

Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

Form Status: Approved

Overall Rating:	Highly Satisfactory
Decision:	
Portfolio/Project Number:	00113029
Portfolio/Project Title:	STRENGTHENING THE NATIONAL RESPONSE TO HIV IN ANGOLA
Portfolio/Project Date:	2018-07-01 / 2022-06-30

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:

Changes in the national therapeutic guidelines for HIV treatment lead to an update of the list of the health products to reflect the nevirapine phase out. The updated list of health products was submitted and approved by the Global Fund.

On the other hand the project updated the project budget to align with real implementing costs of the SR's. The Budget was submitted for review and subsequent approval, by the Global Fund.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Listofhealthproducts_2018-2021_v01August2019_1945_201_11111_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Listofhealthproducts_2018-2021_v01August2019_1945_201_11111_301.xlsx)	domingos.jorge@undp.org	12/31/2021 12:56:00 AM
2	NFM2RevisedSummaryBudgetwithSR-08Oct2019_1945_201_11111_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/NFM2RevisedSummaryBudgetwithSR-08Oct2019_1945_201_11111_301.xlsx)	domingos.jorge@undp.org	12/31/2021 12:56:00 AM

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

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

Evidence:

The project responds to one of the development settings as specified in the 2018-2021 UNDP Strategic Plan and the CPD 2020-2022, corresponding to “Advance poverty eradication in all its forms and dimensions”. This project also adapts to the following signature solutions: (i) keeping out of poverty; (ii) Strengthen gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	CPDAngola2020-2022_11111_302 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CPDAngola2020-2022_11111_302.pdf)	domingos.jorge@undp.org	12/22/2021 8:49:00 PM
2	UNDP_StrategicPlan_2018-2021_11111_302 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/UNDP_StrategicPlan_2018-2021_11111_302.pdf)	domingos.jorge@undp.org	12/22/2021 9:32:00 PM
3	fundingrequestNFM2_11111_302 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/fundingrequestNFM2_11111_302.pdf)	domingos.jorge@undp.org	12/31/2021 8:45:00 AM

Relevant**Quality Rating: Highly 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:

The project targets groups who are furthest behind as re stated in the NFM2 Narrative Funding Request. These groups include people living with HIV, HIV positive pregnant women, TB and malaria patients, adolescent girls and young women, female sex workers, men who have sex with men. Reports received by UNDP from the main implementers (MSH, OIC, APDES and ADPP) of interventions targeted at these groups and demonstrated consistent use of consultation, involvement and empowerment approaches vis-à-vis to such groups. The selection of the target groups was based on the 2015-2018 National Strategic Plan for HIV/aids, the 2016 MICS/Demographic Health Survey (DHS, Ministry of Health), the 2016 SADC Integrated Biological and Behavioural Survey on (IBBS, INLS) on Female Sex workers, and the 2017 PLACE Study on Female Sex Workers, Men who have sex with Men and Transgender persons (Linkages). The DHS and two IBBS surveys used rigorous survey processes which generated reliable evidence on the vulnerability of key populations to HIV. Epidemiological evidence was also completed by equally rigorous qualitative research on the Situation analysis of Key Populations (UNDP, 2018), AGYW programming (UNDP, 2018) or the HIV Legal Environment Assessment (UNDP, 2019). Together with the Audit of HIV patient's data, these exercises informed the prioritisation of target groups in the NFM2. People living with HIV and Key Populations are represented in the Country Co-ordination Mechanism (CCM) which is the project board. Geographic coverage included a national coverage between 2018 and 2020.

