

# Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

**Form Status: Approved**

<b>Overall Rating:</b>	Highly Satisfactory
<b>Decision:</b>	
<b>Portfolio/Project Number:</b>	00102129
<b>Portfolio/Project Title:</b>	Strengthening the Rule of Law in LBR: Justice & Sector
<b>Portfolio/Project Date:</b>	2017-01-01 / 2023-05-31

**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:**

There were a number of occasions the project team identified changes in the external environment which the Board considered and made changes to the programme. Example, implementation of the programme interventions in fulfilment of its 2017 AWP got delayed due to the 2017 Presidential and Legislative elections. The implication was recognized and the Board considered that some of the activities that could not be implemented on account of the situation be carried over to 2018. This was approved by the Board at its May 1, 2018 Board Meeting.

Similarly, the programme team identified that due to the several delays occasioned by changes in the external environment such as the general elections, there was a need to extend the end date of the programme. The Programme Board considered the situation and extended the end date of the programme to March and subsequently May 31, 2020.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	ROLBoardMeetingMinutes1May2018_6370_301 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ROLBoardMeetingMinutes1May2018_6370_301.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ROLBoardMeetingMinutes1May2018_6370_301.pdf</a> )	amara.kanneh@undp.org	11/20/2020 3:25:00 PM
2	ROLBoardMeetingMinutes21February2019_6370_301 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ROLBoardMeetingMinutes21February2019_6370_301.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ROLBoardMeetingMinutes21February2019_6370_301.pdf</a> )	amara.kanneh@undp.org	11/20/2020 3:26:00 PM
3	BoardmeetingMinutesJan2020Signed_6370_301 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/BoardmeetingMinutesJan2020Signed_6370_301.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/BoardmeetingMinutesJan2020Signed_6370_301.pdf</a> )	amara.kanneh@undp.org	11/20/2020 3:26:00 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 settings<sup>1</sup> as specified in the Strategic Plan. The project's RRF included at least one SP output indicator, if relevant. (both must be true)
- 1: While the project may have responded to a partner's identified need, this need falls outside of the UNDP Strategic Plan. Also select this option if none of the relevant SP indicators are included in the RRF.

#### Evidence:

The programme was fully aligned with UNDAF and CPD Outcome 1 ( National reconciliation and social cohesion fostered within an enabling constitutional and legal environment supported by a strengthened and accountable justice and security institutions at the national and local levels), and Democratic Governance of the Strategic Plan. This included UNDP's signature solutions 2,3,5 and 6. The Programme supported these objectives and results of the UNDAF, CPD and Strategic Plan by delivering on outputs that sought to achieve the following results:

- Capacity of justice and security institutions strengthened, and linkages forged
- Civil society contribution to rule of law and community access to justice enhanced
- Gender responsiveness of justice, security and legislative actors strengthened and women and girls' access to justice and security improved
- Capacity of key actors and stakeholders to monitor progress and results in rule of law development increased

#### List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	RoLprogrammeProDoc2016.2016_6370_302 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/RoLprogrammeProDoc2016.2016_6370_302.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/RoLprogrammeProDoc2016.2016_6370_302.pdf</a> )	amara.kanneh@undp.org	11/20/2020 4:03:00 PM
2	CPD-EXBapproved_6370_302 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CPD-EXBapproved_6370_302.doc">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CPD-EXBapproved_6370_302.doc</a> )	amara.kanneh@undp.org	11/20/2020 4:05:00 PM

## 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:**

Programme design, plan and activities were developed and agreed with the targeted institutions to ensure ownership, relevance and sustainability of programme's interventions and results. Feedbacks were collected from targeted institutions and beneficiaries, and these feedbacks were used to inform the planning process for the next period. For instance, the Programme Annual Work Plans were developed based on consultations and feedbacks from targeted institutions/groups. CSOs and government partners often engaged communities, particularly marginalized and discriminated groups that feedback into the plan and reports submitted to UNDP.

The project also conducted monitoring visits where feedbacks from the communities, CSO and government partners were gathered. These feedbacks and/or findings were used to inform programmatic decisions and planning.

