

Procedure Year: 2024

Procedure Status: Approved

Procedure Department: CO - Sri Lanka - Colombo

Record Owner: Jothirajah Karunenthira

Created by: Jothirajah Karunenthira,5/25/2025, 11:43 PM

Procedure Rating: Satisfactory

Procedure Name: ASM-16000

Procedure Type: Closure

Last Modified by: Malin HERWIG,5/26/2025, 4:52 AM

Portofolio/Project Type: Project

RELATED PORTFOLIOS/PROJECTS (1)						
NAME	PORTOFOLIO/PROJECT NAME	DEPARTMENT	STATUS	ATLAS PROJECT NUMBER	START DATE	END DATE
01001743	UNPRPD Fund_LKA_Inception Phase	CO - Sri Lanka - Colombo	Financially Closed		11/27/2023	11/30/2024

Approval Information

Approval Date: Mon May 26 00:00:00 GMT 2025

Approved By: Malin HERWIG <malin.herwig@undp.org>

APPROVAL HISTORY			
STEP NAME	DATE	STATUS	ASSIGNED TO
Submitted for Approval	2025-05-26 04:52:08	Approved	Tashya deSilva
Submitted for Approval	2025-05-26 04:39:29	Reassigned	Tashya deSilva

QA Questionnaire:

Strategic

Status: Complete

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 has identified relevant changes in the external environment that may present new opportunities or threats to the project's ability to achieve its objectives and the assumptions have been tested to determine if the project's strategy is still valid. There is evidence that the project board has considered the implications, and documented any changes needed to the project in response. (all must be true)

☒

 2: The project team has 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 may not have been fully integrated in the project. (both must be true)

☐

 1: The project team may have considered relevant changes in the external environment since implementation began, but there is no evidence that the project team has considered changes to the project as a result.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The project identified changes in the external environment and incorporated them into its strategy. A cabinet reshuffle significantly impacted the implementation timeline, leading to reduced willingness from government stakeholders to proceed with the originally planned induction trainings for government officials and Disabled People’s Organization (DPO) members. In response, the project adapted by reassessing its engagement strategies with government counterparts to maintain momentum and relevance.

The project also encountered logistical challenges in organizing a 6-day residential workshop that was accessible to the 15 participating persons with disabilities (PwDs). This challenge prompted a proactive search for suitable venues, resulting in the identification of a few accessible locations that can be utilized for future workshops. This adjustment not only addressed immediate accessibility needs but also contributed to long-term planning for inclusive training environments.

Furthermore, there is evidence that the Portfolio Board—under which this project is anchored as part of the SDG 16 Portfolio on Peace, Justice, and Strong Institutions of UNDP Sri Lanka—had the opportunity to discuss these changes during its deliberations on future project priorities. This reflects a strategic and responsive approach to evolving external conditions.

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

- ☐ 3: The project responds to at least one of the development settings as specified in the Strategic Plan (SP) and adopts at least one Signature Solution and the project's RRF includes at all the relevant SP output indicators. (all must be true)
- ☒ 2: The project responds to one of the three areas of development work as specified in the Strategic Plan. The project's RRF includes at least one SP output indicator, if relevant. (both must be true)
- ☐ 1: While the project may respond to a partner's identified need, this need falls outside the UNDP Strategic Plan. Also select this option if none of the relevant SP indicators are included in the RRF.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

Since this is an inception-phase project anchored under Sri Lanka's flagship SDG 16 Portfolio on Peace, Justice, and Strong Institutions, its results align with the overarching values and strategic direction of the portfolio. While the project does not have a standalone results framework due to its scope and early-stage nature, it is directly guided by the SDG 16 Portfolio Results Framework.

Specifically, the project contributes to Portfolio Output 1.3: Representation, protection, and empowerment of persons with disabilities (PwDs) strengthened, with a particular focus on the development and implementation of a legal framework to institutionalize the role of PwDs in public policymaking. This output is aligned with two key Strategic Plan (SP) indicators:

SP Indicator 2.2.2: Number of countries that have targeted systems with strengthened capacities to:

- a) address discrimination
- c) expand civic space

SP Indicator 2.4.1: Number of countries with:

- c) parliaments with improved capacities to undertake inclusive, effective, and accountable law-making, oversight, and representation

The project primarily contributes to two of the three development priorities outlined in the UNDP Strategic Plan: "Leaving no one behind" and "Structural transformation." By aligning with these priorities, the project ensures coherence with the broader development agenda while addressing the specific needs of PwDs in Sri Lanka.

