.gonzalez@undp.org	10/5/2021 5:59:00 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:

Sobre los resultados del proyecto, la contraparte hizo comentarios durante la Junta de Cierre: Indicó que a partir de esta colaboración entre el INFONAVIT y el PNUD-México, por primera vez se creó un equipo encargado de atender los casos de Hostigamiento y Acoso Sexual y Laboral (HAS) al interior del Instituto. En relación con los casos laborales, hubo una propuesta de fortalecimiento que hoy se está discutiendo en órganos colegiados al interior del Instituto, con base en las recomendaciones del PNUD. Indicó que anteriormente el INFONAVIT, al ser un organismo independiente de la Administración Pública Federal, realizaba alrededor de 90% de sus compras en modalidad directa. Hoy, el 60% de compras institucionales se realizan mediante procesos competitivos. El equipo de adquisiciones estuvo muy involucrado y, como resultado de este proyecto, se hizo una revisión del área de adquisiciones del Instituto. Hubo varias encuestas al personal, que han servido para realizar diagnósticos internos para generar mayor confianza entre los trabajadores e incentivarlos a realizar denuncias sobre hechos irregulares. Parte de las recomendaciones han fortalecido algunos proyectos del Instituto.

La Encuesta de Denuncias se socializó con la totalidad del personal del Infonavit, tanto personal sindicalizado como no sindicalizado, y personal perteneciente al Infonavit, así como a sus Órganos Colegiados. No se recibieron respuestas por parte de los miembros de los Órganos Colegiados, y de los cuatro mil empleados del Instituto se recibieron aproximadamente 800 cuestionarios respondidos. Con base en los resultados de la Encuesta de Denuncias, 45% del personal reportó que no considera viable ninguna opción de represalias por denunciar violaciones al Código de Ética; 55% del personal reportó que considera viable de una a cinco opciones de represalias por denunciar violaciones al Código de Ética en el Infonavit.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	120701_Informe_Final_9692_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/120701_Informe_Final_9692_304.docx)	alejandrogonzalez@undp.org	10/15/2021 6:14:00 PM
2	210729MinutaJuntadeCierre.INFONAVIT-final30sep21firmaMEA3_9692_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/210729MinutaJuntadeCierre.INFONAVIT-final30sep21firmaMEA3_9692_304.pdf)	alejandrogonzalez@undp.org	10/13/2021 6:27:00 PM

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:

Sobre la extensión del proyecto, la contraparte (INFONAVIT) señaló que se solicitó, toda vez que era muy importante la consolidación de los entregables: en ese último mes se logró concluir los talleres, y la entrega de todos los entregables que se habían comprometido. Indicó que falta la maduración de los entregables, pero que una vez que están en el ámbito de trabajo del INFONAVIT, están haciendo lo necesario dentro de sus atribuciones, a fin de que su normativa interna refleje las recomendaciones. Un ejemplo son los procedimientos de adquisiciones.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	210729MinutaJuntadeCierre.INFONAVIT-final30sep21firmaMEA3_9692_305 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/210729MinutaJuntadeCierre.INFONAVIT-final30sep21firmaMEA3_9692_305.pdf)	alejandrogonzalez@undp.org	10/13/2021 6:28:00 PM

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:

El proyecto contempla la perspectiva de género en el diagnóstico incluido en la sección Desafíos de Desarrollo, considera algunas actividades con enfoque de género en la sección de Resultados Esperados, y toma en cuenta esta perspectiva en el Marco de Resultados y plan de Monitoreo y Evaluación. Como parte de las actividades del proyecto, se realizó una Encuesta de Denuncias con sección de sociodemográficos para obtener datos desagregados por género, condición de discapacidad, grupos etarios, escolaridad, discriminación o pertenencia a comunidades originarias y diversidades sexuales.

Por otra parte, el proyecto contribuyó al fortalecimiento de capacidades en vigilancia y control para el cumplimiento del Código de Ética en materia de hostigamiento y acoso sexual (HAS) y de violencia y discriminación laboral en contra de las mujeres, a través del desarrollo de un protocolo de atención de casos HAS, lineamientos y formatos de atención, así como un diagnóstico para su tratamiento.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	PRODOCfirmado_9692_306 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PRODOCfirmado_9692_306.pdf)	alejandrogonzalez@undp.org	10/13/2021 6:29:00 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:

En el SESP se determinó que las actividades clave del proyecto no tienen un impacto negativo significativo en el medio ambiente. Las actividades realizadas y los resultados conseguidos no requieren de insumos físicos que generen residuos o emisiones contaminantes ni la utilización de recursos naturales que pudieran generar impactos negativos en ecosistemas o agravar el proceso de cambio climático. Además, en atención a directivas del BMS se evitará el uso de plásticos de un solo uso en eventos organizados por el proyecto y se tomarán en cuenta criterios de sostenibilidad, reducción de residuos, y reducción de la huella de carbono en las decisiones de compra de materiales.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	SESPInfonavit2003311_9692_307 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SESPInfonavit2003311_9692_307.pdf)	alejandro.gonzalez@undp.org	10/13/2021 8:26:00 PM

