

# Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

**Form Status: Approved**

<b>Overall Rating:</b>	Exemplary
<b>Decision:</b>	
<b>Portfolio/Project Number:</b>	00109593
<b>Portfolio/Project Title:</b>	Droits des Personnes Handicapées
<b>Portfolio/Project Date:</b>	2018-01-15 / 2022-03-31

**Strategic**

**Quality Rating: Exemplary**

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

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

**Evidence:**

Se basant sur l'opportunité de la Loi n° 2017-06 portant protection et promotion des droits des personnes handicapées en République du Bénin, adoptée le 13 avril 2017, le présent projet conjoint a été initié pour accompagner le Gouvernement à faire avancer le droit des personnes handicapées. Il avait pour but de soutenir la mise en œuvre effective de la Politique nationale sur la protection et l'inclusion des personnes handicapées 2012-2021 en contribuant à la réali

sation de trois effets complémentaires qui combinent l'intégration des droits de l'homme et des interventions ciblées sur une période de 3 ans. Les trois effets attendus du projet d'ici à fin 2020 sont : i) le cadre juridique et les politiques nationales dans 4 secteurs ciblés (éducation, santé, emploi décent, égalité des sexes) sont améliorés; ii) les cadres juridiques et politiques nationales dans les 4 secteurs ciblés sont effectivement mis en œuvre conformément au CDPH en vue de renforcer la protection et la promotion des droits des personnes handicapées au Bénin; et iii) les capacités et la sensibilisation des principales parties prenantes nationales, locales et communautaires sont renforcées pour améliorer l'accès des personnes handicapées, en particulier des femmes handicapées, aux Services de base.

Au terme des trois années de sa mise en œuvre, le projet a permis l'adoption de nouveaux comportements en faveur des personnes handicapées au sein des populations et une prise de conscience de l'ensemble des parties prenantes de la pertinence de la prise en compte des besoins spécifiques et le respect des droits des personnes en situation de handicap.

Au niveau juridique et programmatique, neuf (09) décrets d'application de la Loi N° 2017-06 du 29 Septembre 2017 portant Protection et Promotion des Droits des Personnes Handicapées en République du Bénin ont pu être élaborés et validés. Le contenu de la Loi N° 2017-06, a été vulgarisé avec les acteurs des zones d'intervention du projet. On a noté la volonté de plus en plus affichée du Gouvernement et de son Chef à mettre en place des programmes pour l'inclusion sociale et la promotion des droits des personnes handicapées. Il y a eu l'élaboration d'un guide d'identification des besoins spécifiques des personnes handicapées notamment dans les secteurs sociaux (l'éducation, santé, emploi, transport, cadre de vie, et autres services sociaux). Le Bénin grâce au projet a pu élaborer le premier rapport pays sur la mise en œuvre de la CDPH. Pour la 1ère fois également, les organisations faitières (OPH) et les OSC ont pu élaborer le rapport alternatif de la société civile sur la mise en œuvre de la CDPH.

Aussi grâce à ce projet, les capacités des principaux acteurs nationaux, départementaux, communaux et communautaires ont été renforcées pour assurer un meilleur accès des personnes handicapées, en particulier des femmes et des enfants aux services sociaux. Les populations en général (de plus de 948 hommes et 1,549 femmes) ont été sensibilisés sur les lois protégeant les personnes handicapées. Les

responsables des OPH et les Les personnes handicapées en particulier ont été outillés sur la loi et la CD PH pour mieux revendiquer leurs droit..

#### List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	PRODOCUnisdanslactionpourfaireavancerlesdroitsdespersonnes__10580_301 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PRODOCUnisdanslactionpourfaireavancerlesdroitsdespersonnes__10580_301.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PRODOCUnisdanslactionpourfaireavancerlesdroitsdespersonnes__10580_301.pdf</a> )	josephine.kanakin@undp.org	11/19/2021 4:11:00 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:

le projet est bien en lien avec le plan stratégique du PNUD en sa Solution type no 2 : "mettre en place une gouvernance plus efficace, plus inclusive et plus responsable"

Prodoc

### List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	PRODOCUnisdanslactionpourfaireavancerlesdroitsdespersonnes__10580_302 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PRODOCUnisdanslactionpourfaireavancerlesdroitsdespersonnes__10580_302.pdf)	josephine.kanakin@undp.org	11/16/2021 5:18:00 AM

### Relevant

Quality Rating: **Exemplary**

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:**

Les principaux acteurs au centre de la mise en œuvre du Programme Conjoint sont le Ministère des Affaires Sociales et de la Microfinance, le Ministère du Développement et de la Coordination de l'action gouvernementale et les points focaux des Ministères Sectoriels. Il s'agit notamment de la Direction en charge des personnes handicapées, de la Direction Générale de la Programmation et du Suivi des Investissements Publics, des Directions de la Programmation et de la Prospective des ministères sectoriels et de la Fédération des Associations de Personnes Handicapées au Bénin (La FAPHB).

Tous les acteurs visés par le projet notamment les personnes en situation de handicap ont été à la fois bénéficiaires et acteurs de la mise en œuvre de ce projet. L'ensemble des activités ont été planifiées et exécutées sous le leadership du Ministère en charge des Affaires Sociales et de la Fédération des Associations des personnes handicapées du Bénin. Les femmes handicapées de 8 départements ont également été impactées par le renforcement de leurs activités génératrice de revenus.

Rapport de mise en œuvre du programme

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	PointdesRésultatsprojetsappuiàlapromotiondesdroitsdespersonneshandicapées_10580_303 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PointdesRésultatsprojetsappuiàlapromotiondesdroitsdespersonneshandicapées_10580_303.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PointdesRésultatsprojetsappuiàlapromotiondesdroitsdespersonneshandicapées_10580_303.docx</a> )	josephine.kanakin@undp.org	11/17/2021 12:00:00 AM
2	RapportpaysdelamiseenoeuvredelaCDPH_10580_303 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/RapportpaysdelamiseenoeuvredelaCDPH_10580_303.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/RapportpaysdelamiseenoeuvredelaCDPH_10580_303.pdf</a> )	josephine.kanakin@undp.org	11/17/2021 12:01:00 AM
3	RapportGénéralAtelierFAPHBCDPH_10580_303 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/RapportGénéralAtelierFAPHBCDPH_10580_303.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/RapportGénéralAtelierFAPHBCDPH_10580_303.docx</a> )	josephine.kanakin@undp.org	11/17/2021 12:09:00 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:**

L'implication dès le départ des cibles bénéficiaires et des acteurs de la partie nationale dans la conception et la planification des actions du projet a permis et a facilité l'appropriation rapide du contenu du projet et de la mobilisation des parties prenantes pour sa mise en œuvre.

Au moment de l'élaboration du document de ce projet, des expériences des agences de des Nations Unies dont le PNUD et celles des structures étatiques partenaires ont été capitalisées.

En effet, les leçons apprises chaque année, de la mise en œuvre du programme ont permis d'améliorer au fur et à mesure l'approche de mise en œuvre pour le rendre plus efficace et à effet durable par rapport aux objectifs fixés par le projet.

En outre, l'implication du Directeur National du Projet, des membres des Cabinets des ministères et des structures partenaires de mise en œuvre ont constitué un appui important pour l'atteinte des résultats du programme.

Rapport de l'atelier d'élaboration du document de projet en 2018.

### List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Draft_RapportGénéral_Atelier_PTA2018projetHandicap_10580_304 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Draft_RapportGénéral_Atelier_PTA2018projetHandicap_10580_304.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Draft_RapportGénéral_Atelier_PTA2018projetHandicap_10580_304.docx</a> )	josephine.kanakin@undp.org	11/17/2021 12:25:00 AM

5. Was the project sufficiently at scale, or is there potential to scale up in the future, to meaningfully contribute to development change?

- 3: *There was credible evidence that the project reached sufficient number of beneficiaries (either directly through significant coverage of target groups, or indirectly, through policy change) to meaningfully contribute to development change.*
- 2: While the project was not considered at scale, there are explicit plans in place to scale up the project in the future (e.g. by extending its coverage or using project results to advocate for policy change).
- 1: The project was not at scale, and there are no plans to scale up the project in the future.

#### Evidence:

Le Programme est de portée nationale. L'objectif global du Programme conjoint qui a regroupé quatre agences NU est d'éliminer l'accès des personnes handicapées aux services sociaux de base et aux moyens de subsistance, le projet vise à soutenir le Ministère des Affaires sociales dans la mise en œuvre de la Politique Nationale Publique et intégré pour les Personnes Handicapées (PNPIPH) dans deux domaines prioritaires : i) Renforcer les cadres juridiques et politiques pour contribuer au progrès des droits des personnes handicapées dans 4 secteurs ciblés (éducation, santé emploi, égalité des sexes); et ii) améliorer l'accès des personnes handicapées, en particulier des femmes et des enfants de moins de 18 ans, aux services de base. À cette fin, le projet a utilisé les leviers de changement suivants : environnement normatif et capacité des principales parties prenantes nationales, locales et communautaires.

Le principe ne laisser personne de côté a été au cœur des interventions du Projet.

Source : PRODOC

### List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

### Principled

Quality Rating: **Exemplary**

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:

La dimension genre a été une préoccupation majeure dans la mise en oeuvre du présent programme. Le Programme conjoint a impacté en priorité les personnes handicapées les plus vulnérables, notamment les femmes et les enfants. Le renforcement des capacités des centres de formation professionnelle des personnes par la mise à disposition d'équipements et supports pédagogiques adaptés selon les types de handicap. Cependant, compte tenu de sa nature transversale, l'appui aux activités génératrice de revenus des femmes a contribué à leur autonomisation économique. pour aider les OPH a protéger les personnes handicapées contre la pandémie COVID 19, 2700 PH ont été impactés dont 845 femmes handicapées.

Enfin, les interventions du Projet ont été entre autres au profit des groupes extrêmement pauvres et vulnérables pour ne laisser personne de côté.



### List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	RAPPORTANNUELUNPRPD2019PNUD_10580_306 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/RAPPORTANNUELUNPRPD2019PNUD_10580_306.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/RAPPORTANNUELUNPRPD2019PNUD_10580_306.pdf</a> )	josephine.kanakin@undp.org	11/19/2021 5:07:00 AM

7. Were social and environmental impacts and risks successfully managed and monitored?

- 3: *Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. Appropriate assessments conducted where required (i.e., Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) for High risk projects and some level of social and environmental assessment for Moderate risk projects as identified through SESP). Relevant management plan(s) developed for identified risks through consultative process and implemented, resourced, and monitored. Risks effectively managed or mitigated. If there is a substantive change to the project or change in context that affects risk levels, the SESP was updated to reflect these changes. (all must be true)*
- 2: Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. Appropriate assessments conducted where required (i.e., Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) for High risk projects and some level of social and environmental assessment for Moderate risk projects as identified through SESP). Relevant management plan(s) developed, implemented and monitored for identified risks. OR project was categorized as Low risk through the SESP.
- 1: Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. For projects categorized as High or Moderate Risk, there was no evidence that social and environmental assessments completed and/or management plans or measures development, implemented or monitored. There are substantive changes to the project or changes in the context but SESP was not updated. (any may be true)

#### Evidence:

Pendant l'élaboration du document du projet, les potentiels risques ont été identifiés et analysés et les actions de mitigation à mettre en oeuvre, ont été planifiées et exécutées.

Prodoc

### List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

8. Were grievance mechanisms available to project-affected people and were grievances (if any) addressed to ensure any perceived harm was effectively mitigated?

- 3: Project-affected people actively informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism (SRM/SECU) and how to access it. If the project was categorized as High or Moderate Risk through the SESP, a project -level grievance mechanism was in place and project affected people informed. If grievances were received, they were effectively addressed in accordance with SRM Guidance. (all must be true)
- 2: Project-affected people informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism and how to access it. If the project was categorized as High Risk through the SESP, a project -level grievance mechanism was in place and project affected people informed. If grievances were received, they were responded to but faced challenges in arriving at a resolution.
- 1: Project-affected people was not informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism. If grievances were received, they were not responded to. (any may be true)

**Evidence:**

Toutes les agences impliquées dans la mise en oeuvre du programme conjoint, de même que toutes les parties responsables du Programme ont été bien informées du mécanisme de responsabilisation et y ont eu accès tout au long de la mise en oeuvre du programme conjoint...

Sources : PRODOC ; rapports de progrès

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
---	-----------	-------------	-------------

No documents available.

**Management & Monitoring**

**Quality Rating: Highly 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 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:

Le programme dès son élaboration était doté d'un plan de suivi-évaluation. Il disposait d'indicateurs ayant des valeurs de référence et des valeurs cibles bien définies.

Les niveaux des indicateurs ont été renseignés lors de l'élaboration des rapports périodiques de mise en oeuvre.

Sources : PRODOC,  
Rapports des activités

#### List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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:**

Le Programme conjoint dispose d'un mécanisme de coordination et de gestion qui a bien fonctionné. La coordination a été assurée par le Ministère du plan et du Développement pour ce qui concerne la partie nationale. Le bureau du Coordonnateur Résident a assuré la coordination du programme conjoint au niveau des agences NU.

Sources : PRODOC,

**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:**

Un point de la situation des risques a été réalisé cha que rapportage. Pour chaque risque identifié, on pré cise la nature (le type), les réponses de gestion ou a ctions de mitigation et la situation (réduction, statut q uoi, croissant) au moment de la rédaction du Rappor t.

Sources : Rapports de progrès

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

**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:**

RAS

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

13. Were project inputs procured and delivered on time to efficiently contribute to results?

- 3: *The project had a procurement plan and kept it updated. The project quarterly reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addressed them through appropriate management actions. (all must be true)*
- 2: The project had updated procurement plan. The project annually reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addressed them through appropriate management actions. (all must be true)
- 1: The project did not have an updated procurement plan. The project team may or may not have reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs regularly, however management actions were not taken to address them.

**Evidence:**

Les rapports conjoints ont été élaborés chaque année sous la supervision du bureau du Coordonnateur Résident qui les soumet à l'UNPRPD

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

14. Was there regular monitoring and recording of cost efficiencies, taking into account the expected quality of results?

- 3: There is evidence that the project regularly reviewed costs against relevant comparators (e.g., other projects or country offices) or industry benchmarks to ensure the project maximized results delivered with given resources. The project actively coordinated with other relevant ongoing projects and initiatives (UNDP or other) to ensure complementarity and sought efficiencies wherever possible (e.g. joint activities.) (both must be true)
- 2: *The project monitored its own costs and gave anecdotal examples of cost efficiencies (e.g., spending less to get the same result,) but there was no systematic analysis of costs and no link to the expected quality of results delivered. The project coordinated activities with other projects to achieve cost efficiency gains.*
- 1: There is little or no evidence that the project monitored its own costs and considered ways to save money beyond following standard procurement rules.

**Evidence:**

En se basant sur l'estimation des coûts réalisée dans le PRODOC, les rapports de progrès ont renseigné chaque année à travers les taux d'exécution financière sur les éventuels gaps...

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

**Effective****Quality Rating: Exemplary**

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

- Yes  
 No

**Evidence:**

RAS

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

16. Were there regular reviews of the work plan to ensure that the project was on track to achieve the desired results, and to inform course corrections if needed?

- 3: Quarterly progress data informed regular reviews of the project work plan to ensure that the activities implemented were most likely to achieve the desired results. There is evidence that data and lessons learned (including from evaluations /or After-Action Reviews) were used to inform course corrections, as needed. Any necessary budget revisions were made. (both must be true)**
- 2: There was at least one review of the work plan per year with a view to assessing if project activities were on track to achieving the desired development results (i.e., outputs.) There may or may not be evidence that data or lessons learned were used to inform the review(s). Any necessary budget revisions have been made.
- 1: While the project team may have reviewed the work plan at least once over the past year to ensure outputs were delivered on time, no link was made to the delivery of desired development results. Select this option also if no review of the work plan by management took place.