Relevant

Status: Complete

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

3. Are the project's targeted groups, and particularly those marginalized, vulnerable and left further behind (LNOB), being systematically engaged, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized, to ensure the project leaves no one behind (LNOB) and remains 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 (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

This project specifically targets the empowerment and inclusion of persons with disabilities (PwDs) by promoting their active participation in Sri Lanka's governance systems and decision-making processes. The targeted population has been meaningfully involved in all aspects of project implementation and monitoring. Feedback from the target groups is regularly collected and consolidated to inform the project's measurement of achievements and ensure responsiveness to their needs.

As part of the project's participatory approach, induction trainings were conducted with pre- and post-evaluation forms administered and analyzed to assess learning outcomes and impact. Additionally, two validation workshops were held to develop a comprehensive situational analysis, incorporating the perspectives of marginalized PwD communities in alignment with donor priorities.

To ensure inclusive representation, the induction workshops adopted targeted measures to engage PwDs from vulnerable and underrepresented sectors. This was facilitated through a sectoral mapping process led by a national consultant in close collaboration with the UNDP team. This approach ensured that the voices of diverse PwD groups were reflected in the project's design, implementation, and evaluation.

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 (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

Knowledge and lessons learned, though based on relatively limited evidence primarily drawn from within the project, were actively considered by the project team. As an inception-phase initiative supported by the UN Partnership on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNPRPD), one of the project's major components was the development of a Situational Analysis on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities in Sri Lanka and its validation. This analysis was conducted through an external consultancy and produced a comprehensive report intended to serve as a foundation for future engagement in advancing the inclusion of persons with disabilities (PwDs) in governance processes, in alignment with UNDP Sri Lanka's broader efforts.

To ensure accessibility and inclusivity, training materials were provided in local languages and accessible formats. Furthermore, focus group discussions (FGDs) and key informant interviews (KIIs) were conducted using adaptive methods to facilitate the meaningful participation of PwDs in the situational analysis process.

Importantly, the project demonstrated responsiveness to lessons learned during implementation. When initial questionnaires failed to yield the intended insights, the project team simplified and readapted the questions and consultative methods to enhance their relevance and accessibility. This adjustment reflects a clear example of how feedback and internal learning informed changes to the project, ensuring its continued relevance and alignment with the needs of the target population.

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 (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

While the project was not initially designed to operate at scale, there are clear and explicit plans to scale it up in the future—for example, by expanding its coverage or leveraging its results to advocate for policy change.

This is an inception-phase project anchored within UNDP's broader SDG 16 Portfolio. It contributes to portfolio-level learning, enabling informed decisions on the potential scale-up of interventions. The portfolio includes a dedicated output focused on the advancement of persons with disabilities (PwDs), particularly in terms of their representation, protection, and empowerment. A key emphasis is placed on developing and implementing a legal framework to institutionalize the role of PwDs in public policymaking.

A major component of the project—the delivery of a situation analysis report—serves as a foundational step toward scaling up. It aims to inform strategic planning and ensure the project is well-positioned to support inclusive governance processes for PwDs in the future.

Principled

Status: Complete

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

6. Were the project's measures (through outputs, activities, indicators) to address gender inequalities and empower women relevant and produced the intended effect? If not, evidence-based adjustments and changes were made.

- ☐ 3: The project team has systematically 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 (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The project team possessed data and evidence demonstrating the relevance of the measures implemented to address gender inequalities and empower women. This evidence informed the design and implementation of targeted strategies, and there is clear indication that adjustments were made where appropriate to enhance effectiveness.

Disability and gender were treated as cross-cutting themes within the project's implementation framework and aligned with donor priorities, which explicitly emphasized the inclusion of women with disabilities in consultation processes—particularly during the situational analysis phase. To operationalize this, the project employed several inclusive strategies, such as organizing dedicated and separate sessions for women with disabilities during focus group discussions (FGDs) and key informant interviews, ensuring privacy and protection. Furthermore, a separate analysis was conducted to assess the specific circumstances and needs of women with disabilities, reinforcing the project's commitment to inclusive and responsive programming.

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 were conducted where required (i.e., Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) for high/substantial-risk projects and targeted assessments for moderate risk projects as identified through SESP). Relevant management plan(s) developed, implemented, and monitored for identified risks. Select this option for SESP exempted projects and/or 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 (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

Given the scope and scale of the project, it is anchored under the SDG 16 portfolio on Peace, Justice, and Strong Institutions. Therefore, the social and environmental screening of this project was conducted as part of the overall portfolio-level screening.

However, project-level risks—including social and environmental risks—are continuously updated in Quantum and monitored through the organization's internal risk review mechanisms, such as quarterly risk reviews and bi-annual project progress reviews.

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 have been informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism and how to access it. If the project is categorized as High Risk through the SESP, a project -level grievance mechanism is in place and project affected people informed. If grievances have been received they are responded to but face challenges in arriving at a resolution. Select this option for SESP Exempted projects.

☐ 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 (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The grievance redress mechanisms established at the UNDP corporate level, the Sri Lanka Country Office level, and within the SDG 16 portfolio are clearly communicated to project-affected communities. The project's main components—including inception workshops, situation analyses of persons with disabilities (PWDs), and validation workshops—have provided platforms for stakeholders to raise concerns. These forums have enabled discussions on grievances, which can be reported through the various channels established by UNDP.

Management & Monitoring

Status: Complete

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

9. Was the project's M&E Plan adequately implemented?

☐ 3: The project had a comprehensive and costed M&E plan. Baselines, targets and milestones were fully populated. Progress data against indicators in the project's RRF was reported regularly using credible data sources and collected according to the frequency stated in the Plan, including sex disaggregated data as relevant. Any evaluations conducted, if relevant, fully meet decentralized evaluation standards, including gender UNEG standards. Lessons learned, included during evaluations and/or After-Action Reviews, were used to take corrective actions when necessary. (all must be true)

☒ 2: The project costed M&E Plan, and most baselines and targets were populated. Progress data against indicators in the project's RRF was collected on a regular basis, although there was may be some slippage in following the frequency stated in the Plan and data sources was not always reliable. Any evaluations conducted, if relevant, met most decentralized evaluation standards. Lessons learned were captured but were used to take corrective actions. (all must be true)

☐ 1: The project had M&E Plan, but costs were not clearly planned and budgeted for, or were unrealistic. Progress data was not regularly collected against the indicators in the project's RRF. Evaluations did not meet decentralized evaluation standards. Lessons learned were rarely captured and used. Select this option also if the project did not have an M&E plan.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

Given that this is a small-scale, inception-phase project, its monitoring and evaluation (M&E) are integrated within the broader portfolio-level M&E framework. This project falls under Pillar 1 – Voice, Representation, and Accountability of the SDG 16 Portfolio.

As such, the project shares portfolio-level indicators to measure its results and achievements.

Progress is tracked according to the frequency outlined in the portfolio's monitoring framework, although some data-source gaps exist at the national level. A separate evaluation is not required specifically for this project due to its limited scope and scale. However, broader evaluations conducted at the portfolio level—such as the mid-term evaluation—have captured relevant aspects of this project's scope and implementation.

10. Did 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 (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The Portfolio Board of UNDP Sri Lanka's Flagship Portfolio on SDG 16 – Peace, Justice, and Strong Institutions serves as the primary steering body, supported by a high-level advisory group. This board functions as an internal decision-making and governance mechanism, convening at least once annually.

The UNPRPD Inception Phase project is firmly embedded within UNDP's Inclusive Governance Team and the SDG 16 Flagship Portfolio. The portfolio, structured around four programmatic pillars, is managed through a Portfolio Board co-chaired by the External Resources Department (ERD) and UNDP, with participation from key implementing partners. The Board provides strategic oversight, reviews progress and workplans, addresses implementation challenges, and advocates for the scale-up of successful models and best practices.

Annual progress updates are jointly presented by the respective government counterparts and UNDP, in its role as the project's executive, to the SDG 16 Portfolio Board.

These governance structures ensure effective oversight, coordination, and alignment of activities across the portfolio, thereby supporting the successful implementation of projects—including the EDRR initiative—and the achievement of intended outcomes.

Additionally, as this project is funded through the UNPRPD Fund, the United Nations Country Team (UNCT) also plays an advisory role in its implementation and participates in the overall Portfolio Board, further strengthening inter-agency collaboration and coherence.

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 (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The project conducted continuous risk monitoring on a quarterly basis as part of the overall portfolio risk management plan and some updates were made. Given its direct support to persons with disabilities, particular attention was paid to risks specifically affecting this group. These risks were regularly assessed and reviewed in collaboration with relevant stakeholders to ensure timely

and appropriate mitigation measures.

Comprehensive risk management plans, including detailed mitigation strategies, were developed and regularly updated within the Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) system (Quantum). These plans were implemented in a timely manner through close coordination with implementing partners, stakeholders, and government counterparts, ensuring the effectiveness and responsiveness of the project's interventions.

Efficient

Status: Complete

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 (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

This project represents a targeted intervention under the inception phase of the fourth funding round, directly supported by the UN Partnership on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNPRPD) Fund. Resources were allocated adequately in alignment with the intended results and objectives of the project.

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 (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

Procurement plans under the PROMPT initiative are reviewed monthly and formally updated on a quarterly basis to ensure alignment with evolving operational needs and programme timelines.

Operational bottlenecks are systematically identified and addressed through established internal coordination mechanisms. These include the Inclusive Governance Team (IGT) Programme Finance Meetings, which provide a platform for financial oversight, and the weekly Integrated Implementation Group (IIG) meetings, chaired by the Deputy Resident Representative, which focus on cross-functional implementation issues and ensure timely resolution of operational challenges.

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 (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

UNDP guidelines on achieving cost efficiencies in procurement are rigorously followed to ensure value for money and responsible use of resources. Furthermore, by adopting a portfolio approach, human resources are strategically shared across multiple projects. This integrated staffing model reduces duplication and optimizes the use of personnel, office space, and equipment, thereby minimizing operational and administrative overheads.

Effective

Status: Complete

Quality Rating: Needs Improvement

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

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

As highlighted during the previous Portfolio Implementation Quality Assurance (QA) exercise, the project successfully achieved its planned outputs by its scheduled completion in November 2024.

Throughout the implementation period, the project maintained regular engagement with the donor to ensure alignment with expectations and to stay on track toward the full realization of its intended deliverables.

Evidence of this progress is documented in the annual portfolio progress reports submitted to the Portfolio Board.

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 (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The project workplan, along with broader portfolio reviews, is assessed on a bi-annual basis to monitor progress against planned results and strategic deliverables. These reviews serve as a key accountability mechanism, ensuring the project remains aligned with its expected outcomes.

In addition to the formal bi-annual review process, continuous oversight is maintained through regular consultation mechanisms. These include bi-annual strategic discussions with senior management, focusing on programmatic results, and weekly operational reviews chaired by the Deputy Resident Representative, which provide a platform to track implementation progress and address emerging challenges.

Project-level planning and coordination discussions are also routinely conducted within the team at both the technical and Inclusive Governance Team (IGT) levels, ensuring ongoing alignment across workstreams.

All mandatory budget revisions have been executed in a timely manner within the corporate system, in accordance with UNDP’s financial management protocols and in response to evolving operational needs.

17. Were the targeted groups, and particularly those marginalized, vulnerable and left further behind (LNOB), 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 (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The project specifically targeted persons with disabilities, identified as a marginalized group based on prior assessments and interventions conducted through UNDP's portfolio in collaboration with the Sri Lankan Parliament. These interventions included efforts such as the development of parliamentary sign language interpretation, which highlighted the communication barriers faced by this group and their exclusion from full participation in democratic processes.

This inception phase was designed to analyze the current situation of persons with disabilities and assess their capacity needs. Evidence confirms that project beneficiaries are indeed members of the targeted group, as the project activities were exclusively designed for and implemented with persons with disabilities.

During the past year, there was engagement with beneficiaries to evaluate whether the intended benefits were being realized. Feedback from these engagements has informed the project's direction and confirmed that the expected outcomes for the target group are being achieved.

18. If there is a digital or data technology solution in the project: have technology and data risks been addressed specifically for closure, or continued use by partners or UNDP?

- ☐ 3: Yes, a) the implementation and closure followed good practices, such as UNDP's digital standards and data principles; b) technology sustainability risks are addressed: hosting, licenses, intellectual property, data ownership, code documentation, or partner capacity (operations, maintenance and continued improvement); and c) post project scalability has been considered: digital public goods or reusability for other UNDP units. (All must be true)
- ☐ 2: Specific technology and data risks have been partially addressed for project closure, next to Standard UNDP sustainability practices and project risk management.
- ☒ 1: Standard UNDP sustainability practices and project risk management are applied, but no specific practices to address technology or data risks are followed.
- ☐ The project did not utilize a data or digital technology solution.

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The project does not explicitly require the deployment of digital or data technology solutions, as its core idea is to analyze the situation of the Persons with Disabilities in democratic processes.

However, given that the project contributes to Pillar 1 – Voice, Representation and Accountability – under the SDG 16 Flagship Portfolio on Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions, it has benefited from digital tools and platforms developed under other complementary initiatives within the portfolio. These include projects such as digitization support to parliament, Capacity Development of Local Government and Countering Hate Speech, which have introduced digital solutions to enhance service delivery and engagement with beneficiaries such as persons with disabilities.

From an operational standpoint, all financial management functions—including the risk matrix, procurement planning, and budget

execution—are managed through UNDP's enterprise resource planning (ERP) system, Quantum. These processes are fully compliant with UNDP's financial regulations, ensuring transparency, accountability, and efficiency in project implementation.

Sustainability & National Ownership

Status: Complete

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

19. 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 (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

The project is implemented under the Direct Implementation Modality (DIM), with UNDP assuming full responsibility for procurement, monitoring, evaluation, and financial oversight.

The Portfolio Board, co-chaired by the External Resources Department (ERD) representing the Government of Sri Lanka, plays a central role in governance. Annual and bi-annual workplans are developed in close consultation with key stakeholders and are submitted for the Board's review and approval.

The Board also reviews periodic progress reports and provides strategic guidance. This guidance is systematically integrated into portfolio planning processes, as evidenced by documented meeting minutes and follow-up actions.

20. Were there regular monitoring of changes in capacities and performance of institutions and systems relevant to the project, as needed, and were the implementation arrangements⁸ 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 were monitored by the project, however changes to implementation arrangements were not considered. Also select this option if changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems were not monitored by the project.
- ☐ Not Applicable

Evidence (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

Although this project is relatively small in scale, it is anchored within the broader SDG 16 Flagship Portfolio, and therefore, changes in the capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems have been monitored as part of the overall portfolio approach. The portfolio utilizes established indicators and reasonably credible data sources to track progress.

Several other projects within the portfolio, which align with the broader scope of work related to persons with disabilities, have contributed to monitoring institutional and systemic changes. These complementary initiatives have supported the assessment of capacity development and performance improvements in relevant institutions.

Given that this project was in its inception phase, there was no requirement for HACT (Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfers) assurance activities. Instead, project-level monitoring was conducted through the portfolio's overarching monitoring and evaluation mechanisms.

21. 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 (Enter a short explanation or upload a document that provides evidence for your response)

This project represents the inception phase of an initiative funded by the UN Partnership on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNPRPD), aimed at producing and validating a Situation Analysis on the rights of persons with disabilities in Sri Lanka. The primary objective of this phase is to identify future opportunities to advance the rights of persons with disabilities.

The findings from the Situation Analysis report have been widely shared with the United Nations Country Team (UNCT) in Sri Lanka, supporting their efforts to identify potential areas for future programming and collaboration.

As such, the project contributes meaningfully to sustainability by providing a foundational evidence base that can inform future scale-up and targeted interventions. The report itself serves as a strategic resource for continued advocacy and program development in support of the rights of persons with disabilities.