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:

Las personas que posiblemente pudieran ser afectadas no fueron informadas específicamente sobre el Mecanismo de Responsabilidad Corporativa. Valga notar que se trata de un proyecto de fortalecimiento institucional. No se recibieron quejas mediante ningún otro medio.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	SESPInfonavit2003311_9692_308 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SESPInfonavit2003311_9692_308.pdf)	alejandro.gonzalez@undp.org	10/13/2021 8:27:00 PM

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 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 proyecto contó con un plan de Monitoreo y Evaluación que se estableció en el PRODOC. Para verificar su cumplimiento, llevó a cabo informes trimestrales en los que dio cuenta del avance en las actividades, así como de los resultados logrados.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	PRODOCfirmado_9692_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PRODOCfirmado_9692_309.pdf)	alejandro.gonzalez@undp.org	10/13/2021 8:29:00 PM

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:

El mecanismo de gobernanza del proyecto (es decir, la Junta Directiva del Proyecto) no realizó revisiones periódicas del proyecto para evaluar su desempeño. Sin embargo, en el transcurso del último año del proyecto, la Junta Directiva realizó una revisión final del proyecto para captar las lecciones aprendidas y socializar los resultados del proyecto y las lecciones aprendidas con los actores relevantes.

Management Response:

La corta duración del proyecto, el calendario de entregables y el cambio en la dirección del Programa de Gobernanza impidieron la organización de las debidas juntas. Sin embargo, en febrero de este año se retomó la comunicación con el INFONAVIT y se llevaron a cabo al menos 5 reuniones de seguimiento hasta la reunión de cierre.

Para futuros proyectos, el Programa de Gobernanza establecerá un cronograma de reuniones de la Junta Directiva de Proyecto (al menos una al año) para evaluar el desempeño del mismo. Las reuniones podrían ser trimestrales o semestrales, y podrían girar en torno a los Informes de avances presentados por la Coordinación, para que la contraparte esté informada y tenga un papel activo en la toma de decisiones de la implementación, así como en la identificación de riesgos, resultados deseados y oportunidades de mejora.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	210729MinutaJuntadeCierre.INFONAVIT-final30sep21firmaMEA3_9692_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/210729MinutaJuntadeCierre.INFONAVIT-final30sep21firmaMEA3_9692_310.pdf)	alejandro.gonzalez@undp.org	10/13/2021 8:32:00 PM

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 riesgos del proyecto fueron actualizados cada año, así como las medidas para mitigarlos. Los riesgos identificados fueron: 1. Comunicación constante con Infonavit, validación de actividades en la etapa de diseño e implementación, diversificación de puntos focales en la contraparte. 2. Comunicación constante con Infonavit, validando los tiempos de trabajo, señalando las acciones de mitigación para retrasos en los calendarios, y proponiendo alternativas para mitigar las prórrogas de tiempo no programadas. 3. Validar con el Infonavit de manera periódica los recursos requeridos para la implementación de las estrategias, y proponer alternativas menos costosas o intensivas en recursos cuando se considere que su implementación no será viable o sostenible en el mediano plazo y 4. Comunicación constante con Infonavit, dotar a promotores/campeones internos con las herramientas para apoyar las propuestas del PNUD

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Risks1_9692_311 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Risks1_9692_311.png)	alejandrogonzalez@undp.org	10/15/2021 6:24:00 PM
2	Risks2_9692_311 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Risks2_9692_311.png)	alejandrogonzalez@undp.org	10/15/2021 6:24:00 PM
3	Risks3_9692_311 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Risks3_9692_311.png)	alejandrogonzalez@undp.org	10/15/2021 6:24:00 PM
4	Risks4_9692_311 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Risks4_9692_311.png)	alejandrogonzalez@undp.org	10/15/2021 6:24:00 PM

Efficient**Quality Rating: Highly 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:

Los recursos movilizados fueron adecuados para lograr los resultados esperados, se adjunta el informe final como soporte, se erogó el 100% del recurso del proyecto.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	120701_Informe_Final_9692_312 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/120701_Informe_Final_9692_312.docx)	alejandro.gonzalez@undp.org	10/13/2021 8:33:00 PM

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 cuenta con un plan de adquisiciones revisado constantemente y con ajustes que permitió asegurar la operatividad. A pesar de las implicaciones por la contingencia sanitaria, se realizaron las adecuaciones necesarias para que los insumos del proyecto fueran entregados de manera oportuna y con la calidad técnica necesaria para cumplir con los objetivos. Se ejecutaron el 100% de los recursos para el logro de los resultados del proyecto.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	120701_PDA_20-21_9692_313 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/120701_PDA_20-21_9692_313.xlsx)	alejandrogonzalez@undp.org	10/15/2021 7:39:00 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:

Se mantuvo una comunicación constante con la oficina de País para revisar costos de manera periódica. También se mantuvo una estrecha comunicación con el PNUD entre el área de programas, operaciones y el Proyecto, posibilitando una visión de largo plazo para el alcance de resultados, asegurando complementariedad y eficiencia. Sin embargo, no se realizó comparación con otros procesos similares tanto a nivel del PNUD o con otros socios.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	120701_Informe_Final_9692_314 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/120701_Informe_Final_9692_314.docx)	alejandrogonzalez@undp.org	10/13/2021 8:37:00 PM

Effective**Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

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

☒ **Yes**

☐ No

Evidence:

De acuerdo con el PRODOC, el Proyecto Infonavit tenía el compromiso de realizar diez entregables y cinco talleres. A la fecha de cierre, el proyecto había realizado 31 entregables y cinco talleres. Esta extensión adicional de entregables se realizó sin aportaciones adicionales de presupuesto.

Ambos, entregables y talleres abarcaron los siguientes rubros: 1. Riesgos de integridad (Mapas de riesgos), 2. Conflicto de intereses y evolución patrimonial, 3. Denuncias e investigaciones, 4. Compras Institucionales y 5. Hostigamiento y acoso sexual y laboral.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	120701_Informe_Final_9692_315 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/120701_Informe_Final_9692_315.docx)	alejandrogonzalez@undp.org	10/13/2021 8:37:00 PM
2	210729MinutaJuntadeCierre.INFONAVIT-final30sep21firmaMEA3_9692_315 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/210729MinutaJuntadeCierre.INFONAVIT-final30sep21firmaMEA3_9692_315.pdf)	alejandrogonzalez@undp.org	10/13/2021 8:37:00 PM
3	210729PresentaciónJuntadeCierreProyectoINFONAVIT-revMEA1_9692_315 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/210729PresentaciónJuntadeCierreProyectoINFONAVIT-revMEA1_9692_315.pptx)	alejandrogonzalez@undp.org	10/13/2021 8:37:00 PM
4	PRODOCfirmado_9692_315 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PRODOCfirmado_9692_315.pdf)	alejandrogonzalez@undp.org	10/13/2021 8:38:00 PM

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:

Los datos obtenidos en los reportes trimestrales así como del anual se utilizaron como insumos para ajustar el plan de trabajo del proyecto. Las lecciones aprendidas en cada reporte permitieron tomar decisiones de gestión estratégica para llevar a buen término el Proyecto en su etapa de cierre. De igual forma se mantuvo informada a la junta de proyecto, sobre los riesgos durante un año de pandemia.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	PlandeTrabajoAWP_9692_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PlandeTrabajoAWP_9692_316.docx)	alejandro.gonzalez@undp.org	10/13/2021 8:45:00 PM
2	2.InformeTrimestral2020_9692_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2.InformeTrimestral2020_9692_316.pdf)	alejandro.gonzalez@undp.org	10/13/2021 8:45:00 PM
3	3.InformeTrimestral2020_9692_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/3.InformeTrimestral2020_9692_316.pdf)	alejandro.gonzalez@undp.org	10/13/2021 8:46:00 PM
4	4.InformeTrimestral2020_9692_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/4.InformeTrimestral2020_9692_316.pdf)	alejandro.gonzalez@undp.org	10/13/2021 8:46:00 PM

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:

Los grupos objetivo se encuentran definidos en la subsección Participación de las partes involucradas. Se definen con base en su pertenencia a una organización, no características individuales o socioeconómicas. Si bien algunas personas pueden pertenecer a grupos excluidos, no participan en el proyecto en función de esa pertenencia. Como parte de las actividades del proyecto, se realizó una Encuesta de Denuncias con sección de sociodemográficos para obtener datos desagregados por género, condición de discapacidad, grupos etarios, escolaridad, discriminación o pertenencia a comunidades originarias y diversidades sexuales.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	PRODOCfirmado_9692_317 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PRODOCfirmado_9692_317.pdf)	alejandro.gonzalez@undp.org	10/13/2021 8:47:00 PM
2	120701_Informe_Final_9692_317 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/120701_Informe_Final_9692_317.docx)	alejandro.gonzalez@undp.org	10/13/2021 8:47:00 PM

Sustainability & National Ownership**Quality Rating:** Needs Improvement

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:

Los asociados nacionales se involucraron totalment e en el seguimiento del Proyecto, manteniendo una comunicación estrecha y frecuente con la contrapart e e involucrándola en la toma de decisiones y jugand o un papel fundamental en la implementación. Se utilizan los sistemas nacionales para la implementac ión y seguimiento del proyecto.

Durante la implementación de las actividades susta ntivas del proyecto, el personal del INFONAVIT y de sus órganos colegiados fue involucrado durante la r ealización de una encuesta sobre posibles violacion es al Código de Ética. Por otra parte, para poder dia gnosticar el cumplimiento de la ética se consideró u na misión de investigación (contemplando quince se siones individuales, más dos sesiones con la direcci ón general del Instituto). Además, para la elaboració n del cuestionario del mapa de riesgos, se involucró a las áreas de adquisición del Infonavit, para el desa rrollo de indicadores de monitoreo y evaluación en l os procesos de compras institucionales

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	120701_Informe_Final_9692_318 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/120701_Informe_Final_9692_318.docx)	alejandro.gonzalez@undp.org	10/13/2021 8:48:00 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](#)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:

A lo largo de la implementación del Proyecto se ha realizado un seguimiento periódico e integral del desempeño de socios y de la pertinencia de las acciones del Proyecto. La contraparte señaló la importancia de la consolidación de los entregables: en el último mes de actividades, se logró concluir los talleres, y la entrega de todos los entregables que se habían comprometido. Indicó que falta la maduración de los entregables, pero que una vez que están en el ámbito de trabajo del INFONAVIT, están haciendo lo necesario dentro de sus atribuciones, a fin de que su normativa interna refleje las recomendaciones. Un ejemplo son los procedimientos de adquisiciones.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	210729MinutaJuntadeCierre.INFONAVIT-final30sep21firmaMEA3_9692_319 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/210729MinutaJuntadeCierre.INFONAVIT-final30sep21firmaMEA3_9692_319.pdf)	alejandrogonzalez@undp.org	10/13/2021 8:48:00 PM

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:

A lo largo de la implementación no hubo Junta de Proyecto en la cual se revisaran y ajustaran los arreglos de transición. Sin embargo, sí hubo una Junta de Cierre.

Management Response:

La corta duración del proyecto, el calendario de entregables y el cambio en la dirección del Programa de Gobernanza impidieron la organización de las debidas juntas. Sin embargo, en febrero de este año se retomó la comunicación con el INFONAVIT y se llevaron a cabo al menos 5 reuniones de seguimiento hasta la reunión de cierre.

Para futuros proyectos, el Programa de Gobernanza establecerá un cronograma de reuniones de la Junta Directiva de Proyecto (al menos una al año) para evaluar el desempeño del mismo. Las reuniones podrían ser trimestrales o semestrales, y podrían girar en torno a los Informes de avances presentados por la Coordinación, para que la contraparte se mantenga informada acerca de los avances, riesgos y atrasos en la implementación plan de sustentabilidad del proyecto, y colabore en la realización de ajustes a los arreglos de gestión.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	210729MinutaJuntadeCierre.INFONAVIT-final30sep21firmaMEA3_9692_320 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/210729MinutaJuntadeCierre.INFONAVIT-final30sep21firmaMEA3_9692_320.pdf)	alejandro.gonzalez@undp.org	10/13/2021 8:49:00 PM

QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments

Repuestas de gerencia: Para futuros proyectos, el Programa de Gobernanza establecerá un cronograma de reuniones de la Junta Directiva de Proyecto (al menos una al año) para evaluar el desempeño del mismo. Las reuniones podrían ser trimestrales o semestrales, y podrían girar en torno a los Informes de avances presentados por la Coordinación, para que la contraparte se mantenga informada acerca de los avances, riesgos y atrasos en la implementación plan de sustentabilidad del proyecto, y colabore en la realización de ajustes a los arreglos de gestión.

Principales acuerdos finales convenidos en la junta de cierre:

- Sobre los aspectos financieros, deberán incluirse los montos en pesos mexicanos, por ser la moneda de la contribución; el monto equivalente en dólares estadounidenses debe ir entre paréntesis.
 - Desarrollar más los resultados obtenidos por el proyecto, tanto en la presentación como en el informe de cierre. Para ello, se incluirá la información detallada sobre los entregables y los talleres impartidos, los retos de implementación por la pandemia, los logros obtenidos y la necesidad de extenderlo por un mes para concluirlo debidamente.
 - Especificar las metas de sostenibilidad y los Objetivos del Desarrollo Sostenible a los cuales abonó el proyecto.
 - Se aprobó el cierre del proyecto, con las observaciones emitidas.
- (ver minuta de cierre, adjunta en la pregunta 20)