**Evidence:**

Les différentes revues organisées avec les parties prenantes du Programme ont permis d'anticiper sur l'efficacité des actions. Les réorientations ont été également faites.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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

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



**Evidence:**

le Programme a été initié au profit des personnes vulnérables. C'est pour faire la promotion et la protection des droits des personnes handicapées que le programme a été mis en place. Lors de l'élaboration de son PRODOC, les représentants des bénéficiaires des actions du programme ont été identifiés et impliqués dès la note conceptuelle du programme et tout au long de la planification et de la mise en oeuvre. Les actions du programme ont essentiellement été de s'appuyer aux besoins pratiques et aux intérêts stratégiques de ces cibles.

Sources : PRODOC,  
Rapport de progrès

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

**Sustainability & National Ownership****Quality Rating: Exemplary**

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:**

Le Programme conjoint a été mis en œuvre suivant la modalité d'exécution direct (DIM). Toutefois, toutes les activités ont été exécutées sous le leadership du Ministère en charge des Affaires Sociales avec l'implication des différentes parties responsables dans le processus de conception et d'adoption du document du Programme et ont été pleinement impliqués dans la mise en œuvre et le suivi des activités. Le document du projet a été signé en 2018 par le Ministre d'Etat chargé du Plan et du Développement avec son homologue Ministre des Affaires sociales et de la Microfinance en présence de la Présidente de la Fédération des Associations de Personnes Handicapées du Bénin.

Prodoc et rapport de lancement du projet

Sources : Document de Projet, Rapports de progrès

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

19. Were there regular monitoring of changes in capacities and performance of institutions and systems relevant to the project, as needed, and were the implementation [arrangements](#)<sup>8</sup> adjusted according to changes in partner capacities?

- 3: *Changes in capacities and performance of national institutions and systems were assessed/monitored using clear indicators, rigorous methods of data collection and credible data sources including relevant HACT assurance activities. Implementation arrangements were formally reviewed and adjusted, if needed, in agreement with partners according to changes in partner capacities. (all must be true)*
- 2: Aspects of changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems were monitored by the project using indicators and reasonably credible data sources including relevant HACT assurance activities. Some adjustment was made to implementation arrangements if needed to reflect changes in partner capacities. (all must be true)
- 1: Some aspects of changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems may have been monitored by the project, however changes to implementation arrangements have not been considered. Also select this option if changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems have not been monitored by the project.
- Not Applicable

**Evidence:**

La mise en œuvre du Programme conjoint a induit une amélioration des capacités et des performances des structures ayant bénéficié de l'appui du Programme. Par exemple la FAPHB a été bien renforcée et outillée pour des actions de plaidoyer pour la défense de leurs droits auprès des autorités au plus haut niveau. Ce qu'il n'était pas possible avant le programme..

Source : Rapports de progrès

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

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

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

**Evidence:**

Sur la base des résultats obtenus, le programme a été bien apprécié par les bénéficiaires et les parties prenantes dans son efficacité et l'efficacité des actions menées. Ce qui a conduit à l'élaboration d'une nouvelle note conceptuelle et l'obtention d'une nouvelle note de financement de la part de l'UNPRPD pour continuer les actions et assurer la pérennisation des acquis du programme conjoint. Le nouveau Prodoc pour la phase 2 est en cours d'élaboration.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	ProgrammesignaturepageUNPRPDMPFBenin_10580_320 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ProgrammesignaturepageUNPRPDMPFBenin_10580_320.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ProgrammesignaturepageUNPRPDMPFBenin_10580_320.pdf</a> )	josephine.kanakin@undp.org	11/19/2021 8:56:00 AM
2	UNPRPDMPF-InceptionphasestemplateR4Beninfinal_10580_320 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/UNPRPDMPF-InceptionphasestemplateR4Beninfinal_10580_320.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/UNPRPDMPF-InceptionphasestemplateR4Beninfinal_10580_320.docx</a> )	josephine.kanakin@undp.org	11/19/2021 8:56:00 AM

**QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments**

Le présent projet a permis de faire changer des comportements et des regards vis à vis des personnes en situation de handicap. Cela a également renforcé les capacités des mécanismes nationaux en place pour la promotion des droits des personnes en situation de handicap. C'est un programme pertinent et efficace dont les acquis au profit des bénéficiaires, sont perceptibles