List of Uploaded Documents			
#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Annex1FundingRequestFullReviewFINAL_1111_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Annex1FundingRequestFullReviewFINAL_1111_303.pdf)	domingos.jorge@undp.org	12/23/2021 8:11:00 AM
2	PropostaExpansaoServicosdeTB_6Dez2021002_Review3_1111_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PropostaExpansaoServicosdeTB_6Dez2021002_Review3_1111_303.docx)	domingos.jorge@undp.org	1/2/2022 9:43:00 AM
3	RelatórioExpansãodaParagemÚnica-1_Review_i_1111_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/RelatórioExpansãodaParagemÚnica-1_Review_i_1111_303.pdf)	domingos.jorge@undp.org	1/2/2022 9:44:00 AM
4	ONUAngolaPTC_2021_RevisãointercalarOG4.pt_Review_1111_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ONUAngolaPTC_2021_RevisãointercalarOG4.pt_Review_1111_303.xlsx)	domingos.jorge@undp.org	1/2/2022 9:45:00 AM
5	RelatóriofinalJan-Mar_2021UNDPVIH-SIDA.docx_1111_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/RelatóriofinalJan-Mar_2021UNDPVIH-SIDA.docx_1111_303.pdf)	domingos.jorge@undp.org	1/3/2022 9:30:00 AM
6	RelatórioGeralUNDP-HIVAbril-Junho_2021vs16_07_2021_1111_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/RelatórioGeralUNDP-HIVAbril-Junho_2021vs16_07_2021_1111_303.pdf)	domingos.jorge@undp.org	1/3/2022 9:30:00 AM
7	Relatorio_Anuar_Out20_Jun21_1111_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Relatorio_Anuar_Out20_Jun21_1111_303.pdf)	domingos.jorge@undp.org	1/3/2022 9:35:00 AM
8	Versãoreal_ProgramadoEncontroFinal_1111_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Versãoreal_ProgramadoEncontroFinal_1111_303.pdf)	domingos.jorge@undp.org	1/3/2022 9:35:00 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:

This project is a consolidation of three existing grants from the Global Fund (HIV, TB and Malária), which were developed in 2017 considering the epidemiological context at the time, following a revision in 2020. In addition, lessons learned in programme implementation were also identified at the time and programmatic and financial gap tables were developed to directly inform the country needs in relation to the three diseases. The previous narrative for the Z-grant and the current narrative for NFM3 include lessons learned from USAID/linkages project, from ADPP using a risk assessment approach to counsel adolescent girls and young women, and from Hospital Esperança pilot on drug prescription and dispensation system.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	2-Annex1FundingRequestFullReviewFINAL_11111_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2-Annex1FundingRequestFullReviewFINAL_11111_304.pdf)	domingos.jorge@undp.org	12/27/2021 5:39:00 PM
2	ProjectDocument-UNDPGlobalFundPRrole-2018-2021B_11111_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ProjectDocument-UNDPGlobalFundPRrole-2018-2021B_11111_304.doc)	domingos.jorge@undp.org	12/27/2021 5:41:00 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:

Governmental Disease programs, NGO's, CBOs, platforms (ANASO and religious) were very active in the national response to the three diseases, and on COVID 19, both at national as well as provincial level. These organisations include ADPP, Associação das Igrejas de Angola (AIA), ANASO, APDES, ASCAM, Centro de Apoio aos Jovens (CAJ), IRIS, MSH, and OIC, as well as ADECOS on the part of the Government. They have already played/play a noteworthy role in the implementation of the past and current grant/s (NFM2 and the Z Grant) as PR, SR and SSRs.

Investments in civil society will ensure community level interventions have a direct impact on the improvement of individuals' health, well-being, and human rights, including enabling communities to play a more effective and informed participation in decision-making processes that affect their lives and the full development of their human capacities, autonomy and, ultimately, their dignity. More specifically, CSO and CBO interventions will aim to stimulate demand for the prevention and treatment of the diseases, improve the legal and policy environment and contribute to the country responses with better coordination to ensure the best outcomes.

The involvement of CSOs, CBOs and coordinating platforms in delivering interventions at both national and subnational levels will ensure that existing and future programmes are efficiently implemented by reaching out to provinces, municipalities, and smaller communities.

Investments also aim to strengthen CSO networks that focus attention on persons affected by the diseases, particularly those caring for the marginalised, KVPs and others in need of accessing quality services.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	2-Annex1FundingRequestFullReviewFINAL_11111_305 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/2-Annex1FundingRequestFullReviewFINAL_11111_305.pdf)	domingos.jorge@undp.org	12/27/2021 8:11:00 PM

Principled

Quality Rating: **Highly 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:

The Adolescent Girls and Young Women component of the Project is informed by the assessment of UNDP's programming in this area in 2017-2018. The Female Sex Workers component focused on gender-based violence (GBV), using data on sources and occurrences of GBV collected by UNDP's implementing partner (MSH) in 2017-2018. The component on the prevention of mother-to-child transmission is HIV (PMTCT) is informed by the situation analysis of PMTCT conducted in 2018. The Grant results framework (i.e. Performance Framework) includes three gender-sensitive indicators out of five indicators. The national health information is not yet geared towards generating gender-sensitive data on access to health services.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	CPDAngola2020-2022_11111_306 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CPDAngola2020-2022_11111_306.pdf)	domingos.jorge@undp.org	12/27/2021 10:17:00 PM
2	AGO-Z-UNDP_PFGGrantRevisionMay72020MECAApproved-1_11111_306 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/AGO-Z-UNDP_PFGGrantRevisionMay72020MECAApproved-1_11111_306.xlsx)	domingos.jorge@undp.org	1/2/2022 1:21:00 PM
3	AGO-H-UNDP2018-2021ApprovedPerformanceFramework_11111_306 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/AGO-H-UNDP2018-2021ApprovedPerformanceFramework_11111_306.xlsx)	domingos.jorge@undp.org	1/2/2022 1:36:00 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:

The SESP is not a requirement for Global Fund grants. The Project relates to a Global Fund grant managed by UNDP.

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:

In case of grievances, Project staff were aware of UNDP's Corporate Responsibility. The SESP is not a requirement for Global Fund grants. The Project relates to a Global Fund grant managed by UNDP.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Management & Monitoring**Quality Rating: Exemplary**

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:

There was an M&E Plan available, which included a supervision Plan, and data collection and analysis, reporting mechanisms

The M&E plan was the principal document designed by UNDP to describe how the M&E system would function throughout the Project implementation, allowing the collection, processing, and transformation of data into strategic information, enabling informed decision-making at all levels: local, national, and global.

This plan illustrated how the PR would continuously monitor the implementation of its GF interventions, collect, and manage the data, identify, and address implementation challenges while contributing the MOH and CSOs' efforts to increase data governance, coordinate data flow, analysis and sharing, harmonize supportive supervision and use of the information for decision-making.

The Project RRF is the Grant Performance Framework which includes impact, outcome and coverage indicators and respective baseline data. Progress data against indicators was reported every six (6) months for coverage or according to the timeline set for outcome and impact indicators.

The Project RRF is the Grant Performance Framework which includes impact, outcome and coverage indicators and respective baseline data. Progress data against indicators was reported every six (6) months for coverage or according to the timeline set for outcome and impact indicators.

There is an M&E Plan available, which includes supervision Plan, data collection and analysis, reporting mechanisms.

In September 2021, UNDP submitted to GF the latest PU, which provided an update on the Programmatic results against the target, on all related coverage, outcome and impact indicators, for the period Jan. - Jun. 2021, as agreed between UNDP and GF.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	MEPlanemactualização2019-2021003_11111_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MEPlanemactualização2019-2021003_11111_309.docx)	domingos.jorge@undp.org	1/2/2022 2:28:00 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:

As per Global Fund grant architecture, the project Governance mechanism is the Country Co-ordination Mechanism (CCM). The CCM has a Governance Manual which describes its mandate, structure as well as the roles and responsibilities of its members.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	CCMReport-3_9862_210_11111_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CCMReport-3_9862_210_11111_310.pdf)	domingos.jorge@undp.org	12/28/2021 12:19:00 PM
2	RuthMixinge_9862_210_11111_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/RuthMixinge_9862_210_11111_310.pdf)	domingos.jorge@undp.org	12/28/2021 12:19:00 PM
3	UNDP2018_ReporttoCCM_GrantOverview_9862_210_11111_310 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/UNDP2018_ReporttoCCM_GrantOverview_9862_210_11111_310.docx)	domingos.jorge@undp.org	12/28/2021 12:20:00 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:

Subrecipients including ADPP, APDES, INLS and Mwenho submitted quarterly reports on their performance Indicators related to HIV key population, as well as TB and Malária at facility and community level. Findings and recommendation were provided and follow up actions taken through management letters issued by the PR (UNDP/GF). After the conclusion of the Project, the PR submitted a PU to the Global Fund, with the data and comments on the different levels of results achieved, including coverage, process, outcome and impact indicators, which the Project attained or contributed to.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	1°_SRProgrammaticReport_TrimestreOut-Dez2019_11111_311 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/1°_SRProgrammaticReport_TrimestreOut-Dez2019_11111_311.pdf)	domingos.jorge@undp.org	1/3/2022 4:09:00 PM
2	4thSRProgrammaticReport_JUL_SET_11111_311 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/4thSRProgrammaticReport_JUL_SET_11111_311.pdf)	domingos.jorge@undp.org	1/3/2022 4:09:00 PM
3	ADPP_Relatório_Abr._Jun.2021_11111_311 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ADPP_Relatório_Abr._Jun.2021_11111_311.pdf)	domingos.jorge@undp.org	1/3/2022 4:10:00 PM
4	ADPP_RelatórioJan-Mar_2021.docx_11111_311 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ADPP_RelatórioJan-Mar_2021.docx_11111_311.pdf)	domingos.jorge@undp.org	1/3/2022 4:10:00 PM
5	AGO-H-UNDP_PUDR-30June2019-Final_1945_212-1_11111_311 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/AGO-H-UNDP_PUDR-30June2019-Final_1945_212-1_11111_311.xlsx)	domingos.jorge@undp.org	1/3/2022 4:10:00 PM
6	AGO-Z-UNDP_ProgressReport_31Dec2020_v16-26-3-21Finalversion_11111_311 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/AGO-Z-UNDP_ProgressReport_31Dec2020_v16-26-3-21Finalversion_11111_311.xlsx)	domingos.jorge@undp.org	1/3/2022 4:10:00 PM
7	APDESMLSEMESTRAL-MR-11Maio2020_11111_311 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/APDESMLSEMESTRAL-MR-11Maio2020_11111_311.doc)	domingos.jorge@undp.org	1/3/2022 4:11:00 PM
8	ODPMgmtLetter_FINAL_2019_11111_311 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ODPMgmtLetter_FINAL_2019_11111_311.docx)	domingos.jorge@undp.org	1/3/2022 4:11:00 PM
9	Q3ManagementLetterADPP_11111_311 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Q3ManagementLetterADPP_11111_311.pdf)	domingos.jorge@undp.org	1/3/2022 4:11:00 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:

As per the NFM2 Grant Agreement with the Global Fund, the PR received 93 percent of the total approved Budget for the period July 2018 to September 2019, of which 52% has been spent. The Z-grant (July 2020 – June 2021) is part of this Project, which is linked to the Country Programme theory of change under the first programme priority on "Fostering poverty eradication and inclusive economic growth".

The Z Grant is a consolidated grant covering the last year of the NFM2 grants for HIV, TB and malaria for the period of July 2020 to June 2021. As part of this consolidation, UNDP led the process to develop the submission materials to the Global Fund. This process took place between February and May 2020. In March 17-19, a retreat was held with the participation of INLS and the DNSP, representing the three disease programmes, to discuss the strategies and interventions to improve the indicators in the remaining 12 months of NFM2. The Z-grant also serves to prepare for the newly designed sub-national approach for Angola. This submission involved carrying out an epidemiological update, the development of a consolidated performance framework, budget, list of health products and implementation map. The documentation related to this proposal was validated by the project board (CCM) and was approved by the Global Fund in May 2020.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	AGO-H-UNDP_PUDR-30June2019-Final_1945_212-1_11111_312 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/AGO-H-UNDP_PUDR-30June2019-Final_1945_212-1_11111_312.xlsx)	domingos.jorge@undp.org	12/28/2021 3:33:00 PM
2	AGO-Z-UNDP_ProgressReport_16August_SignedRevisedon20August_Jan_Jun.2021_11111_312 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/AGO-Z-UNDP_ProgressReport_16August_SignedRevisedon20August_Jan_Jun.2021_11111_312.xlsx)	domingos.jorge@undp.org	12/28/2021 3:50:00 PM
3	GRANTAPPROVEDBUDGETMALTBHIV-V8_UNDP__GFRevised_26thAug2020_GFEOV III-TL_9862_212_11111_312 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/GRANTAPPROVEDBUDGETMALTBHIV-V8_UNDP__GFRevised_26thAug2020_GFEOV III-TL_9862_212_11111_312.xlsx)	domingos.jorge@undp.org	12/28/2021 4:02:00 PM
4	AGO-Z-UNDPGFRevisedBudget_26thAug2020_X-_GFReviewedfinal-22April2021_11111_312 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/AGO-Z-UNDPGFRevisedBudget_26thAug2020_X-_GFReviewedfinal-22April2021_11111_312.xlsx)	domingos.jorge@undp.org	1/2/2022 7:35:00 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 has a list of Health Products approved by the Global Fund and a Health and non-Health Products procurement action tool (HPAP). It keeps both documents based on the updates of the national notification.

All procurements of HIV, TB and Malaria commodities planned under Z grant were successfully completed although some constraints related to the deliveries due to Covid-19 restrictions on airspace/flights.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	ZGrant_LOHPassumptionupdated-version8-Final28Maio2020_9862_213_11111_313 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ZGrant_LOHPassumptionupdated-version8-Final28Maio2020_9862_213_11111_313.xls)	domingos.jorge@undp.org	12/28/2021 4:35:00 PM
2	ZGrant_LoHPupdated-version8-Final28052020_9862_213_11111_313 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ZGrant_LoHPupdated-version8-Final28052020_9862_213_11111_313.xls)	domingos.jorge@undp.org	12/28/2021 4:35:00 PM
3	Llistofhealthproducts_2018-2021_v01August2019_1945_213_11111_313 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Llistofhealthproducts_2018-2021_v01August2019_1945_213_11111_313.xlsx)	domingos.jorge@undp.org	12/28/2021 4:29:00 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:

Since the beginning of the Project in July 2018, one Reprogramming Proposal was submitted to the Global Fund for approval. The objective is to maximize results and achieve efficiencies.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	AGO-H-UNDPFirstReprogrammingProposal-17July2019sb_1945_214_11111_314 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/AGO-H-UNDPFirstReprogrammingProposal-17July2019sb_1945_214_11111_314.xlsx)	domingos.jorge@undp.org	12/28/2021 11:42:00 PM

Effective**Quality Rating: Exemplary**

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

- Yes
 No

Evidence:

The project closed in June 2021 and was on track. According to the latest Progress Update report to the Global Fund, this project achieved its expected targets for the HIV component of the grant (NFM2).

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	AGO-Z-UNDP_ProgressReport_16August_SignedRevisedon20August_Jan_Jun.2021_1111_315 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/AGO-Z-UNDP_ProgressReport_16August_SignedRevisedon20August_Jan_Jun.2021_1111_315.xlsx)	domingos.jorge@undp.org	12/29/2021 12:24:00 AM

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:

All Subrecipients submitted regular quarterly reports, on the performance of the established indicators at health facility and community levels. In addition, as per Global Fund principles, semestral reviews of the Project were done through the Progress Updated and Disbursement Requests (PUDR) and the Progress Update (PU) at the end of the Project (after June 2021)

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	UNDP_PlanodeTrabalho_2020_9862_216_1111_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/UNDP_PlanodeTrabalho_2020_9862_216_1111_316.xlsx)	domingos.jorge@undp.org	12/29/2021 12:57:00 AM
2	UNSDCF2020-21JointAWPwithCOVIDupdate_Final24June_9862_216_1111_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/UNSDCF2020-21JointAWPwithCOVIDupdate_Final24June_9862_216_1111_316.xlsx)	domingos.jorge@undp.org	12/29/2021 12:57:00 AM

17. Were the targeted groups systematically identified and engaged, prioritizing the marginalized and excluded, to ensure results were achieved as expected?

- 3: *The project targeted specific groups and/or geographic areas, identified by using credible data sources on their capacity needs, deprivation and/or exclusion from development opportunities relevant to the project's area of work. There is clear evidence that the targeted groups were reached as intended. The project engaged regularly with targeted groups over the past year to assess whether they benefited as expected and adjustments were made if necessary, to refine targeting. (all must be true)*
- 2: The project targeted specific groups and/or geographic areas, based on some evidence of their capacity needs, deprivation and/or exclusion from development opportunities relevant to the project's area of work. Some evidence is provided to confirm that project beneficiaries are members of the targeted groups. There was some engagement with beneficiaries in the past year to assess whether they were benefiting as expected. (all must be true)
- 1: The project did not report on specific targeted groups. There is no evidence to confirm that project beneficiaries are populations have capacity needs or are deprived and/or excluded from development opportunities relevant to the project area of work. There is some engagement with beneficiaries to assess whether they benefited as expected, but it was limited or did not occurred in the past year.
- Not Applicable

Evidence:

The Project target groups includes Female Sex Workers (FSW), Men who have Sex with Men (MSH) and Adolescent Girls, Young Women (AGYW) and pregnant women. Reports received by UNDP from the main implementers of interventions targeted at these groups.- respectively MSH, OIC, APDES and ADPP, demonstrate that consistent use of consultation, involvement and empowerment approaches vis-à-vis to their target groups. the Project Board (the CCM) includes representatives of FSW, MSM, and AGYW.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	RelatórioGeralUNDP-HIVAbril-Junho_2021vs16_07_2021_11111_317 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/RelatórioGeralUNDP-HIVAbril-Junho_2021vs16_07_2021_11111_317.pdf)	domingos.jorge@undp.org	12/29/2021 1:59:00 AM
2	Relatorio_Anual_Out20_Jun21_11111_317 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Relatorio_Anual_Out20_Jun21_11111_317.pdf)	domingos.jorge@undp.org	12/29/2021 1:49:00 AM
3	Apresentação_término_tulitati_apdes_11111_317 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Apresentação_término_tulitati_apdes_11111_317.pdf)	domingos.jorge@undp.org	12/29/2021 1:50:00 AM
4	Versãoreal_ProgramadoEncontroFinal_11111_317 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Versãoreal_ProgramadoEncontroFinal_11111_317.pdf)	domingos.jorge@undp.org	12/29/2021 1:51:00 AM

Sustainability & National Ownership

Quality Rating: **Satisfactory**

18. Were stakeholders and national partners fully engaged in the decision-making, implementation and monitoring of the project?

- 3: Only national systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) were used to fully implement and monitor the project. All relevant stakeholders and partners were fully and actively engaged in the process, playing a lead role in project decision-making, implementation and monitoring. (both must be true)
- 2: *National systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) were used to implement and monitor the project (such as country office support or project systems) were also used, if necessary. All relevant stakeholders and partners were actively engaged in the process, playing an active role in project decision-making, implementation and monitoring. (both must be true)*
- 1: There was relatively limited or no engagement with national stakeholders and partners in the decision-making, implementation and/or monitoring of the project.
- Not Applicable

Evidence:

Two out of the five PF indicators were national Indicators. They were monitored in close collaboration with the National HIV Program. Civil society organizations were also engaged, reporting two of the five indicators defined in the PF The Project Board (CCM) also participated in the monitoring of the Project through the ordinary information sharing mechanism.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	AGO_TH_FundRequest_en_1945_218_1111_318 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/AGO_TH_FundRequest_en_1945_218_1111_318.pdf)	domingos.jorge@undp.org	12/29/2021 2:38:00 AM
2	MinutesofLPACMeeting-16Oct2018-CDedits-Final_1945_218_1111_318 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MinutesofLPACMeeting-16Oct2018-CDedits-Final_1945_218_1111_318.docx)	domingos.jorge@undp.org	12/29/2021 2:39:00 AM

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:

Based on the results of the performance assessment to all previous SR, a capacity assessment was conducted to the selected Organizations to identify strengths and weaknesses for a consequent establishment of a capacity development plan to address this issues.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	ADPPNFM2SRCapacityAssessmentTool-forvfm-03Nov2018_1945_219_11111_319 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ADPPNFM2SRCapacityAssessmentTool-forvfm-03Nov2018_1945_219_11111_319.xls)	domingos.jorge@undp.org	12/29/2021 2:10:00 AM
2	ADPPRiskManagementPlan-03Nov2018_1945_219_11111_319 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ADPPRiskManagementPlan-03Nov2018_1945_219_11111_319.doc)	domingos.jorge@undp.org	12/29/2021 2:10:00 AM
3	LitsofdocumentssubmittedbyADPPforCA-03Nov2018_1945_219_11111_319 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/LitsofdocumentssubmittedbyADPPforCA-03Nov2018_1945_219_11111_319.doc)	domingos.jorge@undp.org	12/29/2021 2:11:00 AM

20. Were the transition and phase-out arrangements were reviewed and adjusted according to progress (including financial commitment and capacity).

- 3: The project's governance mechanism regularly reviewed the project's sustainability plan, including arrangements for transition and phase-out, to ensure the project remained on track in meeting the requirements set out by the plan. The plan was implemented as planned by the end of the project, taking into account any adjustments made during implementation. (both must be true)
- 2: *There was a review of the project's sustainability plan, including arrangements for transition and phase-out, to ensure the project remained on track in meeting the requirements set out by the plan.*
- 1: The project may have had a sustainability plan but there was no review of this strategy after it was developed. Also select this option if the project did not have a sustainability strategy.

Evidence:

The country prepared and submitted a New Funding Request for the period 2021 - 2024, which was submitted to the Global Fund in 2020 and consequently approved.

An Induction activity was organized by the PR which ensured a smooth transition from the Z Grant to NFM 3. This activity was organized with the participation of the relevant parties of the Government and SCOs.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	InductionProgram_GF_NFM3_11111_320 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/InductionProgram_GF_NFM3_11111_320.pptx)	domingos.jorge@undp.org	12/29/2021 2:26:00 AM
2	CartaInducao_GPBG-Governador_11111_320 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CartaInducao_GPBG-Governador_11111_320.docx)	domingos.jorge@undp.org	12/29/2021 2:29:00 AM
3	CartaInducao_GPSBG-AMunicipais_11111_320 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CartaInducao_GPSBG-AMunicipais_11111_320.docx)	domingos.jorge@undp.org	12/29/2021 2:29:00 AM
4	CartaInducao_GPSBG-Director_11111_320 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CartaInducao_GPSBG-Director_11111_320.docx)	domingos.jorge@undp.org	12/29/2021 2:30:00 AM
5	CartaInducao_GPSBG-DMunicipais_11111_320 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CartaInducao_GPSBG-DMunicipais_11111_320.docx)	domingos.jorge@undp.org	12/29/2021 2:30:00 AM

QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments

