Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

Form Status: Approved

Overall Rating:	Satisfactory
Decision:	
Portfolio/Project Number:	00110463
Portfolio/Project Title:	Voice of Persons with Disabilities
Portfolio/Project Date:	2018-03-01 / 2020-03-02

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:

Project "Autonomy, Voice and Participation of Peopl e with Disabilities" was joint project of the UNCT in S erbia. UNDP was responsible for the Pillar 3. The pr oject team identified relevant changes and some we re integrated in the project implementation. In the An nual report Section on Variations in impact and outc ome indicators, Table 3. represents what has learne d through project implementation having in mind The ory of change developed for the project.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	ANNUALPROGRESSREPORTTemplateforR 3countriesFINAL2018_6308_301 (https://intr anet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocu ments/ANNUALPROGRESSREPORTTempl ateforR3countriesFINAL2018_6308_301.doc x)	nenad.petkovic@undp.org	11/23/2020 9:49:00 PM
2	TheoryofChangeUNCTSerbiaUPDATED_630 8_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/Project QA/QAFormDocuments/TheoryofChangeUN CTSerbiaUPDATED_6308_301.docx)	nenad.petkovic@undp.org	11/23/2020 10:23:00 PM

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:

As a joint project of UNCT in Serbia the action responded to priority areas as concerns the position and rights of persons with disabilities in Serbia – equality before the law, equality of women and girls with disabilities and the right to work - rooted in the UN CRPD, CRPD Committee Concluding Observations to Serbia (2016) and other relevant recommendations, reports and findings, including reports from independent human rights institutions (NHRI, Equality Commissioner), CSO and DPO sources, CEDAW and UPR reports, as well as reports from other international and regional actors. The project was strategically planned to seize the opportunity to utilize the context in which a new Strategy on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities was drafted and adopted the baseline for which was supported by UNCT, and wed key outcomes and activities with the Strategy measures to use the momentum of close cooperation, political and partnership levers.
By addressing inequalities and exclusion with persons with disabilities in the main focus this project responded to UNDP Strategic plan development setting: Accelerate structural transformations for sustainable development and adopted Signature solution 2: Strengthen effective, inclusive and accountable governance.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	SERBIAProjectproposalUPDATE_FINALOUT_6308_302 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SERBIAProjectproposalUPDATE_FINALOUT_6308_302.docx)	nenad.petkovic@undp.org	11/23/2020 9:55:00 PM

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:

National Disability Forum (NOOIS) and Mental Disability Rights Initiative (MDRI) were members of the Work Group established for Pillar 3/UNDP to design and develop supported employment service along with the Our House association, Halfway There and Forum of Youth with Disabilities. Our House – OPD – an association of parents and persons with intellectual disabilities were beneficiaries of the sub-grant in Pillar 3/UNDP awarded to design and run innovative employment initiative of job coaching and supported employment of PwDs.

Persons with disabilities and their representative organizations were included in the Steering Committee of the project which had been set up in the inception period of the project. The initial joint planning workshop was organized in a form of a two-day retreat where all potential Steering Committee members including all listed stakeholders from the Government, national human rights institutions, UNCT, and civil society were gathered to develop activity plan of the project and indicators for M&E plan. Stakeholders were divided into clusters for legal capacity, rights of women with disabilities and employment of people with disabilities according to their interests and organizational mandates to work in small groups and propose and develop a full activity plan. In that way, it was ensured that space, means, and opportunity were given to all stakeholders including OPDs to voice their proposals and argumentation for the approaches to be used in the project.

All of the OPDs included in the Steering Committee were involved in project implementation and delivery of the activities as implementing partners. As for the participation in monitoring and evaluation participating SC members decided collaboratively on the set of indicators to be used for monitoring and evaluation guided by M&E officer of UN RCO and participating UN agencies and have been participating continuously in the monitoring of project activities.

See the Inception activities report and Section 6. Full and effective participation of persons with disabilities and Section 7 Partnerships building in the End of project report.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	InceptionActivitiesReportPRPDSerbia_6308_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/InceptionActivitiesReportPRPDSerbia_6308_303.docx)	nenad.petkovic@undp.org	11/23/2020 10:24:00 PM
2	EndofProjectReport-RevisedSerbiaAVPprojectFINAL_6308_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/EndofProjectReport-RevisedSerbiaAVPprojectFINAL_6308_303.docx)	nenad.petkovic@undp.org	11/23/2020 10:24:00 PM

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:

There has been regular monitoring on variations in o utcome indicators and risk management. Monitoring instrument developed in the inception project phase and later adapted to reflect changes in the implemen tation, was used periodically. In relation to that, CSO s expressed the need for additional support in under standing and applying robust monitoring methodolog ies, such was the one utilized by the project. From a management point of view, additional expertise, eith er in-house or external, could be employed so to full y integrate all monitoring functions and mechanisms into the PMC, including its cross sections.
See the Section 9.Creation of knowledge and comm unications materials in the End of project report, as well as progress in the interim reports. The case stu dy is example of after action review from UNDP.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Annex1UNPRPDReportingTemplates_RevisedHalf-YearlyProgressreportFINAL_6308_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Annex1UNPRPDReportingTemplates_RevisedHalf-YearlyProgressreportFINAL_6308_304.docx)	nenad.petkovic@undp.org	11/23/2020 10:26:00 PM
2	ANNUALPROGRESSREPORTTemplateforR3countriesFINAL2018_6308_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ANNUALPROGRESSREPORTTemplateforR3countriesFINAL2018_6308_304.docx)	nenad.petkovic@undp.org	11/23/2020 10:26:00 PM
3	EndofProjectReport-RevisedSerbiaAVPprojectFINAL_6308_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/EndofProjectReport-RevisedSerbiaAVPprojectFINAL_6308_304.docx)	nenad.petkovic@undp.org	11/23/2020 10:27:00 PM
4	Annex4UNPRPDCaseStudyOutline__Pillar3_6308_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Annex4UNPRPDCaseStudyOutline__Pillar3_6308_304.docx)	nenad.petkovic@undp.org	11/24/2020 2:50:00 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:

Project was sufficiently implemented and it has potential for scale up. The plan for continuation and scale up of the project in the period 2021-2023 is described within the EoI submitted to UNPRPD fund Call in October 2020.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	UNPRD4EoIUNCTSERBIAfinal_6308_305 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/UNPRD4EoIUNCTSERBIAfinal_6308_305.docx)	nenad.petkovic@undp.org	11/23/2020 10:28:00 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:

Equality between men and women is taken into account throughout the planning of all project activities and the project team have paid due regard to support and encourage participation of women, with special emphasis on women with disabilities and their representative organizations, in all inception activities and to streamline gender component in planning of the project implementation.
All three baseline studies for three project pillars have included disaggregated data on sex from secondary sources.
The project has one Pillar 2 dedicated to support women and girls with disability. UN Women and UNFPA were leading the implementation of activities within the second pillar – Strengthening the voice and integrity of women and girls with disabilities.

Pillar 3/UNDP identified that, according to the official data around 1/3 of people with disabilities in Serbia who are active in search for a job are women. This indicates a gender gap in economically active people with disabilities. That is why we supported inclusion and capacity building of women with disabilities in our activities. Most of the participants on the capacity building trainings were women. Both genders are included as candidates in the training for job couches. There was equal distribution among gender in the employment phase as 9 women vs. 10 men were employed.
In all events held in implementation most of participants were women.
See the Section 5 Equality between men and women in End of project report.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	EndofProjectReport-RevisedSerbiaAVProjectFINAL_6308_306 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/EndofProjectReport-RevisedSerbiaAVProjectFINAL_6308_306.docx)	nenad.petkovic@undp.org	11/24/2020 2:52:00 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:

Low risk project.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	ANNUALPROGRESSREPORTTemplateforR3countriesFINAL2018_6308_307 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ANNUALPROGRESSREPORTTemplateforR3countriesFINAL2018_6308_307.docx)	nenad.petkovic@undp.org	11/23/2020 10:29:00 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:

There were no grievances received related to this pr oject.

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 M&E plan was developed and .implemented on a regular basis.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Annex3UNPRPDMEPlanTemplateFINAL_6308_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Annex3UNPRPDMEPlanTemplateFINAL_6308_309.docx)	nenad.petkovic@undp.org	11/23/2020 10:30:00 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:

The project has set up, in the beginning, the Steering Committee of the project gathering Government's representatives (line Ministry – MoL including the sectors for antidiscrimination, sector for family and social protection and sector for employment), Office for Human and Minority Rights, national human rights institutions, OPDs and CSOs,and participating UN agencies. Initially invited representatives have all embarked on Steering Committee and planned the project activities and project timeframe collaboratively.

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:

See Section 15 Risk Reporting in the End of project report.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	EndofProjectReport-RevisedSerbiaAVPprojectFINAL_6308_311 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/EndofProjectReport-RevisedSerbiaAVPprojectFINAL_6308_311.docx)	nenad.petkovic@undp.org	11/23/2020 10:31:00 PM

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 short-term results were not only achieved, but majority even exceeded planned targets. Activities were implemented pursuant to the initial plan and budget frame. Moreover, all partners including UNDP managed to deliver some additional activities and by making good connection with their other ongoing initiatives, maximized effects achieved.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Evaluation_PRPD_FINAL2020_6308_312 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Evaluation_PRPD_FINAL2020_6308_312.docx)	nenad.petkovic@undp.org	11/23/2020 10:32:00 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:

The project followed and monitored engagement of all sub-recipients that most of the project implementation relied on. The attachment is the table with sub-recipients and costing.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	UNPRPDsubrecipientarrangementsAutonomyvoiceandparticipation2020FINAL_6308_313 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/UNPRPDsubrecipientarrangementsAutonomyvoiceandparticipation2020FINAL_6308_313.xlsx)	nenad.petkovic@undp.org	11/23/2020 10:33:00 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:

The project monitored expenses on a regular basis according to the UN PRPD directions and requirements.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Annex2UNPRPDAnnualWorkplanandProjectTrackerTemplate_FINAL1April2020_6308_314 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Annex2UNPRPDAnnualWorkplanandProjectTrackerTemplate_FINAL1April2020_6308_314.xlsx)	nenad.petkovic@undp.org	11/23/2020 10:34:00 PM

Effective **Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory**

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

- (●) *Yes*
- ( ) No

Evidence:

The project was implemented on track and delivered expected results with additional .actions and results from all UN participators agencies, including UNDP. Evaluation report available in the attachment.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Evaluation_PRPD_FINAL2020_6308_315 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Evaluation_PRPD_FINAL2020_6308_315.docx)	nenad.petkovic@undp.org	11/23/2020 10:35:00 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:

Annual work plans were developed regularly.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	AnnualWorkPlan-AWPPWDs2019AJFINAL_6308_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/AnnualWorkPlan-AWPPWDs2019AJFINAL_6308_316.DOCX)	nenad.petkovic@undp.org	11/23/2020 10:35:00 PM
2	AnnualWorkPlan-AWPPWDs2020NEW.docx_6308_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/AnnualWorkPlan-AWPPWDs2020NEW.docx_6308_316.pdf)	nenad.petkovic@undp.org	11/23/2020 10:36:00 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:

In the initial phase of the project the outreach efforts were made to get on board all OPDs and CSOs working in the field of disability rights especially those programmatically oriented to target areas of the project (legal capacity, rights of women and girls with disabilities and employment) as well as the national representative organization – National Organization of Persons with Disabilities (NOOIS). Bilateral meetings were held with OPDs envisaged as partners in the project to inform them on the project start and upcoming activities and discuss with them their involvement. Project team has also mapped other relevant OPDs working in the field and target areas of the project beyond those listed in the project application and ensured their participation as well fostering cross-disability approach and getting on board national representative organization, self-advocates and parental associations, independent living organization, organizations of women with disabilities and organizations of people with psychosocial disabilities. Persons with disabilities, as well as their respective organization, have been an integral part of the planning and inception, and important implementing partners as well.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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:

UNDP CO support and procedures along with the na tional system were applied in implementation.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	EndofProjectReport-RevisedSerbiaAVPprojectFINAL_6308_318 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/EndofProjectReport-RevisedSerbiaAVPprojectFINAL_6308_318.docx)	nenad.petkovic@undp.org	11/23/2020 10:39:00 PM
2	InceptionActivitiesReportPRPDSerbia_6308_318 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/InceptionActivitiesReportPRPDSerbia_6308_318.docx)	nenad.petkovic@undp.org	11/23/2020 10:39:00 PM
3	UNPRPDsubrecipientarrangementsAutonomyvoiceandparticipation2020FINAL_6308_318 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/UNPRPDsubrecipientarrangementsAutonomyvoiceandparticipation2020FINAL_6308_318.xlsx)	nenad.petkovic@undp.org	11/23/2020 10:39:00 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:

The outcomes of the intervention were consistent wit h beneficiaries' requirements, country needs, and gl obal policies. The following aspects were considered in project implementation: contextual and (national) community needs, their link to the national and glob al policies, and particularly CRPD policy agenda, ne eds of target groups and beneficiaries and expertise and know-how of partners to address these needs. See Brief baseline for Pillar 3/UNDP were the situati on was assessed and Implementation plan for arran gements in the project implementation.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	BriefbaselinePillar3FINAL_6308_319 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/BriefbaselinePillar3FINAL_6308_319.docx)	nenad.petkovic@undp.org	11/23/2020 10:41:00 PM
2	PRPDImplementationplan2018-2020forallpillars0810_6308_319 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PRPDImplementationplan2018-2020forallpillars0810_6308_319.xlsx)	nenad.petkovic@undp.org	11/23/2020 10:41:00 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:

See Section 11 Project follow up and Sustainability in the End of project report and Evaluation report.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	EndofProjectReport-RevisedSerbiaAVProjectFINAL_6308_320 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/EndofProjectReport-RevisedSerbiaAVProjectFINAL_6308_320.docx)	nenad.petkovic@undp.org	11/23/2020 10:42:00 PM
2	Evaluation_PRPD_FINAL2020_6308_320 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Evaluation_PRPD_FINAL2020_6308_320.docx)	nenad.petkovic@undp.org	11/23/2020 10:43:00 PM

QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments

Project was implemented successfully and will be scaled up. The plan for continuation and scaling up of the project in the period 2021-2023 is described within the EoI submitted to UNPRPD fund Call in October 2020.