### List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	CSOMONITORINGREPORT-JOINTUNDP_OHCHRRULEOFLAWPROGRAMME-20102019REVISEDFINAL1_6370_303 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CSOMONITORINGREPORT-JOINTUNDP_OHCHRRULEOFLAWPROGRAMME-20102019REVISEDFINAL1_6370_303.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CSOMONITORINGREPORT-JOINTUNDP_OHCHRRULEOFLAWPROGRAMME-20102019REVISEDFINAL1_6370_303.docx</a> )	amara.kanneh@undp.org	11/20/2020 4:32:00 PM
2	ROLBoardMeetingMinutes21February2019_6370_303 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ROLBoardMeetingMinutes21February2019_6370_303.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ROLBoardMeetingMinutes21February2019_6370_303.pdf</a> )	amara.kanneh@undp.org	11/20/2020 4:34:00 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:

The Programme developed knowledge products and collected lessons learnt through monitoring and evaluation exercises. These knowledge products, namely Public Perception Survey of Liberian Justice and Security Institutions (2019) and A Comprehensive Review of Liberian Justice and Security Sectors Data (2019), were used to provide relevant and tangible information for the successful implementation, monitoring and management of the programme. Further, lessons learnt were collected through the regular monitoring visits and the outcome evaluation. Information gathered from these exercises guided and informed implementation of the programme and the development of Phase II of the programme.

### List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Evaluationreport-CliffBernardandTeakonJ.WilliamssFINALDraftReport-UNDP-OHCHROutcomeEvaluation-07Feb2020_6370_304 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Evaluationreport-CliffBernardandTeakonJ.WilliamssFINALDraftReport-UNDP-OHCHROutcomeEvaluation-07Feb2020_6370_304.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Evaluationreport-CliffBernardandTeakonJ.WilliamssFINALDraftReport-UNDP-OHCHROutcomeEvaluation-07Feb2020_6370_304.docx</a> )	amara.kanneh@undp.org	11/20/2020 5:07:00 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:

The programme covered all 15 counties in Liberia and reached a significant number of people directly through support to 22 civil society organizations (CSOs) across the country and indirectly through policy reforms that tend to benefit the entire population. Some of the policy change includes the Domestic Violence Bill passed in law in August 2019 through the support of the Programme, other UN agencies, CSOs and partners. The Programme reached approximately 1,127,958 throughout the country with rule of law and human rights messages and delivered justice and security services to some 20,997 indigents including survivors of SGBV, children in conflict with the law, pre-trial detainees, civil disputants, etc.

### List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Evaluationreport-CliffBernardandTeakonJ.WilliamssFINALDraftReport-UNDP-OHCHROutcomeEvaluation-07Feb2020_6370_305 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Evaluationreport-CliffBernardandTeakonJ.WilliamssFINALDraftReport-UNDP-OHCHROutcomeEvaluation-07Feb2020_6370_305.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Evaluationreport-CliffBernardandTeakonJ.WilliamssFINALDraftReport-UNDP-OHCHROutcomeEvaluation-07Feb2020_6370_305.docx</a> )	amara.kanneh@undp.org	11/22/2020 3:46:00 PM
2	RoLEPRConsolidatedwithJamesandIgnatiuscommentsandinputs17112020new_6370_305 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/RoLEPRConsolidatedwithJamesandIgnatiuscommentsandinputs17112020new_6370_305.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/RoLEPRConsolidatedwithJamesandIgnatiuscommentsandinputs17112020new_6370_305.docx</a> )	amara.kanneh@undp.org	11/22/2020 3:47:00 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 Programme employed measures that sought to aggressively address gender inequalities and empower women and girls. It targeted women led CSOs to promote gender equality and women empowerment support women and girls to claim and defend their rights. Legal aid services supported by the programme specifically targeted women and girls and survivors of SGBV. The programme contributed to strengthening the capacity of the Liberia National Police (LNP) and the Judiciary to be gender sensitive and gender responsive. Based on data gathered that pointed out the low capacity of the LNP and the Judiciary to effectively provide gender responsive protection, security and judicial services to women and girls including survivors of SGBV, the Programme supported the training of police and judicial personnel; the provision of logistics, office supplies and equipment; and the construction and rehabilitation of courts and police stations. These efforts contributed to increasing the capacity of the police and the Judiciary to dispense more gender responsive services as manifested in, for example, the number of SGBV cases investigated by the police and disposed of by the Judiciary.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/RoLEPRConsolidatedwithJamesandIgnatiuscommentsandinputs17112020new_6370_306">RoLEPRConsolidatedwithJamesandIgnatiuscommentsandinputs17112020new_6370_306</a> ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/RoLEPRConsolidatedwithJamesandIgnatiuscommentsandinputs17112020new_6370_306.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/RoLEPRConsolidatedwithJamesandIgnatiuscommentsandinputs17112020new_6370_306.docx</a> )	amara.kanneh@undp.org	11/22/2020 4:04:00 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 programme catalogued, tracked and monitored social and environment risks in a risk log that was an integral part of the programme management process. The Programme monitored the risks identified in the risk logs and took appropriate actions where needed based on changes observed. For example, the 2017 elections and the UNMIL drawdown were tracked and monitored for their adverse effects on the Programme and the necessary actions were taken based on management plan developed to respond to foreseeable risks that might occur.

#### List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	RoLprogrammeProDoc2016.2016_6370_307 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QA/FormDocuments/RoLprogrammeProDoc2016.2016_6370_307.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QA/FormDocuments/RoLprogrammeProDoc2016.2016_6370_307.pdf</a> )	amara.kanneh@undp.org	11/22/2020 4:37:00 PM
2	RoLEPRConsolidatedwithJamesandIgnatiuscommentsandinputs17112020new_6370_307 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QA/FormDocuments/RoLEPRConsolidatedwithJamesandIgnatiuscommentsandinputs17112020new_6370_307.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QA/FormDocuments/RoLEPRConsolidatedwithJamesandIgnatiuscommentsandinputs17112020new_6370_307.docx</a> )	amara.kanneh@undp.org	11/22/2020 4:37:00 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:**

The programme was categorized as low risk and it did not undertake activities that potentially put beneficiaries at risks. Almost all the activities and interventions delivered by the Programme were soft activities, except for the few renovation/reconstruction of police stations, prisons and courts. In the instances of the renovation and reconstruction of the police stations, courts and prisons, the programme support was provided through the Government of Liberia that undertook all measures to comply with social and environmental standards. However, the programme management mechanism consisted of several layers including the Board that has the responsibility to address such issues should they emerge.

**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 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 programme has a costed M&E plan that it operated to perform the M&E activities associated with the programme. Monitoring visits were conducted by the programme team and findings used to guide planning and programmatic decision making process.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	CSOMONITORINGREPORT-JOINTUNDP_OHCHRRULEOFLAWPROGRAMME-20102019REVISEDFINAL1_6370_309 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CSOMONITORINGREPORT-JOINTUNDP_OHCHRRULEOFLAWPROGRAMME-20102019REVISEDFINAL1_6370_309.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CSOMONITORINGREPORT-JOINTUNDP_OHCHRRULEOFLAWPROGRAMME-20102019REVISEDFINAL1_6370_309.docx</a> )	amara.kanneh@undp.org	11/22/2020 5:25:00 PM
2	RoLprogrammeProDoc2016.2016_6370_309 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/RoLprogrammeProDoc2016.2016_6370_309.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/RoLprogrammeProDoc2016.2016_6370_309.pdf</a> )	amara.kanneh@undp.org	11/22/2020 5:26:00 PM
3	MonitoringplanforRoL2020_6370_309 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MonitoringplanforRoL2020_6370_309.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MonitoringplanforRoL2020_6370_309.docx</a> )	amara.kanneh@undp.org	11/22/2020 5:27:00 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 programme management mechanism included a management structure that was composed of the Programme Advisory Group, the Joint Programme Team and the Programme Board. The Programme Board met frequently to review programme progress and results, approve programme work plan and take strategic decisions for the successful implementation of the programme. At the end of every implementation year, the CTA/Programme Manager made a report to the Programme Board and presented plan for the succeeding year for approval.

#### List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	ROLBoardMeetingMinutes1May2018_6370_310 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ROLBoardMeetingMinutes1May2018_6370_310.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ROLBoardMeetingMinutes1May2018_6370_310.pdf</a> )	amara.kanneh@undp.org	11/22/2020 5:39:00 PM
2	ROLBoardMeetingMinutes21February2019_6370_310 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ROLBoardMeetingMinutes21February2019_6370_310.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/ROLBoardMeetingMinutes21February2019_6370_310.pdf</a> )	amara.kanneh@undp.org	11/22/2020 5:40:00 PM
3	BoardmeetingMinutesJan2020Signed_6370_310 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/BoardmeetingMinutesJan2020Signed_6370_310.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/BoardmeetingMinutesJan2020Signed_6370_310.pdf</a> )	amara.kanneh@undp.org	11/22/2020 5:40:00 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:**

The programme developed and monitored the risk log, and instituted management's actions based on the changing context. However, it did not systematically update the risk log to reflect the most recent status and management actions. However

**Management Response:**

Subsequently, UNDP and its partners will ensure that the risk log is not just developed, monitored and decisions taken based on the status of the risk, it will regularly and systematically update the risk log. This is part of the plan for Phase II of the programme.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

**Efficient**

**Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

12. Adequate resources were mobilized to achieve intended results. If not, management decisions were taken to adjust expected results in the project's results framework.

- Yes
- No

**Evidence:**

Though a good amount of resources were mobilized for the implementation of the programme, but it fell short of mobilizing the required, adequate resources for the successful implementation of all planned activities and interventions. The programme had a projected budget of USD 16.8 million against which it only mobilized USD 10 million, representing 60% of the required resources. This affected the number of activities and interventions carried out, and management took decisions to prioritize some activities and interventions at the expense of others. That means, some planned activities and interventions did not get started at all while others got started but could not be fully executed due to budget shortfall.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/RoLEPRConsolidatedwithJamesandIgnatiuscommentsandinputs17112020new_6370_312">RoLEPRConsolidatedwithJamesandIgnatiuscommentsandinputs17112020new_6370_312</a> ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/RoLEPRConsolidatedwithJamesandIgnatiuscommentsandinputs17112020new_6370_312.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/RoLEPRConsolidatedwithJamesandIgnatiuscommentsandinputs17112020new_6370_312.docx</a> )	amara.kanneh@undp.org	11/22/2020 6:20:00 PM
2	<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PROGRAMMEFINALUPDATEBOARDMEETINGRC28062020_6370_312">PROGRAMMEFINALUPDATEBOARDMEETINGRC28062020_6370_312</a> ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PROGRAMMEFINALUPDATEBOARDMEETINGRC28062020_6370_312.odp">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PROGRAMMEFINALUPDATEBOARDMEETINGRC28062020_6370_312.odp</a> )	amara.kanneh@undp.org	11/22/2020 6:21:00 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 programme had a procurement plan which was referenced and updated regularly at weekly, monthly, quarterly and annual meeting as were needed. Management actions were recommended and taken in instances where bottlenecks arose (such as delay in procuring and delivering goods and services).

**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:**

The programme was specifically concerned about cost or resource efficiency. This formed some of the bases for which it was developed as a joint programme aimed at pulling together resources, expertise and experience to effectively and efficiently delivered on programme results, relying on the comparative advantage of each agency involved. The programme also strongly collaborated with other UN agencies and programmes to form synergy and foster complementarity. The programme was developed as a joint programme by UNMIL and UNDP. At the departure of UNMIL, OHCHR came on board as a joint partner based on a signed memorandum of understanding by both agencies.

In addition, procurement processes were undertaken through competitive bidding processes, which, among other factors, consider the costs of goods and services though not at the expense of quality.

**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:**

As far as the resources mobilized could implement, the programme was effective in delivering the expected outputs. Despite some delays, the programme implemented all funded planned activities and interventions and delivered the expected outputs. The Outcome Evaluation completed in February 2020 indicated that 15 out of 23 expected outputs were satisfactorily achieved; seven expected outputs partially achieved; and one did not register any much achievement. By the end of the programme on May 31, 2020, it has satisfactorily delivered on 18 of the 23 outputs and partially delivered on the remaining five expected outputs.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	RoLEPRConsolidatedwithJamesandIgnatiuscommentsandinputs17112020new_6370_315 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/RoLEPRConsolidatedwithJamesandIgnatiuscommentsandinputs17112020new_6370_315.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/RoLEPRConsolidatedwithJamesandIgnatiuscommentsandinputs17112020new_6370_315.docx</a> )	amara.kanneh@undp.org	11/22/2020 7:21:00 PM
2	Evaluationreport-CliffBernardandTeakonJ.WilliamssFINALDraftReport-UNDP-OHCHROutcomeEvaluation-07Feb2020_6370_315 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Evaluationreport-CliffBernardandTeakonJ.WilliamssFINALDraftReport-UNDP-OHCHROutcomeEvaluation-07Feb2020_6370_315.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Evaluationreport-CliffBernardandTeakonJ.WilliamssFINALDraftReport-UNDP-OHCHROutcomeEvaluation-07Feb2020_6370_315.docx</a> )	amara.kanneh@undp.org	11/22/2020 7:21:00 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:**

The programme team reviewed the Annual Work Plan at its regular periodic meeting, taking stock of what has been achieved, the challenges and actions/support required to forge ahead with implementation and proceed with the delivery of outputs. Several remedial actions were taken in such regards to ameliorate delivery of programme outputs. For example, it was based on a review of the work plan in 2017 that identified lagging activities and recommended that activities which could not be implemented due to the delay be carried forward to 2018 and that the team members provided support to one another and back-to-back implementation of activities and interventions be activated to catch up with the lost time and put the delivery on course.

**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:**

The programme targeted specific groups, institutions and geographic locations based on credible data sources from national and sector specific plans, policies, strategies and assessment. It made frantic, deliberate efforts to reach targeted groups and institutions and involved them in the planning and implementation of the programme. During the development of the Annual Work Plan, all key stakeholders participated and provided inputs through joint work and consultation. The programme implemented the majority of the planned activities and interventions through CSOs and national/government counterparts, giving them the opportunity to work with the communities and personnel whom they best understand.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

**Sustainability & National Ownership**

**Quality Rating: Highly 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:**

The programme was implemented under the DIM implementation modality. However, both UNDP and the national system were used as were appropriate. Where no conflict existed and the national system was in conformity with international best practice, the national system was used. Nonetheless, to ensure financial probity, UNDP's system was used in many instances since it was the Administrative Agent responsible for both narrative and financial reporting. All relevant stakeholders and partners were actively involved in the management, implementation and monitoring of the programme. All relevant national partners were part of the Programme Board, and attended the Board Meetings where they were involved in key strategic decision making that often defined the course of the programme.

**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:**

The programme regularly monitored the capacity and performance of the national partners and applied necessary adjustment in implementation modalities. It conducted monitoring visits, spot checks, micro assessments and audit of partners as part of its capacity and performance assessment, and used the data/information from these assessments to adjust implementation modalities as much as possible.

List of Uploaded Documents			
#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	CSOMONITORINGREPORT-JOINTUNDP_OHCHRRULEOFLAWPROGRAMME-20102019REVISEDFINAL1_6370_319 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CSOMONITORINGREPORT-JOINTUNDP_OHCHRRULEOFLAWPROGRAMME-20102019REVISEDFINAL1_6370_319.docx">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/CSOMONITORINGREPORT-JOINTUNDP_OHCHRRULEOFLAWPROGRAMME-20102019REVISEDFINAL1_6370_319.docx</a> )	amara.kanneh@undp.org	11/24/2020 8:23:00 PM
2	Judiciary2016MicroAssessmentReport_6370_319 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Judiciary2016MicroAssessmentReport_6370_319.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Judiciary2016MicroAssessmentReport_6370_319.pdf</a> )	amara.kanneh@undp.org	11/24/2020 8:24:00 PM
3	IDLOMicroAssessmentReport6Nov2018final_6370_319 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/IDLOMicroAssessmentReport6Nov2018final_6370_319.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/IDLOMicroAssessmentReport6Nov2018final_6370_319.pdf</a> )	amara.kanneh@undp.org	11/24/2020 8:25:00 PM
4	MOJ2016MicroAssessmentReport_6370_319 ( <a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MOJ2016MicroAssessmentReport_6370_319.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MOJ2016MicroAssessmentReport_6370_319.pdf</a> )	amara.kanneh@undp.org	11/24/2020 8:25:00 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:**

The programme integrated and/or interspersed its sustainability plan into the programme strategy, which defined the activities and interventions to be implemented and how these interventions were to be delivered to achieve the desired results. These strategies were regularly reviewed and adjusted to ensure the programme deliver on the sustainability of the programme results. As part of the strategy, man-power development, institutional and policy reforms were carried out. Sustainability modalities were discussed, planned and agreed with government partners at the onset of the programme development and followed through. For example, the training and deployment of magistrates and public defenders and the deployment of judges, which were discussed, planned and agreed with Government of Liberia that it would assume responsibility of the payment of salaries and support after the first six months that will be catered by the programme. All of those plans which have matured in this regard have been respectfully implemented by the Government. Today, the Government is paying the salaries of the 60 magistrates and 6 public defenders whose salaries were earlier paid by the programme for six months after supporting their training and deployment.

**List of Uploaded Documents**

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

No documents available.

**QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments**