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Strategic

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

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

- 3: The project team identified relevant changes in the external environment that may present new opportunities or threats to the project's ability to achieve its objectives, assumptions were tested to determine if the project's strategy was valid. There is some evidence that the project board considered the implications, and documented the changes needed to the project in response. (all must be true)

- 2: The project team identified relevant changes in the external environment that may present new opportunities or threats to the project's ability to achieve its objectives. There is some evidence that the project board discussed this, but relevant changes did not fully integrate in the project. (both must be true)

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

The COVID-19 pandemic threatens all members of society, but many persons with disabilities face inequalities that leave them more exposed. The project discussed and mobilized additional resources from the UNPRPD to conduct the situational analysis and impact assessment of the situation of persons with disabilities, especially women and marginalized groups of persons with disabilities. The findings and recommendations were shared and discussed with the relevant policy-makers, DPOs, and development agencies that have been working to support persons with disabilities during and post-pandemic. In addition to this, the project also developed a national three-year recovery plan and an advocacy tool to implement the analysis’s recommendations.

Learning from the pandemic, technology and digitalization are needed to support the Disability Action Council (DAC) to effectively monitor the progress of the National Disability Strategic Plan (NDSP). The project developed an Accessible Mobile App named Cambodia Disability News that is an easy and user-friendly App where DAC can share all disability-related information, news, legal frameworks, reports, etc. It can also respond to any requests or complaints of persons with disabilities accordingly. Importantly, this Accessible Mobile App will allow persons with disabilities to keep track of the disability information, enable them to share their concerns, achievements, or requests to DAC or Provincial DAC through the App application.
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2. Was the project aligned with the thematic focus of the Strategic Plan?
Evidence:

The project responded to the UNDP strategic plan (output 2.1.2 and indicator 2.1.2.1) in terms of building the voices and participation of persons with disabilities, for instance, organizations of persons with disabilities were invited to be a key working group at both national and sub-national mechanisms.
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Relevant

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

3. Were the project’s targeted groups systematically identified and engaged, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized, to ensure the project remained relevant for them?
3: Systematic and structured feedback was collected over the project duration from a representative sample of beneficiaries, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized, as part of the project’s monitoring system. Representatives from the targeted groups were active members of the project’s governance mechanism (i.e., the project board or equivalent) and there is credible evidence that their feedback informs project decision making. (all must be true)

2: Targeted groups were engaged in implementation and monitoring, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized. Beneficiary feedback, which may be anecdotal, was collected regularly to ensure the project addressed local priorities. This information was used to inform project decision making. (all must be true to select this option)

1: Some beneficiary feedback may have been collected, but this information did not inform project decision making. This option should also be selected if no beneficiary feedback was collected

Evidence:

From the design to the implementation, the project pro-actively engaged and worked with persons with disabilities and their representative organizations. The project addressed and responded to the needs and challenges faced by persons with disabilities and it applied the disability rights-based approach throughout the project design, implementation and monitoring.

Some of the project’s activities were directly executed by the organization of persons with disabilities (OPD). In addition, the project facilitated a critical space for OPD to engage in the implementation and monitoring of the national law, policies, and strategic plans related to disability by including them as the core members in working groups of the national and sub-national mechanism, where they could raise their views and concerns to influence the legal and policy development process.
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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:**

Based on the national situational analysis, the project paid attention to improve the social services for persons with disabilities regarding the access to national cash transfer programme, vaccination and other emergency support during the pandemic.

Exposure visit of commune authorities was an effective approach to provide opportunities for other commune council leaders to explore and learn what worked well and what didn’t work well in terms of disability inclusion in the commune investment plan (CIP). The full participation of persons with disabilities or their representatives at all steps of the CIP process and how to allocate the commune’s fund or mobilize the fund from other sources to respond to their needs. Three commune councils designed the action plan in 2022 with specific addressing the needs of persons with disabilities; including access to health and rehabilitation services, building the accessible ramp at the commune council office, referring the persons with disabilities to vocational training skills, etc.
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 project was not at scale. However, it could expand its coverage if there is more funding available. Its policy work also has the potential to benefit people with disabilities in Cambodia.

It helped to facilitate 1,832 (952 women with disabilities) persons with disabilities to receive the first dose of COVID-19 vaccination, and 1,745 PWDs (785 women) received the second dose. With its support, 1,508 (737 women with disabilities) persons with disabilities received ID Poor cards and a cash-transfer program. 4,995 (2,787 women) persons with disabilities received PPE materials, emergency supported packages, and another social service supports through support and coordination of the local authorities during the project period.

At the policy level, the project mainstreamed disability into the UNDP social protection initiative for example the persons with disabilities access to ID Poor programme as well as covid-19 relief. It is also mainstreamed in youth skill development and de-mining initiatives through improved access to skill development and livelihoods options.

The project will continue phase II by focusing on the national policy development/formulation, implementation, and monitoring. The project will also set up the national M&E system and enhance disability-inclusive social protection.
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Principled

Quality Rating: Needs Improvement
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:

A gender lens was applied, which was monitored throughout its activities. Two approaches were introduced by the project: gender parity at the leadership and decision-making level and throughout the implementation of the activities. 20% of women with disabilities played a leadership role within DPOs/WWDFs. 40% of DPOs' governing board members are female. About 50% of women with disabilities involved in the project's activities.

List of Uploaded Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>File Name</th>
<th>Modified By</th>
<th>Modified On</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>MPTF_Annual_Narrative_Programme_Report_2021_FINAL31.03.21CLEAN.V1_12035_306 (<a href="https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MPTF_Annual_Narrative_Programme_Report_2021_FINAL31.03.21CLEAN.V1_12035_306.pdf">https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MPTF_Annual_Narrative_Programme_Report_2021_FINAL31.03.21CLEAN.V1_12035_306.pdf</a>)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mao.meas@undp.org">mao.meas@undp.org</a></td>
<td>2/22/2022 5:55:00 AM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 project was identified as a low risk on the social and environmental risk. However, by working closely with disabled people organizations, the project also monitored if there was an unintended consequence on people with disabilities as a result of the project's activities.
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8. Were grievance mechanisms available to project-affected people and were grievances (if any) addressed to ensure any perceived harm was effectively mitigated?

3: Project-affected people actively informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism (SRM/SECU) and how to access it. If the project was categorized as High or Moderate Risk through the SESP, a project -level grievance mechanism was in place and project affected people informed. If grievances were received, they were effectively addressed in accordance with SRM Guidance. (all must be true)

2: Project-affected people informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism and how to access it. If the project was categorized as High Risk through the SESP, a project -level grievance mechanism was in place and project affected people informed. If grievances were received, they were responded to but faced challenges in arriving at a resolution.

1: Project-affected people was not informed of UNDP’s Corporate Accountability Mechanism. If grievances were received, they were not responded to. (any may be true)
**Evidence:**

There is no evidence that the project’s affected people were informed of UNDP’s Corporate Accountability Mechanism. However, the project worked closely with the Disability Action Council and organizations of persons with disabilities, who are the responsible parties and aware of the accountability mechanism. The project is low risk and the feedback from persons with disabilities was regularly collected.
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**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 met decentralized evaluation standards, including gender UNEG standards. Lessons learned, included during evaluations and/or After-Action Reviews, were used to take corrective actions when necessary. (all must be true)

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

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

The project M&E framework is costed. There were baselines and targets set. Data were regularly collected and progress was updated through the quarterly report, annual progress report and project completion reports.
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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 ACCESS Competitive Investment Mechanism Panel (CIMP) was established to manage ACCESS grants selection process. It is composed of representatives from MoWA, MoSVY, DAC, MEF, Australian Embassy, an independent member, and ACCESS Team. The CIMP also acts as a project oversight committee for the ACCESS supported UN joint program. It formally approved the UN joint program annual work plan and met on an ad hoc basis to validate any strategic change in the program as needed.

ACCESS Steering Committee (ASC) provided overall strategic guidance to the ACCESS program, including interventions of its implementing partners. The ACCESS program team acted as secretariat of the ASC and as such provided six-monthly updates on program progress. UNDP, UNFPA, and UN Women contributed to this program level progress update by submitting semi-annual progress reports to the ACCESS.
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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:

Risks were regularly monitored and actions were taken to mitigate the risk. In addition, the project risk log was updated regularly (quarterly and annually).
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Efficient

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

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

Yes

No

Evidence:

The project was fully funded.
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 procurement plan was developed and updated in PROMPT. It was regularly monitored on a quarterly basis. There were several but small procurement actions under the project and through the regular project review, challenges were discussed.
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14. Was there regular monitoring and recording of cost efficiencies, taking into account the expected quality of results?
Evidence:
The project used UNDP's procurement system which follows the cost-efficiency principle. It also collaborated with other disabilities related projects under UNDP and other UN agencies to cost-share staff and activities.
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Effective Quality Rating: Satisfactory

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

Yes

No

Evidence:
The project delivered its expected outputs.
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 project developed a multi-year work plan and an annual work plan which was reviewed and endorsed by the Board. The project also undertook a monthly review of its progress and bottleneck. The budget revision took place as needed.

---

17. Were the targeted groups systematically identified and engaged, prioritizing the marginalized and excluded, to ensure results were achieved as expected?
Evidence:
The project's target groups were identified and engaged throughout the design and implementation. As previously mentioned, some of the project's activities were executed by disabled people organizations and key project activities, involved them either as participants, trainers, beneficiaries, or contributors to the policy design.
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Sustainability & National Ownership

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

18. Were stakeholders and national partners fully engaged in the decision-making, implementation and monitoring of the project?
3: Only national systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) were used to fully implement and monitor the project. All relevant stakeholders and partners were fully and actively engaged in the process, playing a lead role in project decision-making, implementation and monitoring. (both must be true)

2: National systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) were used to implement and monitor the project (such as country office support or project systems) were also used, if necessary. All relevant stakeholders and partners were actively engaged in the process, playing an active role in project decision-making, implementation and monitoring. (both must be true)

1: There was relatively limited or no engagement with national stakeholders and partners in the decision-making, implementation and/or monitoring of the project.

Not Applicable

Evidence:
The project was directly implemented by UNDP (DI M). UNDP system of procurement, monitoring, and evaluation was used. However, the project closely worked with the Government (Ministry of social Affairs Veterans and Youth Rehabilitation and Disability Action Council) and with CSO at both decision making and execution levels.
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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 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 project was DIM. There was no change.

List of Uploaded Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>File Name</th>
<th>Modified By</th>
<th>Modified On</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No documents available.

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

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

Evidence:
The project will continue implementing the ACCESS Phase II.

List of Uploaded Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>File Name</th>
<th>Modified By</th>
<th>Modified On</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No documents available.

QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments
Despite its small budget, the project made a significant contribution to the improvement of disabilities rights. It is an example of the direct involvement of the affected communities in the implementation and the collaboration with civil society. Way forward, the second phase should also pay more attention to the sustainability of the civil society organization, especially the disabled people organization as well as the focus on the economic rights of people with disabilities.