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# Executive Summary

This report presents the findings of an Outcome Evaluation, commissioned by the UNDP Country Office (CO) Ukraine, of a portfolio of 12 selected projects which contributed to the achievement of outcomes 15 and 16 of the 2012-2016/2017 UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD). These projects are concerned with poverty reduction, with an emphasis on rural areas (CPD outcome 15) and access to quality health, education and social services with a focus on vulnerable groups (CPD 16).

The **purpose** of the assignment was threefold. First, it meets accountability requirements as stipulated in the CO’s evaluation plan. Second, it serves learning purposes at CO level by providing a platform for joint reflection and discussion of lessons from project and CPD implementation. Third, it has a forward-looking aspect, contributing to the ongoing discussions on potential programming choices in the framework of the next CPD, which is to cover the period from 2018-2022 and which is currently being prepared.

The evaluation was to address a number of specific points, as outlined in the Terms of Reference (ToR), including:

* The achievement of planned outcomes;
* Specific evidence of UNDP contributions to outcomes;
* Factors facilitating the achievement of outputs, both extraneous and at the level of the internal design of the portfolio;
* Synergies between the interventions in the portfolio-under-review.

The evaluation methodology adopted a combination of **desk review of documents** and **stakeholder interviews**. The document review considered in particular project final reports where projects had closed, as well as evaluations on specific projects where these were available, as well as a number of documents reflecting strategic thinking at the CO level with view to the next CPD strategy period. Stakeholder interviews were conducted with project and programme managers and senior UNDP staff; Ukrainian partner institutions and organisations; as well as donor representatives.

There were **limitations** posed by the severe time constraints under which the assignment took place, and where there was little lead time with regards to a thorough desk review of documents and the preparation of more structured data collection instruments and which would provide a sounder evidence base for the findings.

The report findings are **structure**d around the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, and sustainability. It was agreed with the UNDP CO that efficiency would not be covered in the assignment. Cross-cutting issues, i.e. gender, human rights and vulnerable group issues, were considered across those criteria.

# Findings

Relevance

Overall, the portfolio is aligned with UNDAF and UNDP CPD country programme documents and objectives, as well as specific strategic documents at country level within the UN family. The projects were aligned with reform priorities and needs of the Ukrainian governments, although there has been varying level of ownership across the CPD period (2012-2017), with a clear bifurcation of the cooperation context in 2014.

However, while there have been seismic shifts in the context in which the UNDP CPD operates as a result of the Revolution of Dignity (Maidan) in 2013/2014 and the war in Eastern Ukraine from 2014 onwards, the CPD has remained unchanged. The evaluation is thus assessing the achievements of outcomes against a number of indicators that should (albeit with exceptions), in their existing form, have been reviewed against the fallout from the events in 2013/2014, in particular where this concerned some of the economic indicators (real income growth) in the context of a severe economic crisis, to name but one example. The indicators for CPD 15 and 16 are thus considered relevant only to a limited extent.

Overall, however, the evaluation finds that even at the beginning of the CPD period, i.e. in 2012, the relevance of some of the indicators to measure the achievement of the outcomes had been weak, and the theory of change between indicators and outcomes is in a number of cases no longer obvious in retrospect.

Isolating the projects within the evaluated portfolio from the indicators and thus considering, separately, their relevance with regards to the overall objectives of “Reduction of Poverty in Rural Areas through Socio-Economic Development Activities” (CPD 15), defined as “Growth and Development are inclusive and sustainable, incorporating productive capacities that create employment and livelihoods for the poor and excluded” and “Improved Access to and Utilization of Quality Health, Education and Social Services” (CPD 16) defined further as “Countries have strengthened institutions to progressively deliver universal access to basic services”, the evaluation finds that the projects have, by and large, been relevant to contribute to the achievement of these objectives.

The war in Eastern Ukraine has had a considerable impact on the focus of the work of the UN agencies’ in the country, including on UNDP. Faced with a violent conflict resulting in a humanitarian crisis, including considerable numbers of internally displaced persons (IDPs), donors channelled substantial amounts of funds to help the humanitarian and early recovery effort through UNDP. In 2016, UNDP’s budget had exceeded its initially foreseen needs by three times. While it is clear that the situation demanded immediate responses, this appears to have come **at the** **expense of a clear, pronounced focus on poverty reduction** and some of the subjects addressed by the portfolio in the earlier CPD period (2012/2013). While the concentration of efforts on the early recovery effort in Eastern Ukraine is not in contradiction with the poverty reduction outcome *per se*, there seems an inconsistency in how UNDP currently deals (or does not) with the more structural and systemic problems underpinning poverty and social inequality. These underpinning problems have to be seen as also having contributed to the current situation in the East, and which deserve a continued, medium- to-long term effort and dialogue with the government of Ukraine, and which UNDP is well placed to be engaged in.

Across the portfolio, partnerships with the respective Ukrainian institutions at government as well as at civil society level have been relevant. With regards to value-added as an aspect of relevance, stakeholders were able to identify UNDP with being the international organisations that works at the grass-roots, local level; and which champions vulnerable persons issues on aspects that are less supported by other development partners (specifically disabled persons). Partners have also highlighted UNDP’s value-added as an organisation with long-term presence with a clear appreciation of the non-project based expert advice support to the government. There has been evidence that this type of support has been crucial for institutions to identify policy and legislative gaps and which then formed the basis for targeted work with bi-lateral donors. Given that many of the UNDP staff interviewed in the course of the evaluation seem to be unsure what the role of their organisation is against the background of donors with considerably bigger financial support envelopes, UNDP’s value-added as pointed out by government counterparts should serve as some indication on where UNDP’s effort is pivotal to partners in government, and that could be built upon in the future.

The portfolio of projects is relevant with regards to UNDP cross-cutting priorities, i.e. gender equality and vulnerable group issues, although there is some scope to further strengthen these aspects in a future programme, both at project level as well as issues championed by UNDP within the wider donor and development partner community. In the projects on the early recovery side of the portfolio, disability and vulnerable groups issues have been consistently part of the approach to rehabilitation of physical infrastructure as well as in the economic development outputs. Further work is needed to strengthen the gender aspects of the portfolio, in particular in dialogue with the government.

Effectiveness

The evaluation has considered effectiveness in accordance with the ToR - the task at hand was to appreciate the portfolio’s results against the indicators and CPD 15 and 16. Given the above established lack of review of the CPD indicators, there is limited use in dissecting, in great detail, the problems associated with these. It was considered more productive to map the results from the portfolio and how these have contributed to the two outcomes, and this approach was agreed with the UNDP CO at the beginning of the in-country work.

This task is considerably complicated by the overall lack of results-based reporting, in particular among the projects in the earlier stages of the CPD period. Reports have often focused on activities and outputs, and there is a lack of baselines to provide context to the scale of activities and their reach/coverage. Other projects, such as the CBA and the BMO, have managed to create project information systems that generate sophisticated performance data at project level, but none that would necessarily relate the projects to the CPD level outcomes or indicators.

This notwithstanding, the evaluator identifies a number of results:

* Across the portfolio of reviewed interventions, there is evidence that projects have **contributed to informing policy debate**, as well as **policy-making**. This is particularly the case for the projects that relate to CPD 16, which is concerned with access to social services, education and health, and where considerable results relate to the direction of reforms, as well as the establishment of standards and methodologies in a wide range of areas covered by the ongoing social sector reform.
* Under CPD 16, too, there is evidence from across the portfolio that interventions had an impact on **legislative change** in areas of concern for vulnerable groups in society, including youth; people living with HIV/AIDS; the LGBT community; people with disabilities’ as well as legislation underpinning social reform.
* Projects have provided pivotal **strategic advice** that has helped partners to develop cooperation with other donors, in particular in the area of youth policy.
* Capacities have been built at various levels of partnership. This includes increased capacities of the government at central level to use data and **evidence for policy planning**, as well as capacity of civil society organisations to conduct advocacy work with the government, including on entrepreneurs’ rights and rights of vulnerable groups of the populations.

A more detailed account of results is provided in the core part of the report.

The evaluation finds that at the corporate level, the individual project’s understanding of their place within a wider strategic context were weak, which in part accounted for their lack of monitoring results against CPD indicators. The inter-connectedness between governance and poverty reduction was not clearly rationalised, and project management tended to think solely within the logic of the intervention they were responsible for. This might have resulted in a number of missed opportunities for synergies among projects in the portfolio and that might have been explored and could have maximised the results from projects, such as the reforms piloted in the framework of the Social Sector Service Reform project on others that might have been able to piggyback on some of the other efforts that were more substantial in scale.

Efficiency

While formally outside the scope of this evaluation, the evaluation found some evidence on value-for-money in particular of some of the smaller projects.

Sustainability

Sustainability is one of the key concerns with regards to the results identified. This particularly concerns the earlier (2012/2013) portfolio of projects that focused on social sector service reform; and mainstreaming disability issues; as well as public awareness about HIV/AIDS. In terms of their size, these have been projects with a relatively modest financial envelope, and which have worked strategically at the level of governmental institutions on the legal and normative bases as well as on the development of quality standards in social service delivery. However, considerable further attention is needed to ensure the implementation of legislation as well as the quality norms developed through the SSSR project. Continued attention is also needed with regards to disability issues. With regards to the latter, there is also a considerable amount of work that needs to be done to consistently mainstream disability concerns into all projects within the portfolio of projects. For other projects in the portfolio, the evaluator has not been able to come to conclusive findings with regards to sustainability, as project results have not been consistently monitored after project closure.

## Recommendations

As UNDP is moving to its next CPD, a number of recommendations emerge from the evaluation with regards to poverty reduction specifically. These apply irrespective of where, eventually, the poverty reduction theme is going to be “located” within the CPD thematic pillars.

Strategic level

**Centrality of poverty reduction and social cohesion for UNDP**. Poverty reduction and social cohesion remain at the core of UNDP’s mandate (“No one left behind” as the overarching principle of the Sustainable Development Goals: SDG 1 “No Poverty”), and all interventions across pillars will have to anchor their justification in their contribution to this goal. From this mandate flow the focus on economic development on the one hand, and the protection of those groups in society that are less able to fend for themselves on the other hand. A number of projects (in the recovery cluster; CBA) work with vulnerable groups through their interventions on the ground. However, there is a need to re-energise UNDP’s work at the central level of government on social sector service reform and to pick up and build on the results made in earlier stages of the CPD. With regards to economic development, UNDP’s current donors want to see a more coherent link between economic development and poverty reduction, i.e. it is in UNDP’s interest to re-define this approach in terms of potential funding opportunities. While some aspects of the work on the economic development side in the recovery part of the portfolio are worthwhile to be taken further across areas in Ukraine, other aspects do not lend themselves to replication and thus, do not offer model value for UNDP beyond the Eastern region; this concerns in particular the micro-grants that are part of a number of projects.

**UNDP should play a greater role as the champion for vulnerable and marginalised groups in Ukraine**. This should not only be reflected in the programming/project choices – UNDP has a role to play to promote the mainstreaming of vulnerable groups issues into the awareness and practice of the wider development partner community in Ukraine. Choices have been laid out in a paper at the closure of the “Mainstreaming Disabilities” project. This area, too, represents an opportunity for funding, as disability rights will, for example, be a key priority of DfID in its next programming period. More importantly, it would seem that there is potential for considerable traction on this issue as a result of the war in Eastern Ukraine and where aspects such as universal access to public spaces will remain a challenge that the country will have to deal with for years to come.

**UNDP has a role to play that is rationalised by partners, but should be clearer among UNDP staff.** Staff often appears to be awed by the amount of donors and their funding, and which appears to result in somewhat of a paralysis on thinking of where it adds value to moving the development agenda ahead in Ukraine. Partners in the government have particularly highlighted UNDP’s non-project driven and –based support to their work over the years. This is a useful model to reignite and the funding required for this is often modest, in particular where it comes to joint thinking with government institutions, and conducting gap analyses that then pave the way for institutions’ dialogue with the bigger donors. On a number of issues (gender; marginalised groups; the disabled; youth), there is no monopoly of any one organisation; on the contrary, pressure coming from more than one partner (such as the Council of Europe and which, too, is a standard-setting body) can actually be useful.

**Where projects deal with support to the elaboration of legislation, strategies, policies and standards, greater emphasis needs to be put on costing the implementation of these**. At present, none of the results on the normative and standard-setting side have included a costing of the reforms suggested. This, however, would be an important aspect to support evidence-based policy making at the level of the Ukrainian government institutions, something that stakeholders have identified a considerable need in, and where UNDP can add value.

**Projects should adopt a medium-to long-term perspective, but do not always need big amounts of money**. A number of projects in the portfolio have had considerable results for what would seem very modest amounts of funding. On key issues, it would seem to be more important to have a consistent, long-term engagement with the government counterparts rather than a plethora of activities that lack follow-up.

**Outside of the recovery context, the approach to economic development will have to take a more strategic approach**, to focus on interventions with a systemic character. This imperative is, *inter alia*, dictated by the considerable amounts of funding available in the donor community for private sector development, and where UNDP will have to identify its specific niche – its established relationship with the Employment Agency seems to be such a niche which should be further developed, as is the work with private sector interest groups/associations, including those operating in Eastern Ukraine.

There is some tension between UNDP as small organisation and the size of Ukraine, as well as the priorities now coming from decentralisation process and where needs will be immense for the foreseeable future. These tensions are further fed by the very considerable amount of funding provided by some of the donors in Ukraine, in particular the European Union and USAID. **UNDP’s niche and role is as the champion of vulnerable groups, and it should bring this voice to bear in the process.**

Operational level

**Quality of CPD indicators and tracking of results**. The theory of change underpinning CPD outcomes and the indicators used to measure these needs to be strengthened. Projects in the portfolio need to collect data not only at the level of the individual intervention, but also to feed into the CPD outcome areas. Provisions should be made so that results are being monitored even after projects’ closure.

**Synergies between projects should be better explored and exploited**. UNDP currently has a considerable presence on the ground through its CBA project. It should be explored how other ongoing efforts can tap into CBAs considerable, well-established local presence, for example with regards to social sector service reform at the level of newly amalgamated communities in the context of the ongoing process of decentralisation and where the needs for capacity building are considerable.

**Re-examine the approach to capacity building at central level and build this into project design**. As highlighted above, a number of longer-term interventions have had good results, but have also substituted lacking governmental capacity, while building up specialised capacity inside non-governmental organisations. Future interventions should reflect clearer on how to deal with capacity-building challenges in official partner institutions.

**Training needs to be more strategic**. While trainings have been highlighted as particularly positive by stakeholders, they have reached but a small fraction of the potential target groups in the institutions. In order to have an impact, projects need to first establish the size of the target groups that would benefit from training, and then design the training formats accordingly. In a country the size of Ukraine, this will probably in many cases have to take the form of training-of-trainers.

# Introduction

## Background and Context

UNDP’s current [Country Programme Document](http://www.ua.undp.org/content/dam/ukraine/docs/UNDP%20CPAP_FINAL_ENG.pdf) (CPD) has been in place since 2012, and was initially to last until the end of 2016; it was subsequently extended until 2017. The UN in Ukraine, including UNDP, is currently working on the elaboration of its next UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF), and UNDP is in the course of the development of its next CPD, anticipated to span the period from 2018 to 2022.

The CPD in its current form spans two very different cooperation contexts, which can broadly be divided into the period from 2012 to the end of 2013 and early 2014. The “Revolution of Dignity” in 2013/2014 ousted the government of president V. Yanukovich in spring 2014 and brought in a government with a pro-European reform agenda. Also in spring 2014, in an attempt to demonstrate and assert regional power and influence, the Ukrainian territory of Crimea was unlawfully annexed by the Russian Federation, and a war was incited by Russia on part of Eastern Ukraine and which continues to date (see also the Terms of Reference in Annex 1 of this report for further detail). This changed context had an impact on the operating environment of international organisations in Ukraine, including UNDP.

Until 2014, UNDP’s operations under the CPD were organised into four thematic clusters. These included Economic Growth, Poverty Reduction, and Social Development; Governance and Local Development; Environment and Climate Change; and UNDP Interventions in the Autonomous Republic of Crimea (ARC) and Chernobyl. By 2014, projects in ARC had ceased due to the annexation of the region by the Russian Federation, and the portfolio’s cluster on Economic Growth, Poverty Reduction, and Social Development had been consolidated, i.e. an explicit cluster of projects under this heading stopped to exist. With the considerable inflow of funding from bilateral donors as a result of the war in Eastern Ukraine and the ensuing humanitarian crisis, UNDP’s emphasis has considerably shifted to implement these funds, and most of the interventions that had started earlier (2012/2013) on social development did not continue beyond the projects’ end. However, despite the internal restructuring and re-orientation, indicators have remained, albeit with slight modifications, in place since 2012.

These are:[[1]](#footnote-1)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| CPD 15 | Indicators to measure achievement towards CPD 15 |
| Reduction of poverty in rural areas through socio-economic development activities | 1. Extent to which Millennium Development Goals are integrated into Ukraine’s strategic priorities 2. % of small and micro enterprises in total volume of trade 3. % of households’ real income growth in targeted localities of selected regions of Ukraine by 2017 |
| CPD 16 | Indicators for CPD 16 |
| Improved access to and utilisation of quality health education and social services | 1. Targeting of social assistance through improved services for vulnerable and marginalised groups increased, especially in rural areas 2. % allocated in the state budget for HIV/AIDS programmes comparing to the needs 3. Improved public perception of quality and accessibility of public service provision |

Given the above described re-organisation of the portfolio in 2014/2015, UNDP CO UA considers that the following finished or, in a number of cases, ongoing projects, closest address CPD 15 and 16.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name of intervention** | **Objective** | **Objectives + UNDAF Outcome** | **Duration** | **Main Stakeholders** | **Amount in USD** | **Donor** |
| Strengthening the National TB and HIV Council in Ukraine | National and regional response to HIV/AIDS strengthened through sectoral mainstreaming, good governance, HRBA and gender-based approaches | 16 | 2012-2014 | State Service of Ukraine on HIV/AIDS and Other Socially Dangerous Diseases (now called Ukrainian Center for Socially Dangerous Disease Control of the Ministry of Health of Ukraine) | 377,807 USD actually received;  349,313 USD – spent (as of 2016) | Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Malaria and TB |
| Strengthening National Capacities for Effective HIV/AIDS response in UA, changed name, in 2014, into Strengthening National Capacities for Effective Youth Development and HIV/AIDS Response in Ukraine | National and regional response to HIV/AIDS strengthened through sectoral mainstreaming, good governance, HRBA and gender-based approaches | 16 | 2012-2016 | State Service for Youth and Sports (now Ministry for Youth and Sports), NGOS and civil society, including in ARC | Total resources:  1,107,920  USD  UNDP – 820,000 USD | Charitable Foundation “Development of Ukraine”;  UNAIDS-UBRAF;  EU;  UNDP |
| Support to Social Sector Reform in Ukraine | Support the Government of Ukraine and the Ministry of Social Policy of Ukraine in accelerating the implementation of the reforms in social policy and achieving Ukraine’s short- and mid-term social and economic development goals | 16 | 2011-2017 | Ministry of Social Policy of Ukraine at central level | 560 521 USD (UNDP – 472 521;  Turkey – 88 000 (amount includes GMS, which will be paid back to IRH at the end of 2017. Net contribution from IRH is 85 000USD) | UNDP; Government of Turkey |
| Mainstreaming Policies and Services for People with Disabilities in UA | To promote accessibility and universal design standards as enablers for inclusion and participation of persons with disabilities | 16 | 12/2012-12/2014 | National Assembly for Persons with Disabilities Ukraine (main partner) | Total expenses: 235,057 USD (JPAA – 215,8 USD  UNDP 19,329 USD) | UNDP;  UN Partnership on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNDP(JPAA) |
| Community-Based Approach to Local Development Project Phase III | To promote sustainable socio-economic development at local level by strengthening participatory governance and fostering community-based initiatives throughout Ukraine | 15 and 16 | 2014-2017 | 24 regions of Ukraine | MUSD 26.4 EU – $18,650,149 + $6,842,596\*;  UNDP – $886,704  \* - pending receipt from EU | European Commission  UNDP |
| Aid for Trade Project | To support inclusive growth […] through the promotion of trade and the enhancement of […] competitiveness to support […] efforts to reduce poverty and improve people’s lives | 15 | 2011-2013 | Ministry of Economic Development and Trade (MEDT), business associations, including sectoral business representation organisations | Total: USD 363,023 -  USD 306,360 from Finland;  56,663 from UNDP | Government of Finland  UNDP |
| Acceleration of MDG Progress in UA | MDG-based strategic planning and monitoring is ensured to accelerate progress towards the achievement of MDGs | 16 | 2012-2016 | Ministry for Economic Development and Trade of Ukraine | USD 470,000 | UNDP |
| Improving local capacities to promote and sustain entrepreneurship and SME development in Chernobyl affected territories | Enhanced local capacities in selected areas to effectively use available business support instruments | 15 | 2014-2015 | Municipal authorities in pilot regions in the Chernobyl area | USD 100,000 | Government of Poland |
| Strengthening SME membership organisations | Strengthened capacities of BMOs to represent interests of the private sector and to contribute to policy development leading to private sector growth | 15 | 2015-2018 | 7 BMOs; governments at local, regional and central level | USD 980,223 | Government of Switzerland (SECO) |
| Early Recovery Social Services and Peacebuilding in Donetsk and Lugansk Oblasts | Rapidly respond to urgent needs in the rehabilitation of the most critical social infrastructure, incl. the recovery of social care services aimed at the most vulnerable groups incl. disabled persons  Building of the capacities of the local authorities to plan and manage social services | 16 | 2014-2015 | Authorities in Luhansk and Donetsk regions | MUSD 5.1 | Government of Japan |
| Economic and Social Recovery of the Donbass region | Support local economic recovery  Foster employment  Create income generation opportunities | 15 and 16 | 2015-2016 | Government and local population, including IDPs, in Donetsk and Luhansk regions | MUSD 5 | Government of Japan |
| Rapid Response to Social and Economic Issues of IDPs | Enhance capacity of government for effective coordination, planning and management of activities to create income generation and employment opportunities for IDPS  Improve livelihoods of IDPS by providing access to enterprise development trainings and access to social services  Promote durable integration/reintegration and social cohesion | 15 | 2015 and 2016 | Eight regions of Ukraine including Donetsk and Luhansk | MUSD 6.32  Japan;  1,5 MUSD – DfiD;  730,000 USD - Poland | Government of Japan  Government of Poland  UK DfID |

# The Evaluation

## Purpose

In line with the Evaluation Plan of UNDP in Ukraine, an outcome evaluation is to be conducted to assess the impact of UNDP’s initiatives in the area of poverty reduction implemented in the framework of the 2012-2016/17 Country Programme Document (CPD). The objective of the evaluation is three-fold. First, as with other evaluations, it serves accountability purposes. Second, the evaluation has a learning dimension, as the process provides a framework for reflection and self-assessment at organisational level as well as at the level of individuals. Third, the findings from the evaluation will be used to inform programming of the next CPD, anticipated to span from 2018 – 2022, and which is currently under preparation.

The Terms of Reference (provided in Annex I) specify the purpose as assisting UNDP to gain “a better understanding of the following aspects of its interventions:

* The extent to which the planned outcomes and the related outputs have been or are being achieved;
* The mechanisms by which outputs led to the achievement of the specific outcomes;
* Concrete evidence of the UNDP contribution to outcomes;
* If and which programme processes e.g. strategic partnerships and linkages are critical in producing the intended outcome;
* Factors that facilitate and/or hinder the progress in achieving the outcome, both in terms of the external environment and those internal to the portfolio interventions including: design, management, human resource skills, and resources;
* Lessons learned from the implementation of the interventions, also evidenced;
* Coordination and mutual reinforcement of the inputs, results and outputs of the projects, their integration into larger governance objectives of UNDP Ukraine, their alignment and synergies;
* Sustainability: whether there is ownership and capacity to maintain and manage development in the Outcome”

As a cross-cutting vector of inquiry, the evaluation was to examine the extent to which gender and vulnerable groups have been mainstreamed into the portfolio under evaluation (see p. 5 of the ToR in Annex 1).

The users of the evaluation will primarily be UNDP and the Ukrainian partner institutions.

## Scope

The evaluation covers the portfolio of projects provided in Table 1 above (section on Background). These projects were selected by UNDP CO UA as best reflecting efforts to achieve progress towards CPD 15 and CPD 16, given that there is no stand-alone economic growth, poverty reduction, and social development cluster anymore (see previous discussion). Given the nature of the evaluation (an outcome evaluation), the evaluator has not evaluated individual projects, but has strived for an appreciation of the totality of the results against the CPD objectives. While CPD 17 was part of the ToR of the assignment, during the debriefing with the UNDP CO in Kyiv in early February, it was decided to exclude this outcome area.

## Methodology

The ToR outline the scope of the work and the level of resources allocated to the assignment. The duration of the evaluation is short, totalling 20 input-days, an amount that typically covers the evaluation of one individual project.[[2]](#footnote-2) These days covered the preparation of the field work; a comprehensive document review of 12 projects (the initial list of 11 projects in the ToR was extended during the briefing at the UNDP CO UA); a 9-day mission to Ukraine; the preparation of an exit briefing; the organisation of follow-up interviews; and the draft and final evaluation reports.

The approach adopted was informed by the timeframes in which the evaluation was taking place, and where the UNDP CO Ukraine needed to have the final report with a sense of urgency, as the organisation is in the process of planning its CPD for the forthcoming period (2018-2022).

Four key data sources were the basis for data collection and subsequent triangulation of evaluation results. These were:

* Output document review. Documents prepared by UNDP, primarily the Project Documents per intervention as well as final project reports. This was used to triangulate evidence against the evaluation criteria.
* Semi-structured interviews. These were conducted using a number of standardised questions designed to elicit responses that address the evaluation criteria, as well as informed reactions and insights of interviewees.
* Discussions. These were using open questioning techniques to elicit more qualitative and contextualised information from interviewees. The evaluator strived to incorporate gender considerations during the discussions. Both semi-structured interviews and discussions were conducted using the principle of non-attribution, i.e. specific statements are not linked to specific stakeholders. However, a full list of stakeholders can be found in Annex III of the report which provides the schedule of the evaluator’s field work and the names and affiliations of persons interviewed.
* Review of additional data/reports. These were collected during and after the in-country data collection stage, and include sources outside UNDP, research by domestic and international organisations on issues relevant to the portfolio of interventions under evaluation, and relevant national legislation, policies, and strategic documents that the projects had contributed to. These provided additional evidence to corroborate the contribution to the outcomes reported by UNDP.

In preparation of the in-country visit, (1-9 February 2017), the evaluator prepared standardised fiches for each of the projects to be considered for this outcome evaluation. The fiches contained a summary of the project objectives and reported results, and were then used as the basis to log other relevant information, such as additional evidence to corroborate the reported results; specific observations from stakeholders that were involved in the intervention; potential follow-up information etc. The fiches were a working tool and are not part of the evaluation report. However, they were logged so as to be able to provide specific evidence for findings in the evaluation report.

## Limitations and De-limitations

Due to the considerable time pressure to conduct this evaluation, there were limits as to the use of alternative data collection methodologies. There was no capacity to prepare or administer, for example, an online survey among beneficiaries or stakeholders (something that is standard in better resourced assignments of this nature), though given the wide geographical reach of some of the interventions (for example, the Support to Social Sector Reform Project worked at the level of selected rayons and oblasts to pilot some of its key outputs), this would otherwise be considered a useful approach to harvest responses from areas that cannot be reached during the in-country visit. UNDP CO UA operates as part of the UN family in Ukraine, and a considerable number of projects included in the portfolio have been conducted as part of agreements within the UN Ukraine on the division of tasks among agencies. How well this has worked and whether UNDP has been successful in playing to role assigned to it within this responsibility-sharing set up (for example in the area of HIV/AIDS response) was not an area that the evaluator has been able to explore in the framework of this assignment. Another key de-limitation is that in agreement with UNDP, and in correspondence with the ToR for the evaluation, efficiency, one of the otherwise key standard OECD/DAC evaluation criteria, has not been included as part of this assignment. This is somewhat regrettable in that the evaluator found that some of the small projects dealing with social development issues seemed to present considerable value-for money, and a more detailed analysis might have elicited another set of lessons learned.

The most important limitations for the task at hand has been the overall quality of indicators, at CPD level (see discussion in the Background section) on the one hand, and the quality of data collection throughout across the portfolio of projects that form part of the evaluation on the other hand. The link between indicators and CPD outcomes is often weak, and data has not been systematically collected to capture progress over time. Considerable variations exist between projects, and where a clear difference can be observed in more recent projects which have started to apply systematic data collection and monitoring techniques against baseline indicators (see below on Monitoring and Evaluation) at project level. However, almost none of the projects in the reviewed portfolio had collected data relating their project performance to indicators and outcomes at CPD level.

UNDP CO UA has been aware of this situation and has undertaken credible steps to introduce a more rigorous results orientation at project level, as well as at CPD level, including through the recently introduced Results-Oriented Annual Report (ROAR) format. For the task at hand, i.e. the review of progress achieved against the 2012 CPD indicators, the evaluator discussed with CO staff to what extent it was useful to dissect the problems with regards to the indicators and their suitability to capture progress against CPD Outcomes, in particular as previous evaluation exercises have highlighted this issue repeatedly.[[3]](#footnote-3) It was agreed that while some space should be given to this discussion, the evaluation should also seek to harvest results of the projects even if their impact has not been systematically assessed against indicators at outcome level by the projects themselves.

## Evaluation schedule

*26/27 January and 30/31 January 2017*: Preparation (structuring assignment in accordance with an evaluation matrix; drafting interview questionnaire; preparing project-specific project fiches) of the in-country work and desk review, to the extent possible, of the documents provided by UNDP CO.

*1 February to 9 February 2017*: In-country work Ukraine (see final schedule in Annex III).

*10 February to 28 February 2017* (6 working days within this period): Drafting of final evaluation report, submission to UNDP CO UA for feedback and comments.

*8 March 2017*: Finalisation of final report and submission to UNDP CO UA.

## Structure of the report

The report follows the standard, tried-and-tested structure of evaluation reports, and where the information and analysis is organised primarily around the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact.

# Findings

## Relevance

### Relevance of the portfolio

With the exception of the early recovery projects that have been included in this assessment, the underpinning theory of change characterising the other 9 projects is the rationale of economic development/growth, including through job creating at micro- and small enterprise levels and subsistence or small intensity agricultural activity as a precondition for poverty reduction on the one hand, and the need for the protection of those in society that are not or are less able to participate in economic activities and that deserve the state’s protection. This theory of change remains sound in principle.

While overall, the portfolio of projects has been aligned with UNDAF and UNDP CPD country programme documents and objectives, as well as specific strategic documents at country level within the UN family,[[4]](#footnote-4) there has been a clear bifurcation of the portfolio within the CPD period, and which is a result of the Maidan revolution of 2013 and 2014; the annexation of Crimea; and the war incited by the Russian Federation in the East of Ukraine.

As a direct result of the Maidan revolution, and which saw a pro-European, reform-minded government into power, the context of cooperation became more favourable. In 2012/2013, amidst a general stagnation of relations between the international community and the Ukrainian government, only modest progress could be expected, and parts of the portfolio reflect this. For example, the **Aid for Trade** project is a clear reflection of the type of project that was possible at the time, but probably is a project that would not considered to be relevant under the current circumstances. The revolution also strengthened and consolidated civil society and its voice in shaping Ukrainian policies and legislation in a variety of sectors, and thus, there was, at the 2014 junction, a considerable new potential to advance reforms including on issues championed by UNDP in the economic growth, poverty reduction, and social development cluster. This concerned aspects of existing projects, for example cooperation with civil society groups on HIV/AIDS response, or on universal design for persons with disabilities. The **Social Sector Services Reform Project** was able to respond to an emerging need, at the time, for solutions to social service delivery in the process of decentralisation—arguably one of the major, fundamental reforms underway in Ukraine at present.

A further shift presented itself with the illegal annexation of Crimea by the Russian Federation in early 2014, and where UNDP ceased all its ongoing activities in the Autonomous Region.

The war in Eastern Ukraine has had a considerable impact on the focus of the work of the UN agencies’ in Ukraine, including on UNDP. Faced with a violent conflict resulting in a humanitarian crisis, including considerable numbers of internally displaced persons (IDPs), donors channelled substantial amounts of funds to help the humanitarian and early recovery effort through UNDP. In 2016, UNDP’s budget had exceeded its initially foreseen needs by three times.[[5]](#footnote-5) While it is obvious that the situation demanded immediate responses, this appears to have come at the expense of a clear, pronounced focus on poverty reduction outside of the areas afflicted by the war, and some of the subjects addressed by the portfolio in the earlier CPD period (2012/2013). While the concentration of efforts on the early recovery effort in Eastern Ukraine is not in contradiction with the poverty reduction outcome *per se*, UNDP can strengthen its approach on how it addresses the more structural and systemic problems underpinning poverty and social inequality. These underpinning problems have to be seen as also having contributed to the current situation in the East, and which deserve a continued, medium- to-long term effort and dialogue with the government of Ukraine, and which UNDP is well placed to be engaged in.[[6]](#footnote-6)

The turning towards increased activities in the early recovery effort, then, seems to have come at the expense of a loss of focus of those other areas that were served by projects in the earlier part of the portfolio. At the same time, the need for engagement in those areas remains, although some progress has been made (see section on Effectiveness, but also cross-compare with other evaluations, including the UNPF 2012-2017 Forward-Looking Evaluation and Comparative Advantage Analysis of February 2016). UNDP might want to consider how, in a future strategic positioning, it regains this focus. In the current portfolio, work with the government on key policies informing SME development might need to be further strengthened to complement the more short-term efforts on economic reform in the context of the early recovery effort in Eastern Ukraine. And there is considerable scope for picking up social sector reform issues and topics, at the level of the central government and UNDP’s dialogue with institutions, including disability rights, youth policy, etc.

The portfolio of projects is relevant with regards to UNDP cross-cutting priorities, i.e. gender equality and vulnerable group issues, although there is some scope to further strengthen these aspects in a future programme, both at project level as well as issues championed by UNDP within the wider donor and development partner community. In the projects on the early recovery side of the portfolio, disability and vulnerable groups issues have been consistently part of the approach to rehabilitation of physical infrastructure as well as in the economic development outputs. Further work is needed to strengthen in particular the gender aspects of the portfolio in dialogue with the government.

### Relevance of indicators; Monitoring and Evaluation Systems

While there have been seismic shifts in the context in which the UNDP operates as a result of the Revolution of Dignity (Maidan) in 2013/2014 and the war in Eastern Ukraine from 2014 onwards, the CPD has remained unchanged. The evaluation is thus assessing the achievements of Outcomes against a number of indicators that should (albeit with exceptions), in their existing form, have been reviewed against the background of the fallout from the events in 2013/2014, in particular where this concerned some of the economic indicators (real income growth) in the context of a severe economic crisis, to name but one example. The indicators for CPD 15 and 16 are thus considered relevant only to a limited extent.

Overall, the evaluation finds that even at the beginning of the CPD period, i.e. in 2012, the relevance of some of the indicators to measure the achievement of the outcomes, has been weak, and the theory of change between indicators and outcomes is in a number of cases no longer obvious in retrospect. For example, with regards to CPD 15, there is a specific emphasis on reduction of rural poverty, and it is no longer entirely clear what informed this emphasis, given that none of the projects in the original portfolio had a specific focus on rural areas (with the exception of the CBA project, but which saw itself somewhat outside of the poverty reduction portfolio in the first place). The third indicator under CPD 15 aimed to measure the increase, in percent, of households’ real income growth in targeted localities of selected regions of Ukraine by 2017, but it is not clear which locations this was to cover, and to what extent the indicator should have been adjusted to reflect the economic crisis following the political events in 2014, and which led to a dramatic decrease in real household income.

Baselines at CPD level appear to have been introduced in retrospect (2014). One of the indicators, “% of small and micro enterprises in total volume of trade”, has surpassed the target, set in 2014, of an increase by 24% by 2017. However, it is highly disputable how any of the projects in the portfolio can be directly linked to that development, i.e. to what extent there is any evidence to suggest that UNDP has made a contribution that would justify for the organisation to report an overachievement of this indicator. On CPD 16, similar issues emerge. “Improved public perception of quality and accessibility of public service provision” is one of the indicators to measure progress towards CPD 16, yet, there is no evidence chain that convincingly correlates the progress made between 2015 and 2016 to any UNDP intervention or project. The need to improve the setting of objectives as well as indicators has been well understood by the UNDP CO UA, and efforts are underway to strengthen this aspect of UNDP’s operations.

A dedicated Monitoring and Evaluation System has been introduced in 2015, including reporting against a Results-Oriented Annual Report (ROAR) format, and which is being rolled out at the level of the organisation at present. By the end of 2017, UNDP anticipates that all projects have taken a results-based focus to monitoring results. What would also seem to be important to mainstream is the awareness of individual project management staff that they are part of a bigger whole, rather than in charge of their respective projects. Stakeholder interviews suggest that projects have rarely remembered their relation to CPD outcomes and indicators, and reporting against these has not been a requirement in the past. A case in point is the CBA project, which has generated, across its lifetime (it is currently in its third phase), a considerable amount of data across a huge variety of parameters. The project has, however, not been systematically collecting data relating to poverty reduction – something that it could have done, but was never requested to do.

At the level of projects, the new M&E system should ensure that future efforts consistently establish baselines, including on the size of target groups, and that justify the type of interventions proposed. This has been a key weakness across almost all projects in the evaluated portfolio – it is impossible to know what percentage of the relevant target audience has been reached by efforts, because the size of the target groups is not known.

### Relevance of Partnerships

Across the portfolio, partnerships with the respective Ukrainian institutions at government as well as at civil society level have been relevant. With regards to value-added as an aspect of relevance, stakeholders were able to identify UNDP with being the international organisation that works at the grass-roots, local level; and which champions vulnerable persons issues on aspects that are less, or not at all, supported by other development partners (specifically disabled persons).

Partners have also highlighted UNDP’s value-added as an organisation with long-term presence with a clear appreciation of the non-project based expert advice support to the government, examples here include the work UNDP has done with the Ministry for Youth and Sports (and its predecessor institution), as well as the Ministry for Economic Development and Trade, and the National Assembly for Disabled Persons of Ukraine. Institutions including the Ministry for Social Policy have highlighted the relevance of UNDP to offer much needed advice on short notice, and the organisation’s response to the need for psychological counselling of trauma victims in the aftermath of the outbreak of the war in the East has been a specifically appreciated response (and which also paved the way for efforts of other donors and organisations).

There has been other evidence that this type of support has been crucial for institutions to identify policy and legislative gaps and which then formed the basis for targeted work with bi-lateral donors (for example the Ministry of Youth and Sports). Given that many of the UNDP staff interviewed in the course of the evaluation seem to be unsure, and somewhat daunted about what the role of their organisation is against the background of donors with considerably bigger financial support envelopes, this should serve as some indication on where UNDP’s effort is pivotal to partners in government, and that should be built upon in the future.

UNDP has well established relations to relevant stakeholders in the government. A number of previous partnerships might need to be revived and nurtured/strengthened. This concerns, in particular, the work on economic development policies, and where avenues need to be found to re-establish UNDP’s voice at the level of the central government. Other partnerships appear to be sound, and the history of long-standing collaboration with some of the institutions (for example the Ministry of Social Affairs; the Ministry for Youth and Sports) should provide a range of convincing arguments for fundraising in the donor community.

## Effectiveness

In accordance with the ToR, the task at hand was to appreciate the portfolio’s results against the indicators and CPD 15 and 16. Given the above established lack of review of the CPD indicators, there is limited use in dissecting, in great detail, the problems associated with these. It was considered more productive to map the results from the portfolio and how these have contributed to the two outcomes, and this approach was agreed with the UNDP CO at the beginning of the in-country work.

The task is considerably complicated by the overall lack of results-based reporting, in particular among the projects in the earlier stages of the CPD period. Reports have often focused on activities and outputs, and there is a lack of baselines to provide context to the scale of activities and their reach/coverage. Other projects, such as the CBA and the BMO, have managed to create project information systems that generate sophisticated performance data at project level, but none that would necessarily relate the projects to the CPD level outcomes or indicators.

The following section considers the results of the portfolio of reviewed projects against CPD 15 and 16.

### Outcome area 15: Reduction of poverty in rural areas through socio-economic development activities

#### Contribution to informing the policy debate

Stakeholders representing the Ministry of Economic Development and Trade (MEDT) at the time of the project highlighted that the **Aid for Trade** project made a **contribution to shaping the policy debate** in connection with Ukraine’s preparation for Ukraine’s signing of the Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreement with the European Union in 2012/2013. The MEDT in particular highlighted the usefulness of the project’s facilitating that the voice of the private sector be heard by the government, as well as disseminating information on the implications of the DCFTA to businesses, through reaching out to business associations and interest groups. Stakeholders have also identified this as a key need that continues to deserve attention in the future, i.e. to bring the voice of business to support the government’s **evidence-based policy-making**, and ultimately, to shape the government’s attitude towards business and its pivotal role in the functioning of the country. (Source: stakeholder interviews; project documents)

#### Capacity-building of governmental and private sector stakeholders

An ongoing project, aiming at **Strengthening SME membership organisations**, has expanded this work with organisations representing businesses to become a voice that is heard by the government, and stakeholders from the Ukrainian government as well as business associations have confirmed the relevance of this vector of work/target group. The project takes a two-pronged approach, with an emphasis on working with business associations, while in parallel, work is being conducted with government stakeholders, too. A recent mid-term evaluation of the project has found that as a result of the project, membership in the participating 7 BMOs has increased by, on average, 11.5%. The increase in paid membership has led to a budget increase in the BMOs by, on average, 15%, and additional income is generated by the provision of support services to members. A dedicated strand of activities specifically targets women entrepreneurs. The evaluation found that participating BMOs had filed 20 proposals on issues of relevance to SME’s at the level of local, regional, and central government, with 7 of these proposals having been taken forward at the respective level.

Echoing stakeholder views from the Prime Minister’s office (see above), the evaluation confirmed that the government’s capacities to work with SME’s continued to be limited (including the attitude of government vis-à-vis the private sector), and that this was an ongoing area of concern.[[7]](#footnote-7) Projects in the early recovery part of the portfolio of reviewed projects, too, are working with training of local governments to improve their attitudes towards businesses. While useful as a short-term measure, it is clear that issues exist on a systemic level and this would call for a holistic approach to be taken by UNDP, i.e. continuing its work at the grassroots level on the one hand, while working with the government on high-level advice to the Ministry of Economic Development and Trade, on the other hand.

The evaluator has not been able to independently corroborate results of the project on **Improving local capacities to promote and sustain entrepreneurship and SME development in Chernobyl-affected territories by transferring best practices and experience of using smart instruments for boosting business**, primarily as the evaluation did not foresee visits to project locations. The project set up information points in three selected locations for small and medium-size enterprises to receive business support advice, and it provided business associations with best practices and expertise to conduct advocacy and to promote entrepreneurship at the local and regional levels. Although they were not monitoring the medium-to long-term results of the project, stakeholders interviewed for the evaluations were confident that the information points were still in operation after the project had closed, and that the capacities built in the SME and micro-business community to conduct advocacy work had been retained.

The current third phase of the **Community-Based Approach to Local Development** (CBA) has the most explicit reference to the CPD 15 outcome objectives of reduction of rural poverty through socio-economic development activities, through the promotion of farm and non-farm small business development. The project covers half of the regions of Ukraine (i.e. 12), and participating communities were chosen, inter alia, in relation to their levels of poverty and rural unemployment. A key direction of the activities has been the promotion of the establishment of non-profit agricultural cooperatives, and these have been or are being provided with capacity development skills (including training on business plan developments; marketing and sales etc.). In the framework of the project, cooperatives then receive micro-grants for the implementation of jointly agreed upon priorities in accordance with the cooperatives area of specialisation. For example, cooperatives can use the micro-grants to purchase new technologies/equipment in the areas of milk and fruit processing or fuel briquettes. The most recent, 2016 third quarterly report of the CBA III estimates that 4975 individuals will benefit directly or indirectly from the current round of micro-grants.[[8]](#footnote-8)

#### Provision of employment opportunities and skills training to people and institutions affected by conflict

Three projects in UNDP’s Recovery and Peacebuilding portfolio were part of the outcome evaluation, in particular those that contained significant components on economic development and income generation. For the outcomes under CPD 15, evaluating in particular the medium- to long-term results of these interventions, which fall into early recovery efforts and where UNDP Ukraine has not traditionally been involved in, is going beyond what this outcome evaluation can deliver. Besides, a parallel exercise looking at the lessons learned from UNDP’s engagement in early recovery efforts in the context of Ukraine was conducted at the time of the outcome evaluation. More importantly, UNDP is currently establishing a system through which it attempts to capture, ex-post, the impact its training and capacity building activities had on the affected target groups and communities; the results of these surveys were not, yet, available at the time of the evaluation.

Projects on the early recovery side have consistently sought to capture quantitative data as part of the project monitoring and reporting. However, as with other projects part of the outcome evaluation, contextualisation is a key issue to assess results. While the figures in the different project reports are impressive, it is difficult to come to conclusions per se as to their relation to the overall size and needs of the target population, as well as how the projects inscribed themselves in the overall donor effort in the region. What is particularly difficult to assess as part of this evaluation is whether the projects have been able to address structural issues underpinning medium- to long-term improvement of the business environment. For example, the project **Social and Economic Recovery in the Donbass** reports having supported the training of 1338 individuals in business development skills, and 164 local authorities received training on business friendly practices, among other data. Given the length of the interventions (12 to 18 months), by necessity, these have been short-term efforts, and while certainly useful in the short-term, there should be critical reflection on why these interventions should have achieved so much in a relatively short period of time when other, more long-term, strategic efforts find that progress is considerably harder to achieve (see for example the findings of the medium-term evaluation of the project in support of Business Membership Organisations funded by SECO). However, the evaluator understands that UNDP UA is actively reflecting on how to create a more stringent link between the measures in the early recovery effort and addressing more structural issues related to economic growth.

### CPD 16: Improved Access to and utilisation of quality health, education and social services

#### Legislative Reform

A range of projects have contributed to legislative reform, in particular in areas affecting the most vulnerable groups in society. Over its four and a half year’s implementation period, the project **Support for Social Sector Service Reform** (SSSR), contributed to the 67 pieces of draft legislation, of which 12 have been adopted by the government since the project’s closure. These include, *inter alia*, important amendments to the Law on Social Services [follow-up]. The project on **Strengthening National Capacities for Effective Youth Development** **and HIV/AIDS Response in Ukraine** has significantly contributed, through a gap analysis of Ukrainian legislation’s compliance with the requirements set out in the EU-Ukraine Association Agreement in the area of youth, and specifically on issues relating to non-formal education; health; volunteering and active citizenship. This gap analysis, which is also used as a point of reference of efforts of other actors in the international community (such as the Council of Europe)[[9]](#footnote-9) then informed the draft Ukrainian Law on Youth. The same project’s outcome area on HIV/AIDS response reports to having supported, through partnerships with LGBT rights’ organisations, the removal from the Criminal Code of article 130 which previously made the transmission of HIV a criminal offense. The project also supported LGBT organisations in successfully advocating for the inclusion, in late 2015, of sexual orientation and gender identity as protected grounds in the anti-discrimination section of the Labour Code of Ukraine.[[10]](#footnote-10)

#### Policy reforms

Projects across the portfolio have supported important policy reforms, again with a contribution identifiable in areas with a potential impact on poverty reduction and benefits for vulnerable groups in particular. The project **Accelerating MDGs in Ukraine** (from 2012 to 2016), continued efforts dating back to the early 2000s, establishing the UN’s Millennium Development Goals as a framework for development issues over the medium and long-term, with 33 key national development indicators being monitored regularly over a period of 15 years. As a result of this process, targets formulated as part of the monitoring process have informed the shaping of state goals, strategic documents, programmes, and legislation. Examples include the influence on the recent [Poverty Reduction Strategy of Ukraine](http://zakon2.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/161-2016-р), and which, according to stakeholders interviewed, includes clearer than in previous similar policy documents, the category of “rural poor”, as well as the State Programme on HIV/AIDS. Apart from positioning areas of key importance for poverty reduction as policy priorities for successive governments (at least nominally), another key contribution of the project was to raise the understanding in the main partner institution (the Ministry of Economic Development and Trade) as well as the line ministries about the need for a monitoring and evaluation framework to advance evidence-based policy-making. Stakeholders from the MEDT have convincingly pointed out that they would be looking at UNDP for future assistance in this area, and in particular to advance the government’s understanding on indicators to capture progress towards the fulfilment of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) (see also recommendations).

Other projects, too, have made significant contributions to informing evidence-based reform efforts. The project **Social Sector Service Reform** contributed, at standard-setting level, to efforts in the areas of social services delivery; the pension system; employment policy; poverty reduction policy (including providing inputs into the Poverty Reduction Strategy of Ukraine); and reform in the social sector. The project’s most significant achievements concern the area of social services delivery, and where the project provided expertise and high-level advice resulting in a package of standards and recommendations on social services planning based on needs assessments at the community level; the advancement of new models of social service delivery through commissioning of specialised social service providers outside of the state system and which includes the establishment of quality standards for this type of service delivery model. The standards developed with the help of the project have been adopted by the government, and their focus on the community level is significant not least in the context of the ongoing decentralisation reform in Ukraine, and where communities will have increased responsibilities for the delivery of social services to their citizens. Stakeholders from the partner institution in the government, the Ministry of Social Policy, have corroborated the significance of the contribution by the UNDP project. However, they also highlighted that the capacity for implementation at the local level is very low—this could constitute a potential future direction of cooperation between UNDP and the Ministry. The programme **Promoting Mainstream Policies and Services for People with Disabilities in Ukraine**, too, contributed to standard-setting specifically in the area of information on social services for persons with disabilities.

The project on **Strengthening National Capacities for Effective Youth Development** **and HIV/AIDS Response in Ukraine** has contributed to the development of the State Programme on Youth of Ukraine (2016-2020), which was significantly informed by a preceding (2015) [Survey on Youth](http://www.un.org.ua/en/publications-and-reports/un-in-ukraine-publications/3687-youth-survey-2015) (“Youth in Ukraine”), and which incorporates a number of specific outputs that were developed in the framework of the project, including two interactive internet platforms on career advice (MyCareer) for young people and on promotion of a healthy lifestyle through sports ([Sportify](http://sportify.org.ua/sections/list/city=7;st=0;page=47;status=1;sort_by=by_name;name=;metro_id=;metro_radius=5;address=;lat=;lon=)). Partners in the Ministry for Youth and Sports have confirmed that they continue to use the information from the research to inform policy-making.

The final report of the programme **Promoting Mainstream Policies and Services for People with Disabilities in Ukraine** reports that through its work it contributed to disability issues have been mainstreamed into several laws, as well as finding its way into the 2015 National Strategy on Human Rights of Ukraine.

#### Capacity building

In terms of **building** **institutional capacities** in partner institutions, the evaluator has been able to corroborate a number of results as part of CPD 16 as follows:

While almost all projects have had considerable **training** **as part of capacity-building** components, the above mentioned lack of baseline indicators has made an assessment of the results achieved in many cases more challenging. Projects’ final reports provide numbers of participants in trainings – but these numbers do not speak in and of their own, unless context is provided. For example, the project **Support for Social Sector Service Reform** reports having trained 1,576 social workers across Ukraine in new quality standards on social care provision as well as on relevant aspects of the overall reform of social services. Without knowing the overall number of social workers that are the potential target for this type of events, it is difficult to appreciate the contribution this training has made overall on training in the sector. Training was also provided through the **Strengthening National Capacities for Effective Youth Development and HIV/AIDS response** in Ukraine project, which, *inter alia*, trained 236 youth workers[[11]](#footnote-11) and which has been appreciated by UNDP’s partners in the Ministry for Sports and Youth Policy. There are two issues here. One is that the target institutions UNDP is cooperating with do not, yet, seem to have this type of data—thereby also pointing to an area for potential future assistance, i.e. the collection of statistics in partner institutions. Second, UNDP projects in general appear to not take this perspective in the first place, i.e., to identify the size of the potential target group and then to shape the approach to capacity building accordingly, for example by taking a train-the-trainers approach in order to make a meaningful contribution.

By partnering with an organisation representing rights holders, the programme **Promoting Mainstream Policies and Services for People with Disabilities in Ukraine** has contributed to strengthening its main partner’s—the Ukrainian National Assembly of Persons with Disabilities—capacity to advocate and raise awareness for disability rights at local, regional and national levels. Indirectly, capacities built in the project are being taken forward as the chairman of the National Assembly of Persons with Disabilities (who has also been trained by the programme) has, in 2015, been appointed to the office of the Ombudsperson of Ukraine. Trying to trace the results of the Assembly’s advocacy efforts on the creation of an Ombudsman for the Rights of People with Disabilities, the evaluator has not been fully able to track this appointment, or the success of the establishment of a dedicated Ombudsman, possibly due to the difficulties of navigating the Ombudsperson’s current website. With regards to capacity building at the local level (the programme worked in two pilot regions), the evaluator has not been able to conduct interviews with partners at that level to independently corroborate results reported in the final programme report. What bears specifically to be drawn out is that the programme adopted an approach that would seem very suited to the specific context of Ukraine, as well as the country’s level of advancement on disability rights.

Awareness raising efforts – a key objective of the project – emphasised the concept of universal access and specifically targeted the private sector as well as promoting incentives for architects bidding for public building contracts to include accessibility issues as well. Numerous stakeholders have pointed out that the issue of access to public spaces will be a key challenge in the coming years as the war in the East will see a considerable number of persons with mobility issues return to their home communities. The Ukrainian authorities will have to address this issue systematically, not least as demobilised soldiers and their families are a not insignificant and possibly very vocal segment of the electorate (see for example post-conflict context such as Bosnia and Herzegovina). This clearly presents a window of opportunity for UNDP to advance this topic with the government.

The evaluator has not been able to individually ascertain the results of the capacity building efforts in the social sector areas in the Peacebuilding and Recovery portfolio. The physical rehabilitation of crucial social care centers in the regions and the importance of these efforts is not in question. However, as discussed above, it is difficult to assess the results of the capacity building measures in the medium and long-term. What should be a particular area of reflection is the fact that projects report on having built the capacity of social services on, for example, needs assessment issues for the vulnerable (for example in the **Early Recovery of Social Services and Peacebuilding in Donetsk and Lugansk Oblasts**) through very short-term interventions while other, considerably more long-term efforts across the evaluated portfolio find that capacity building is an uphill process, and where progress is incremental, and cooperation needs to be sustained over a long time.

### Synergies between projects

The evaluator has been able to establish a number of synergies between projects. The programme **Promoting Mainstream Policies and Services for People with Disabilities in Ukraine** has provided an input into one of the normative documents also supported by the **Support to Social Sector Reform** project which concerns the way in which the public is being informed about social services (accessibility of information for persons with impaired eyesight etc.). Both projects also cooperated at the output level (awareness-raising activities on Universal Design issues).

Synergies have also been achieved between the Promoting Mainstream Policies and Services for People with Disabilities project and recovery-related projects. Specifically, the infrastructure work done in the context of these projects—a significant overall part of the interventions—was carried out consistently taking universal design standards into account by partnering with the National Assembly for Disabled Persons of Ukraine, who assessed all work prior to being undertaken for its incorporation of accessibility aspects.

Other examples include the work on psycho-social counselling (establishment of first response resources for practitioners), which was an ad hoc response to a request by the Ministry for Social Policy and which was provided by the SSSR project, and was then taken over by the early recovery portfolio.

In other cases, there would seem to have been unrealised opportunities to explore synergies. This is in particular the case with regards to the SSSR project and its outputs and the CBA project, and where, for example, economies of scale could have been found in testing the newly developed standards in locations where CBA had an established presence.

### Cross-cutting issues

There is good evidence that projects have adopted a Human Rights-Based Approach (HRBA) to programming wherever possible. The CBA project is in and by itself a HRBA project, while the early recovery projects have consistently sought the cooperation of the authorities in the affected regions to identify needs and to craft responses to those.

Mainstreaming of concerns of vulnerable groups has mainly been sound, as evidenced, for example, by the early recovery projects and which took up the universal design issue in the physical rehabilitation efforts of social infrastructure projects. Evaluated projects has also consistently worked with IDPs, and within that group, have put emphases on the most vulnerable (children, elderly, persons with disabilities). The earlier parts of the portfolio under CPD 16 has been solely concerned with vulnerable groups—youth; people living with HIV/AIDS; disabled persons etc.

Gender, too, is a mainstreamed consideration. Evidence includes the specific activity strand for women entrepreneurs in the BMO project. Gender is, however, also an issue where progress overall has been slow at the level of policy-making. At the level of achievements of MDGs, Ukraine has not made any progress on the level of political participation of women. As noted in the 2016 UNPF Forward-Looking Evaluation, attitudes towards gender issues have proven difficult to overcome, this was evidenced by stakeholder interviews with partners that had been directly involved in the work on monitoring MDGs and where there was surprisingly little understanding as to the need for gender as an indicator.

## Efficiency

As highlighted above, efficiency was not to be included as a criterion of analyses for this outcome evaluation. However, a look at the evolution of the financial resources of UNDP from 2012 to today makes it evidently clear that a) the majority of the earlier projects (with the exception of the CBA project) operated with very modest financial amounts and b) that the influx of bi-lateral funding from donors in response to the war in Eastern Ukraine has caused a paradigm shift in the scale of funding available to UNDP. This should not take away from the fact that some of the earlier projects in the portfolio have had considerable results for the very modest amounts available to them. As highlighted above, partners have valued the high-level expertise provided by UNDP on key issues, and the fact that the organisation was able to offer this on a long-term basis. Also discussed above is the observation that UNDP staff often seems daunted by the scale of other donors’ financial envelopes. However, it might be useful to keep in mind what UNDP is valued for in its partner institutions, and how this could be better turned into a strategic advantage and inform future programming.

## Sustainability

Sustainability is one of the key concerns with regards to the results identified. This particularly concerns the earlier (2012/2013) portfolio of projects that focused on social sector service reform; and mainstreaming disability issues; as well as public awareness about HIV/AIDS. In terms of their size, these have been projects with a relatively modest financial envelope, and which have worked strategically at the level of governmental institutions on the legal and normative bases as well as on the development of quality standards in social service delivery.

However, considerably further attention is needed to ensure the implementation of legislation as well as the quality norms developed through the SSSR project. This is becoming a particular imperative in relation with the ongoing decentralisation process in Ukraine, and where service delivery has become a responsibility of local governments. The needs in this area are vast, and future programming should take the standards as well as other outputs (including the methodology for needs assessments at local level; social planning etc.) developed through the SSSR as a starting point and help build the capacity of the governments at regional and local levels to implement these.

Sustainability is ensured of other results in the areas of standard-setting and legislation, for example with regards to the legislation on youth and youth-related state policies. There is ample scope now to assist the Ministry of Youth and Sports to implement some of the new provision, for example on training of youth workers. There is also scope to further explore how other important aspects of this engagement with the Ministry for Youth and Sports can be taken further, and what strategic advice UNDP can provide to its partner on issues for example as healthy lifestyle.

Continued attention is also needed with regards to disability issues. While progress has been made on raising awareness of disability issues among national decision-makers, there is considerable scope to work further on this issue, in particular as disability will be an ongoing concern in a not insignificant part of the Ukrainian population in the generations to come, i.e. this would seem an opportune moment to further this agenda, both pointing to obligations of Ukraine under the UN Convention as well as to the increasing relevance of the topic domestically and which might provide a good leverage for reform. Disability issues have been mainstreamed successfully into the projects in the reviewed portfolio. What is now necessary is to anchor the issue better as a cross-cutting concern within the international community. UNDP has a clear role to play here, and should reconsider its role as the champion for the most vulnerable.

With regards to capacity built around strategic planning (in particular through the project on MDG acceleration), this is a bit more difficult to assess. UNDP has partnered both with the Ministry for Economic Trade and Development, and which has been the coordinating institution inside the Ukrainian government for MDG monitoring; the Ministry is now in charge of SDG monitoring. However, a major part of the actual compilation of the regular MDG reports was done by one UNDPs partner, a Ukrainian think tank/NGO. It is uncertain whether the MEDT has over the years built up sufficient capacity to compile these reports independently; this is to a considerable extent a function of the high fluctuation of staff inside line ministries and which poses specific challenges to capacity building, including in this specific project. There is, however, some evidence from stakeholder interviews to suggest that the need for evidence-based policy making is one of the key learning results from this project, and that the MEDT is keen to cooperate to strengthen this aspect of its work further.

# Conclusions

The evaluation identified a number of problems relating to the way in which the 2012-2017 CPD’s outcomes and related indicators were set, and the lack of systematic tracking of those indicators over the CPD period. Projects contributing to CPD 15 and 16 were contributing to the achievement of these outcomes, but adopted somewhat of a silo approach, and where there was not always a sense of the bigger picture at outcome level.

Notwithstanding this, all projects in the portfolio were relevant to the outcomes, and there have been considerable results as part of most of the projects. These concern key contributions to standard-setting; legislative reform; policy-making; capacity development; and awareness raising on issues important to vulnerable groups in Ukrainian society.

There are numerous issues that need to be reassessed for a future CPD period and that go beyond the current evaluation. This includes UNDP’s future as an actor in the early recovery effort, and where there seems to have been a degree of opportunism presented by the massive influx of donor funding in response to the war inflicted by the Russian Federation on Eastern Ukraine. While this is understandable, to a degree, there is also value in reflecting on whether there is merit in clearer reinvigorating the role of UNDP on core areas of concern at strategic level: moving forward the dialogue with the government on issues that affect marginalised, discriminated and vulnerable communities in Ukraine.

# Lessons Learned

The strength of UNDP in Ukraine as perceived by its main stakeholders in the governmental institution is its continuous in-country presence, and what is perceived to be a non-project driven approach to support that makes UNDP stand out from other development partners and donors. This seems in many ways a niche that UNDP occupies, and on which it should build further in future interventions.

Relating to this, stakeholders particularly value the ability of UNDP to provide, on a low key basis (in the sense of modest amounts of funding involved) assistance in structured, strategic thinking about the scope and direction of future reforms. Where UNDP has provided assistance in gap analyses (for example of existing legislation and its alignment with international standards and obligation, inter alia from Ukraine’s membership in the Council of Europe or stemming from the Association Agreement with the European Union), UNDP has been highly strategic with limited resources, and has paved the way for the government institutions to conduct dialogues with donors that have more substantial financial strength.

UNDP has found ways to advance difficult topics through embedding these into more mainstream efforts. This concerns in particular the universal access project, which was not specifically aimed at disabled people, but which managed to incorporate the issue into a wider public interest debate. The project also managed to create an incentive scheme for the private sector to take access to public buildings forward as part of a self-certification process.

# Recommendations

As UNDP is moving to its next CPD, a number of recommendations emerge from the evaluation with regards to poverty reduction specifically. These apply irrespective of where, eventually, the poverty reduction theme is going to be “located” within the CPD thematic pillars.

## Strategic level

**Centrality of poverty reduction and social cohesion for UNDP**. Poverty reduction and social cohesion remain at the core of UNDP’s mandate (“No one left behind” as the overarching principle of the Sustainable Development Goals: SDG 1 “No Poverty”), and all interventions across pillars will have to anchor their justification in their contribution to this goal. From this mandate flow the focus on economic development on the one hand, and the protection of those groups in society that are less able to fend for themselves on the other hand. A number of projects (in the recovery cluster; CBA) work with vulnerable groups through their interventions on the ground. However, there is a need to re-energise UNDP’s work at the central level of government on social sector service reform and to pick up and build on the results made in earlier stages of the CPD. With regards to economic development, UNDP’s current donors want to see a more coherent link between economic development and poverty reduction, i.e. it is in UNDP’s interest to re-define this approach in terms of potential funding opportunities. While some aspects of the work on the economic development side in the recovery part of the portfolio are worthwhile to be taken further across areas in Ukraine, other aspects, such as the provision of short-term grants to a considerable number of individiuals, do not lend themselves to replication and thus, do not offer model value for UNDP beyond the Eastern region; this concerns in particular the micro-grants that are part of a number of projects.

**UNDP should play a greater role as the champion for vulnerable and marginalised groups in Ukraine**. This should not only be reflected in the programming/project choices – UNDP has a role to play to promote the mainstreaming of vulnerable groups issues into the awareness and practice of the wider development partner community in Ukraine. Choices have been laid out in a paper at the closure of the “Mainstreaming Disabilities” project. This area, too, represents an opportunity for funding, as disability rights will, for example, be a key priority of DfID in its next programming period. More importantly, it would seem that there is potential for considerable traction on this issue as a result of the war in Eastern Ukraine and where aspects such as universal access to public spaces will remain a challenge that the country will have to deal with for years to come.

**UNDP has a role to play that is rationalised by partners, but should be clearer among UNDP staff.** Staff often appears to be awed by the amount of donors and their funding, and which appears to result in somewhat of a paralysis on thinking of where it adds value to moving the development agenda ahead in Ukraine. Partners in the government have particularly highlighted UNDP’s non-project driven and –based support to their work over the years. This is a useful model to reignite and the funding required for this is often modest, in particular where it comes to joint thinking with government institutions, and conducting gap analyses that then pave the way for institutions’ dialogue with the bigger donors. On a number of issues (gender; marginalised groups; the disabled; youth), there is no monopoly of any one organisation; on the contrary, pressure coming from more than one partner (such as the Council of Europe and which, too, is a standard-setting body) can actually be useful.

**Where projects deal with support to the elaboration of legislation, strategies, policies and standards, greater emphasis needs to be paid to cost the implementation of these**. At present, none of the results on the normative and standard-setting side have included a costing of the reforms suggested. This, however, would be an important aspect to support evidence-based policy making at the level of the Ukrainian government institutions, something that stakeholders have identified a considerable need in, and where UNDP can add value.

**Projects should adopt a medium-to long-term perspective, but do not always need big amounts of money**. A number of projects in the portfolio have had considerable results for what would seem very modest amounts of funding. On key issues, it would seem to be more important to have a consistent, long-term engagement with the government counterparts rather than a plethora of activities that lack follow-up.

**Outside of the recovery context, the approach to economic development will have to take a more strategic approach**, to focus on interventions with a systemic character. This imperative is, *inter alia*, dictated by the considerable amounts of funding available in the donor community for private sector development, and where UNDP will have to identify its specific niche – its established relationship with the Employment Agency seems to be such a niche which should be further developed, as is the work with private sector interest groups/associations, including those operating in Eastern Ukraine.

There is some tension between UNDP as small organisation and the size of Ukraine, as well as the priorities now coming from decentralisation process and where needs will be immense for the foreseeable future. These tensions are further fed by the very considerable amount of funding provided by some of the donors in Ukraine, in particular the European Union and USAID. **UNDP’s niche and role is as the champion of vulnerable groups, and it should bring this voice to bear in the process.**

## Operational level

**Quality of CPD indicators and tracking of results**. The theory of change underpinning CPD outcomes and the indicators used to measure these needs to be strengthened. Projects in the portfolio need to collect data not only at the level of the individual intervention, but also to feed into the CPD outcome areas. Provisions should be made so that results are being monitored even after projects’ closure.

**Synergies between projects should be better explored and exploited**. UNDP currently has a considerable presence on the ground through its CBA project. It should be explored how other ongoing efforts can tap into CBAs considerable, well-established local presence, for example with regards to social sector service reform at the level of newly amalgamated communities in the context of the ongoing process of decentralisation and where the needs for capacity building are considerable.

**Re-examine the approach to capacity building at central level and build this into project design**. As highlighted above, a number of longer-term interventions have had good results, but have also substituted lacking governmental capacity, while building up specialised capacity inside non-governmental organisations. Future interventions should reflect clearer on how to deal with capacity-building challenges in official partner institutions.

**Training needs to be more strategic**. While trainings have been highlighted as particularly positive by stakeholders, they have reached but a small fraction of the potential target groups in the institutions. In order to have an impact, projects need to first establish the size of the target groups that would benefit from training, and then design the training formats accordingly. In a country the size of Ukraine, this will probably in many cases have to take the form of training-of-trainers.
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1. **Introduction**

In line with the Evaluation Plan of UNDP in Ukraine, an outcome evaluation will be conducted to assess the impact of UNDP’s development assistance in the area of poverty reduction implemented under Country Programme Document 2012-2016 (which was extended until the end of 2017, in the framework of UNDP’s Executive Board session of January 2016).

1. **Background**

*Country context*

Ukraine is now in its fourth year of conflict. In the spring of 2014, conflict erupted in the eastern oblasts of Donetsk and Luhansk (collectively known as the Donbas), where pro-Russian separatists took control over the eastern parts of both oblasts. Despite the existence of a peace agreement (the Minsk Protocol of September 2014) and the renewal of its cease-fire provisions in February 2015, the likely outcome of this conflict remains uncertain. Recent estimates indicate that the crisis has displaced over 1.5 million people (internally and refugees). The conflict has led to an overall decline of the country’s socio-economic situation, particularly in the Donbas region of eastern Ukraine.

Ukraine is a middle-income country with a strong industrial base and has traditionally been a source of agriculture and food products. However, its economy took a deep dive after the break-up of the Soviet Union, from which it has barely recovered in recent years. In the past two decades its population has shrunk by around 8 million since its 1990 peak. Ukraine’s GDP fell sharply over the first 10 years of its independence from the Soviet Union. The economy experienced a deep recession during the 1990s, including hyperinflation and a drastic fall in economic output.

The refusal by President Yanukovych to sign the EU-Ukraine Association Agreement in December 2013 triggered popular protests, known as Euromaidan. After security forces brutally broke up the initially small student-led demonstrations, the protests swelled into an ever-growing movement against poor governance, lack of accountability and the pervasiveness of corruption. Following an escalation of violence in February 2014 in Kyiv, President Yanukovych was ousted from power. The Euromaidan movement was also emulated by protests in other regions. An interim government was installed on 27 February 2014; and Parliament endorsed the changes, restored the 2004 constitutional amendments and moved towards early presidential and parliamentary elections.

Following a contested ‘referendum,’ Russia annexed Crimea, including Sevastopol, in a move rejected on 27 March 2014 by UN General Assembly Resolution 68/262, which re-affirmed Ukrainian territorial integrity. Subsequently, conflict erupted in the eastern regions of Donetsk and Luhansk (known as the Donbas) as pro-Russian separatists took control of local government offices in Donetsk, Luhansk, Kramatorsk and Sloviansk and blocked off some of the territory. Gradually, the separatist forces succeeded in taking over much of the two oblasts’ territory, until the government of Ukraine launched an Anti-Terrorist Operation (ATO) in April 2014. Ukrainian forces regained control of some of the territory until the summer, when separatist forces stopped their advance.

Despite a ceasefire and outline political peace agreement (the Minsk Protocol of September 2014) and the renewal of its cease-fire provisions in February 2015 (Minsk II), the outcome prospects for a peaceful settlement of the conflict on the basis of the territorial integrity of Ukraine remains uncertain.The economic and social decline as well as poor governance have significantly contributed to the conditions that allowed agents of conflict to take advantage of structural weaknesses and exacerbated the vulnerability of those affected by the conflicts.

Recognizing the need to urgently address reconstruction, economic recovery and peacebuilding needs in areas affected both directly and indirectly by the conflict, the Government of Ukraine requested technical assistance and financial support from the international community to assess and plan priority recovery needs. At the request of the Government of Ukraine (GoU), the UN, World Bank, and EU finalized a Recovery and Peacebuilding Assessment (RPA) for Eastern Ukraine in April 2015. The Ukraine Cabinet of Ministers, through Resolution # 797-p of August 5, 2015, endorsed the RPA. Since that time the UNDP and other development partners have been working with GoU counterparts to support RPA implementation and to put in place the planning and institutional structures for recovery efforts.

In May 2016, the GoU established a new Ministry of Temporarily Occupied Territories and Internally Displaced Persons (MinTOT) that has been charged with elaborating a State Target Program for Donbas Recovery (STP). The STP uses the RPA findings as a foundation for developing a Government-led strategy and financing approach for recovery and peacebuilding activities.

The STP is projected to put forward priorities for international support and investments in recovery, including through the Multi-Partner Trust Fund (MPTF). The MPTF modality is being established in Ukraine following a Memorandum of Understanding, signed by the World Bank, the UN and the GoU on October 28, 2016.

*UNDP’s response to the new challenges*

UNDP strategy adopted for the Poverty Reduction/ Recovery and Peacebuilding Programme for eastern Ukraine builds on UNDP Poverty Reduction outcome as outlined in the Country Programme Strategy for 2012-2016 (extended for one year, for 2017), rapid interventions in response to the 2014 crisis in Ukraine such as the Governance and Recovery Rapid Intervention Project (GRRIP) and the Early Recovery Programme of 2014.

GRRIP resulted from a jointly-organized mission and exchange from UNDP office in Kyiv, RBEC, BDP and BCPR. The resultant ‘theory of change’ indicated a severe crisis in the social contract binding state and society, a crisis that has historical roots in the Soviet and immediate post-Soviet times, but was also amplified by the highly extractive nature of the former leadership. This continues to inform the new longer term Reform and Recovery Programmes.

Therefore, the UNDP programme responds to immediate needs of the Ukrainian government and wider society. It enables UNDP in Ukraine to respond to requests emanating since the Maidan from government, local authorities, civil society and communities. Specifically, the new programme focuses on supporting stabilization and early recovery needs of the conflict-affected areas.

The main thrust of the Governance and Recovery Rapid Intervention Project for Ukraine (GRRIP) were for the CO to refocus its efforts on two broad priorities:

1. Facilitate governance reform processes in a manner that increases coherence, effectiveness, and representativeness of the different political, social and regional aspirations within Ukrainian society and aligns with Ukraine’s human rights obligations.
2. Establish a strategic framework and initial presence on the ground to guide and support the multi-dimensional recovery of conflict-affected areas restored to national authority.

The second priority became one of the pillars of UNDP’s response to the recent crisis:

|  |
| --- |
| Recovery and Peacebuilding |
| *Strategic framework and initial presence on the ground to guide and support the multi-dimensional recovery of conflict-affected areas restored to national authority.* |
| * Supporting the design of national recovery strategies and the establishment of appropriate coordination mechanisms that ensure both a more coherent response from different actors in government but also a more effective utilisation of donor technical and financial support. * Context-specific practices in area-based recovery of conflict-affected communities, addressing their multi-dimensional needs and rights in terms of local governance, service delivery, livelihoods, civic engagement, infrastructure and energy, legal, justice, security, transitional justice and reconciliation. * Package of integrated support offered to a selected number of areas restored to government control, drawing upon the project delivery infrastructure and some available community project funding provided by the Community Based Approach to Local Development Project (CBA). * Establish a key role in supporting the stabilisation and post-conflict recovery in the country that spans the downstream-to-upstream spectrum and therefore guarantees a more effective feedback loop and effective response to the needs and rights of affected populations, both those directly affected or displaced by violent conflict, or those facing potential risks for destabilization. |

In this context, UNDP will provide its share of contribution to Ukraine through three pillars:

* Pillar 1 will support democratic governance and reforms for sustainable, inclusive growth and is laid out in this programme document.
* Pillar 2 will focus on recovery and peacebuilding and will help overcome consequences of the conflict in eastern Ukraine through restoring social services; rehabilitating social and economic infrastructure; boosting economic recovery; rebuilding governance and administrative capacities in the affected areas; providing social support; generating employment and spurring entrepreneurship among internally displaced persons and local communities.
* Pillar 3 will continue UNDP’s longstanding work on energy innovations and environmental policies and will help Ukraine to become a “green and clean” and energy-efficient country, moving forward on its environmentally sustainable development path and successfully addressing climate change mitigation on the policy level through advocacy and policy advice, and through practical initiatives, and will support local energy efficiency initiatives and community organizations protecting the environment.

The above-mentioned joint Recovery and Peacebuilding Assessment (RPA), conducted by the European Union, United Nations and World Bank Group, and supported by the Government of Ukraine provided an initial assessment of the priority needs for recovery and peacebuilding in Ukraine, through three thematic components: (1) infrastructure and social services, (2) economic recovery and (3) social resilience, peacebuilding and community security. Accordingly, the RPA is the Government of Ukraine’s official framework to identify, plan and prioritize strategic recovery and peacebuilding initiatives over the short to medium term, and UNDP is realigning its current programming accordingly.

In 2016 UNDP has established a Project Office in eastern Ukraine (Kramatorsk & Severodonetsk) with a view to consolidate and deliver the various recovery and governance projects through a comprehensive, area-based, “Recovery and Peacebuilding Programme (RPP)” in five conflict-affected regions (oblasts): Donetsk, Luhansk, Zaporizhzhia, Dnipropetrovsk, and Kharkiv. It is envisaged that the RPP will frame UNDP intervention in eastern Ukraine building on the existing projects and expanding the activities in order to address the recovery needs of conflict affected population and communities.

1. **Purpose of the Evaluation**

The purpose of this outcome evaluation is to assess whether and to what extent the planned outcomes have been or are being achieved as a result of UNDP’s work in the areas of poverty reduction and recovery and peacebuilding in the 2012-2016 period. Specifically, the outcome evaluation will assist UNDP in gaining a better understanding of the following aspects of its interventions:

1. the extent to which the planned outcomes and the related outputs have been or are being achieved;
2. the mechanisms by which outputs led to the achievement of the specified outcomes;
3. concrete evidence of the UNDP contribution to outcomes;
4. if and which programme processes e.g. strategic partnerships and linkages are critical in producing the intended outcome;
5. factors that facilitate and/or hinder the progress in achieving the outcome, both in terms of the external environment and those internal to the portfolio interventions including: design, management, human resource skills, and resources;
6. lessons learned from the implementation of the interventions, as also evidenced;
7. coordination and mutual reinforcement of the inputs, results and outputs of the projects, their integration into larger governance objective of UNDP Ukraine, their alignment and synergies
8. sustainability: whether there is ownership and capacity to maintain and manage development in the Outcome.

To the extent possible, answers to the above questions shall address the implications for women and men, their participation in design and implementation of the outcome and particular programmes and projects in the outcome area, whether the latter had addressed the issues of gender inclusion, equality and empowerment and contributed to strengthening the application of these principles to various development efforts in the country, and how gender issues had been mainstreamed across the outcome area by UNDP. Evaluation shall also address the extent to which UNDP had advocated for the principle of equality and inclusive development, and has contributed to empowering and addressing the needs of the disadvantaged and vulnerable population.

The recommendations and lessons learned from this outcome evaluation will feed into the planning process of the next UNDP Country Programme cycle 2018–2022.

1. **Evaluation Scope and Objectives**

The following projects (the final list of project to be agreed during the inception phase) falling under Outcome 15, as stated in UNDP CPD 2012–2016, are to be part of this evaluation. Recovery-related projects also partially contribute to Outcomes 16 and 17:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| CPD/SP outcome | Indicators | UNDP projects |
| (CPD 15) Reduction of poverty in rural areas through socio-economic development activities.  (SP 1) Growth and development are inclusive and sustainable, incorporating productive capacities that create employment and livelihoods for the poor and excluded. | Extent to which Millennium Development Goals are integrated into Ukraine’s strategic priorities.  % of small and micro enterprises in total volume of trade.  % of households’ real income growth in targeted localities of selected regions of Ukraine by 2017 | Poverty-reduction (non-recovery)  Support to the Social Sector Reform in Ukraine  Mainstreaming Policies and Services for People with Disabilities in Ukraine  Acceleration of Millennium Development Goals Progress in Ukraine  Aid For Trade in Ukraine  [Improving local capacity to promote and sustain entrepreneurship and SMEs development in Chernobyl affected territories by transferring best practices and experience of using smart instruments for boosting business](http://www.ua.undp.org/content/ukraine/en/home/operations/projects/poverty_reduction/improving-local-capacity-to-promote-and-sustain-entrepreneurship.html)  Strengthening small and medium enterprises business membership organizations  Strengthening National Capacity for Effective Youth Development and HIV/AIDS Response in Ukraine  Strengthening the National TB and HIV Council in Ukraine  Recovery-related  Early Recovery of Social Services and Peacebuilding in Donetsk and Lugansk Oblasts  Economic and Social Recovery of Donbas Region  Rapid Response to Social and Economic Issues of Internally Displaced People in Ukraine |
| (CPD 16) Improved access to and utilization of quality health, education and social services.  (SP 3) Countries have strengthened institutions to progressively deliver universal access to basic services | Targeting of social assistance through improved services for vulnerable and marginalized groups increased, especially in rural areas  % allocated in the state budget for HIV/AIDS programmes comparing to the needs  Improved public perception of quality and accessibility of public service provision |
| (CPD 17) More effective and accountable public institutions respond to the needs of all persons within the jurisdiction of Ukraine, especially the most vulnerable.  (SP 2) Citizen expectations for voice, development, the rule of law and accountability are met by stronger systems of democratic governance | World Bank Government Effectiveness Index  Contribution of Legal Framework to more effective, accountable and responsive public |

1. **Deliverables**

The Consultant is expected to provide the following deliverables:

* Inception report with evaluation methodology and detailed schedule should be submitted not later than 2 days after signing the contract

Evaluation Report and detailed Power Point presentation should be submitted not later than 20 working days after signing the contract

Debrief of the UNDP on the main findings and conclusions of the Report

The key deliverable expected is a comprehensive evaluation report and PP Presentation that include, but is not limited to the following components: (see UNDP *Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results for more guidance on outcome evaluations).*

* Executive summary
* Introduction
* Description of the interventions
* Evaluation scope and objectives
* Evaluation approach and method
* Development context
* Data analysis and key findings and conclusions
* Recommendations and lessons learnt for the future (including viable project ideas and other recommendations for the development of the new CPD 2018-2022)
* Annexes: TORs, reports on field visits, questionnaires/ guides for interviews, list of people interviewed, list of documents reviewed, etc.

The Recommendations need to be supported by an evidential basis, be credible, practical, action-oriented, and define who is responsible for the action - to have potential to be used in decision-making.

The Power Point presentation should mostly follow the logic of the evaluation report, be concise but informative enough to be used for promoting the results of the evaluation among key decision makers and stakeholders. The use of graphs, charts, tables, schemes and other visual products is highly recommended.

The International Consultant will determine the specific design and methods for the evaluation during the inception period. The Inception report with the evaluation methodology and schedule should be approved by UNDP’s focal point/ prior to the start of fieldwork. It should take into account the opinion/voices of people from Ukraine, government representatives, donors and NGOs.

The Consultant is required to discuss with the UNDP focal point the full draft of the evaluation report prior to departure from Ukraine.

***Evaluation ethics***

The evaluation shall be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’. The Evaluation team will take every measure to safeguard the rights and confidentiality of key information providers in the collection of data.

***Dissemination mechanisms***

The final evaluation report will be placed on the UNDP website and distributed through regular Government channels to interested parties. All information and products produced under this assignment will remain the property of UNDP Ukraine.

1. **Requirements for experience and qualification**

1. Experience

* At least master or equivalent university degree in economics, public administration, regional development/planning, or other sciences related to poverty reduction or recovery issues.
* Additional trainings in project management, monitoring and evaluation is an advantage.

2. Years of experience

* At least 7 years of work experience in the field of poverty reduction or recovery, public administration, and international development, including participatory planning, monitoring and evaluation.
* At least 3 years of experience in conducting monitoring and evaluation of projects and programmes.
* Working experience in the Commonwealth of Independent States or Eastern Europe region.

3. Competencies

* Good understanding of Poverty Reduction and/or Recovery issues, including gender and human rights aspects.
* Sound knowledge about results-based management (especially results-oriented monitoring and evaluation).
* Proven knowledge of complex monitoring and evaluation policies and procedures of international financing agencies, including results based management.
* Familiarity with the political, economic and social situation in Ukraine.
* Extensive research and analytical skills and report writing abilities.
* Availability to work during the indicated /approved period.
* Excellent communication skills.
* Fluency in English. Knowledge of Ukrainian and/or Russian will be an asset.

1. **Timeframe**

The estimated duration of the assignment is 20 working days.

1. **Implementation Arrangements**

The International consultant will work with the available relevant documentation and with the needed ad-hoc translations/ interpretation (costs are to be covered by the consultant). To facilitate the Outcome evaluation process an Evaluation Focal Team (EFT) comprising of representatives of UNDP Ukraine (DCD/Programme) and relevant project staff will be set up. The EFT will assist in connecting the evaluation team with the senior management and key stakeholders. In addition, the EFT will assist in developing a detailed evaluation plan and conducting field visits. During the evaluation, EFT will help identify key partners for interviews and provide project reports and other recommended documents for desk review. Otherwise, the evaluation will be fully independent and the evaluation team will retain enough flexibility to determine the best approach in collecting and analyzing data for the Outcome evaluation.

***Indicative Mission Schedule***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Tentative Timeframe (No of working days)** | **Place** | **Responsible party** |
| Evaluation design, methodology and detailed work plan (inception report) | 2 | On-line | International Consultant, EFT |
| Desk review | 4 | On-line | International Consultant, EFT |
| Interviews, consultation,  online survey (to be discussed),  1st Draft Outline (Power Point Presentation) and presentation to the UN | 9 | 5 days in Kiev  2 days field visit to Kramatorsk Project Office  2 days on-line | International Consultant, EFT |
| Preparation and submission of 1st draft of the evaluation report | 3 | On-line | International Consultant |
| Submission of the final evaluation report and Power Point Presentation | 2 | On-line | International Consultant |

1. **Financial arrangements:**

The candidate will be required to submit an aggregated financial offer (“aggregated financial offer” is the total sum of all financial claims of the candidate for accomplishment of the task), which includes proposed consultancy fee, travel costs, visa costs (if required), per diem (for accommodation, meals and local transport / communication). In general, UNDP shall not accept travel costs exceeding those of an economy class ticket. The consultant will be provided with the necessary administrative and logistical support to enable them deliver on the expected outputs.

|  |
| --- |
| Payment will be disbursed in two installments upon submission and approval of deliverables and certification by the UNDP DCD/Programme that the services have been satisfactorily performed.   * Installment 1:   o 40 % of total consultancy fee;  o Milestone 1: Upon approval of the evaluation methodology, detailed work-plan and schedule and submission of an invoice.  o Milestone 2: Upon submission of the draft Evaluation report with Recommendations and Outline for future interventions and Power Point Presentation.   * Installment 2:   o 60 % of total consultancy fee;  o Milestone 3: Upon finalization of the Evaluation report.  Note |

All envisaged travel costs (including ticket, accommodation, etc.) must be included in the offeror’s financial proposal. The individual offeror should consider the prevailing price for an economy class tickets serving the most direct routes in his /her financial proposal:

* Individual contractor wishing to upgrade his/her travel to business or first class shall do so at his/her own expense;
* The project will arrange local transportation for domestic travel- therefore the cost to be excluded from this contract. As for living allowances, the cost will be included in and covered by this contract. Therefore, the offeror is required to include the foreseen cost (living allowances) for Kyiv, Ukraine;
* The offeror is therefore encouraged to check the ceiling of living allowances for Kyiv, Ukraine following link: http://icsc.un.org?, and to include the amount in the financial proposal. However, the reimbursement of local travel costs will be made upon receipt of travel claim form and based on the actual travel dates;
* Each payment will be made in US dollars upon satisfactory completion of the tasks and respective deliverables as per submission of deliverables/claims by the consultant and the project/UNDP approvals;
* Each payment will be transferred by UNDP through Electronic Fund Transfer to the Dollar account number of the contractor through an official letter indicating full banking information;
* Any payment under this contract will be made using UN Operational Rate of Exchange. For update rates please see: http://treasury.un.org/operationalrates/OperationalRates.aspx;
* Payments will be made according to UNDP regulations as explained in the contract documents;
* The International Consultant shall not do any work, provide any equipment, materials and supplies or perform any other services which may result in any cost in excess of the above mentioned amount.

Interested individual consultant must submit the following documents/information to demonstrate his or her qualifications:

1. Proposal: explaining why he or she is the most suitable for the work including past experience in similar evaluations (brief information on each of the required qualifications, item by item). May include few relevant reports prepared by the consultant;

2. Financial proposal (in USD, specifying a total requested amount per day, including all related costs, e.g. fees, per diems, travel costs, phone calls etc.);

3. Duly completed and signed P11 Form, and at least 3 contacts for references.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Evaluation**   Contract award shall be made to the incumbent whose offer has been evaluated and determined as:  a) responsive/compliant/acceptable (fully meeting the TOR provided), and  b) offering the lowest price/cost. |

**11. Selection method**

The Consultant will be recruited from UNDP’s Express Roster

Prepared by: **Ildar Gazizullin, Recovery Specialist**

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Name, title, signature and date

Approved by: **Blerta Cela, UNDP Deputy Country Director (Programme)**

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Name, title, signature and date

# Annex II – List of documents consulted during desk review

Terms of Reference

Results-Oriented Annual Report 2015/2016

Ukraine Recovery and Peace-Building Assessment, 2015, UN, EU, and World Bank, at <http://www.refworld.org/pdfid/55a4b76c4.pdf>.

Initial Project Document “**Support to Social Sector Reform Ukraine**” (2011)

Project Document and two revisions, “Support to Social Sector Reform Ukraine”

Project Report, “Support to Social Sector Reform Ukraine 2011-2015”

Infographics file with results

Project Document “**Rapid Response to Social and Economic Issues of Internally Displaced Persons**”

Project document (3 parts) for the “**Global Aid for Trade Project in Central Asia, the Southern Caucasus, and Western CIS – Promoting Trade Development and Poverty Reduction in Partnership with Finland’s Wider Europe Initiative**”, 2011 (?)

2011-2012 Progress Report “UNDP **Aid for Trade** Project”; Programme Document (3 files) for phase II of the project.

Project Document “**Improving local capacity to promote and sustain entrepreneurship in SME development in Chernobyl-affected territories by transferring best practices and experience of using smart instruments for boosting business**”

2015 Monitoring report “Improving local capacity to promote and sustain entrepreneurship in SME development in Chernobyl-affected territories by transferring best practices and experience of using smart instruments for boosting business”

Minutes of the Final Project Board Meeting November 2015 of project “Improving local capacity to promote and sustain entrepreneurship in SME development in Chernobyl-affected territories by transferring best practices and experience of using smart instruments for boosting business”

Project Document **Strengthening SME membership organisations.**

Draft Mid-Term Evaluation Report **Strengthening SME membership organisations.**

Final Project Report “**Economic Recovery of the Donbass Region**”

Revised Project Document “**Strengthening the National Capacity for HIV/AIDS response in Ukraine**”

Final Project Review Report (FRP) “**Strengthening the National Capacity for HIV/AIDS response in Ukraine**” (2014)

2015 Survey “Youth of Ukraine”, UNDP and Ministry for Sports and Youth Policy of Ukraine. At <http://www.un.org.ua/en/publications-and-reports/un-in-ukraine-publications/3687-youth-survey-2015> (accessed 24 February 2017)

Report for 2015 of the “**Procurement Support Services to the Ministry of Health of Ukraine**” (January 2016)

Monitoring and Evaluation Plan for the project “Procurement Support Services to the Ministry of Health of Ukraine”

Final Report for the Joint Programme “Promoting Mainstream Policies and Services for People with Disabilities in Ukraine” (2015)

Other sources consulted:

Country Sheet on Youth Policy in Ukraine, 2016. Published by the Partnership for Youth Policy between the European Union and the Council of Europe in the area of youth. At <http://pjp-eu.coe.int/documents/1017981/9038134/Ukraine_Country+sheet_2016.pdf/492169a9-0ba0-44ab-ae00-3d0a076d5864> (accessed 24 February 2017)

Website of the National Assembly of Persons with Disabilities Ukraine <http://naiu.org.ua> (accessed 24 February 2017)

Website of the “Universal Design” website, created by the programme “Promoting Mainstream Policies and Services for People with Disabilities in Ukraine”

Ukraine Alternative Report on Compliance with the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities at <https://www.slideshare.net/undpukraine/alternative-report-ukraine> (accessed 24 February 2017)

Joint UN Programme of Support on Aids in Ukraine 2012-2016 <https://unaids.org.ua/en/about-unaids/joint-un-programme-of-support>

# Annex III – Schedule for in-country work

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Poverty Reduction/Recovery Outcome Evaluation**  ***(Kyiv, 1-9 February 2017)***  AGENDA | | | |
| **Wednesday, 1 February** | | | |
| *Time* |  |  |  |
| 13:25 | Arrival to Kyiv (Boryspil Airport) |  |  |
| 15:00 | Arrival to UNDP office |  |  |
|  | | | |
| *Time* | *Project name* | *Participants* | *Contact info/Venue* |
| 15:00 – 16:00 | Introductory meeting | Blerta Cela (TBC),  Vitaliy Kuchynsky,  Ildar Gazizullin,  Olena Novobranets | **UNDP’s office at 10 Lypska Str., room 1.1** |
| 16:00 – 17:00 | Support to the Social Sector Reform in Ukraine | Olena Ivanova, Project Manager | [olena.ivanova@undp.org](mailto:olena.ivanova@undp.org)  **UNDP’s office at 10 Lypska Str., room 1.1** |
| **Thursday, 2 February** | | | |
| 09:00-11:30 | 1) Aid for Trade in Ukraine;  2)Improving local capacity to promote and sustain entrepreneurship and SMEs development in Chernobyl affected territories by transferring best practices and experience of using smart instruments for boosting business;  3) Strengthening small and medium enterprises business membership organizations | Andriy Zayika, Project Manager; (TBC)  Vitalii Krysko | Andriy.Zayika@undp.org  Mob.: +38 097 965 5072  Skype: andriy\_zayika  [vitalii.krysko@undp.org](mailto:vitalii.krysko@undp.org)  **UNDP’s office at 10 Lypska Str., room 1.1** |
| 11:30 – 13:00 | Acceleration of Millennium Development Goals Progress in Ukraine | Natalia Sitnikova, Project Manager | [natalia.sitnikova@undp.org](mailto:natalia.sitnikova@undp.org)  **UNDP’s office at 10 Lypska Str., room 1.1** |
| 13:00 – 14:00 | *Lunch* | | |
| 14:00 – 15:00 | Early Recovery of Social Services and Peacebuilding in Donetsk and Lugansk Oblasts ;  Rapid Response to Social and Economic Issues of Internally Displaced People in Ukraine | Yuriy Savko, former Project Manager, Ruslan Fedorov, Project Manager | +380 (50) 145 76 55;  [Yuriy.savko@gmail.com](mailto:Yuriy.savko@gmail.com);  [ruslan.fedorov@undp.org](mailto:ruslan.fedorov@undp.org)  **UNDP’s office at 10 Lypska Str., room 1.1** |
| 15:30 – 17:00 | Strengthening the National TB and HIV Council in Ukraine | Liubov Shnerenko, Project Manager | [shnerenko@moz.gov.ua](mailto:shnerenko@moz.gov.ua)  **UNDP’s office at 10 Lypska Str., room 1.1** |
| 17:00-18:00 | Poland (donor) | Jerzy Osiatynski, Member of the Monetary Policy Council, National Bank of Poland *(via skype)* | [Jerzy.Osiatynski@sejm.gov.pl](mailto:Jerzy.Osiatynski@sejm.gov.pl)  **UNDP’s office at 10 Lypska Str., room 1.1** home phone no (+48) 22 7580405  private mobile no (+48) 603600787  skype: jerzyosiatynski |
| **Friday, 3 February** | | | |
| *Time* | *Organization* | *Representative* | *Contact info* |
| 9:00 – 10:00 | National Assembly of Persons with Disabilities (partner organization) | Larysa Baida, Head of Department | +380 (50) 334 86 40 Larysa Baida  **Venue: Assembly’s premises, 8/5A Reitarska Str., meeting room 110** |
| 10:30-11:30 | The Department for International Development, DfID (donor) | Patrick Tobin, Regional Conflict Advisor;  Anastasiya Krashevskaya, Acting DFID Programme Officer, British Embassy in Kyiv | [Anastasiya.Krashevskaya@fco.gov.uk](mailto:Anastasiya.Krashevskaya@fco.gov.uk)  (380) 67 434 2921  **Venue: Embassy’s premises *at 9 Desyatynna St.*** |
| 12:00 – 13:00 | Swiss Cooperation Office in Ukraine (donor SDC) | Viktor Shutkevych, Assistant Director of Cooperation/National Programme Officer | [viktor.shutkevych@eda.admin.ch](mailto:viktor.shutkevych@eda.admin.ch);  +380 (67) 507 18 03  **Meeting will be held at the Swiss Cooperation Office: 4 Hlybochytska St., 3rd floor** |
| 13:00 – 14:00 | *Lunch* | | |
| 14:00 – 15:00 | Institute for Economic Research and Policy Consulting (partner Aid for Trade project) | Igor Burakovskiy, Head of the Board /  Movchan Veronika, Academic Director, Head of the Center for Economic Studies | [burakovsky@ier.kiev.ua](mailto:burakovsky@ier.kiev.ua)  [movchan@ier.kiev.ua](mailto:movchan@ier.kiev.ua)  Tel.: + 38 044 278-63-42  + 38 044 278-63-60  Fax: + 38 044 278-63-36  **UNDP premises, 20 Esplanadna Str., meeting room at 7th floor** *(правый лифт от входа. Код в лифте 6159)* |
| 15:00 – 16:00 | Ptoukha Institute for Demography and Social Studies of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine (partner on MDGs project) | Olena Makarova, Deputy Director for Science | 0507201425  **UNDP premises, 20 Esplanadna Str.**, **meeting room at 7th floor** *(правый лифт от входа. Код в лифте 6159)* |
| 16:00 - 17:00 | Ministry of Social Policy of Ukraine | ***Ms. Natalia Fedorovich***  Deputy Minister of Social Policy of Ukraine (***TBC***);  Oksana Sulima, Head for the Elderly and Social Services Department;  Iryna Pinchuk, Head of the Department  for Social Orphanhood Prevention | [sulima@mlsp.gov.ua](mailto:sulima@mlsp.gov.ua)  2893062 (Sylima)  289-51-94 (Pinchuk)  **UNDP premises, 20 Esplanadna Str.**, **meeting room at 7th floor** *(правый лифт от входа. Код в лифте 6159)* |
| 17:00 – 18:00 | Mainstreaming Policies and Services for People with Disabilities in Ukraine | Kristina Bagramyan, former Project Manager | +380 (50) 418 29 42 [chrisetc@yahoo.com](mailto:chrisetc@yahoo.com)  [kristina.bagramian@coe.int](mailto:kristina.bagramian@coe.int)  **UNDP premises, 20 Esplanadna Str.**, **meeting room at 7th floor** *(правый лифт от входа. Код в лифте 6159)* |
| **Monday, 6 February** | | | |
| 11:30 – 13:00 | Project "Procurement Support Services to the Ministry of Health of Ukraine" | Natalya Lukyanova  HIV and Health Policy Officer;  Zafar Yuldoshev,  Project Coordinator | Tel.: +38 044 253-5984  Mobile(s): +380 67 402 5675  [natalya.lukyanova@undp.org](mailto:natalya.lukyanova@undp.org)  Skype: lukyanovanat  ***Venue: Institutska 28, block G*** |
|  | *Lunch* | | |
| 14:00 – 15:00 | International Organization for Migration | Ester Ruiz de Azua, Emergency and Stabilization Programme Coordinator | [eruizdeazua@iom.int](mailto:eruizdeazua@iom.int)  **IOM premises: Mikhailivska 6, 4th floor** |
| 16:00 | Community Based Approach to Local Development Project (CBA) | Mr. Hendrik Gideon VAN ZYL, International Project Manager;  Olena Ruditch, Community Development Specialist | [henk.vanzyl@undp.org](mailto:henk.vanzyl@undp.org);  [olena.ruditch@undp.org](mailto:olena.ruditch@undp.org)  **UNDP’s office at 20 Esplanadna Str.**  **Room 706 (707)**  +380504179620 |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Tuesday, 7 February** | | | |
| 09:00 | Skype with Marcus Brand | Marcus Brand,  Democratic Governance Advisor | [marcus.brand@undp.org](mailto:marcus.brand@undp.org)  Skype: marcusbrand |
|  | *Lunch* | | |
| 14:00 | Environment Programme | Sergei Volkov, Energy and Environment Programme Analyst | [sergei.volkov@undp.org](mailto:sergei.volkov@undp.org)  **UNDP’s office at 10 Lypska Str., room 1.1*., 3rd floor*** |
| 17:00 | *Strengthening National Capacity for Effective Youth Development and HIV/AIDS Response in Ukraine* | *Kateryna Rybalchenko, Policy Officer (Social and Economic Development); Vira Profazi, Project Manager* | *katerina.rybalchenko@undp.org*  *Tel: +380 44 253 93 63 ext. 170*  *Mob: +380 50 386 56 06*  *Skype: katerina.rybalchenko.0*  [*vira.profazi@undp.org*](mailto:vira.profazi@undp.org)  ***UNDP’s office at 10 Lypska Str., 3rd floor*** |
| **Wednesday, 8 February** | | | |
| 9:30-10:30 | Meeting with Vitaliy Kuchynsky | Vitaliy Kuchynsky,  Monitoring and Evaluation Analyst | M +380 50 936 1716  skype: vitaliy.kuchynsky  [Vitaliy.Kuchynsky@undp.org](mailto:Vitaliy.Kuchynsky@undp.org) |
| 10:30 – 11:30 | Ministry of Economy of Ukraine (MDGs) | Natalia Horshkova, Director of the Department of Economic Strategy and Macroeconomic Forecast / Pavlo Onyshchenko | Natalia Gorshkova 0509073743  [Gorshkova@me.gov.ua](mailto:Gorshkova@me.gov.ua)  [onishchenko@me.gov.ua](mailto:onishchenko@me.gov.ua)  **UNDP’s office at 10 Lypska Str., room 1.1** |
| 12:00-13:00 | Ministry of Youth and Sports of Ukraine | Mrs. Iryna Beliayeva, Director of the Department for Youth Policy | +380935228935  ***Meeting will be held in the Ministry premises***: 42 Esplanadna Str., office 409 *Iryna may meet you at 1st floor, but if not you can go straight to her office #409* |
| 13:40 – 14:40 | Ministry of Economy of Ukraine (Aid for Trade and SME projects partners) | Mr. Valeriy Pyatnitsky, Advisor of the Prime Minister of Ukraine | **UNDP’s office at 10 Lypska Str., room 1.1**  050 4104509  (*Contact person is Andriy Zayika*:Andriy.Zayika@undp.org  Mob.: +38 097 965 5072) |
|  | *Lunch* | | |
| 15:30 – 16:30 | State Employment Service of Ukraine (on Service reform) | Mr. Sergiy Kravchenko, Deputy Head of the State employment service | ***Meeting will be held in the Ministry of Social Policy premises:*** 8/10 *Esplanadna Str., 19th floor.* |
| 17:00 – 17:30 | Ukrainian Chamber of Commerce and Industry (Aid for Trade and SME projects partners) | Gennadiy Chyzhykov, President | +380 44 279-88-99  **UNDP’s office at 10 Lypska Str., room 1.1** |
| **Thursday, 9 February** | | | |
| 10:00 – 11:00 | Japan (donor) | Mr. Koji Tsutsui, Second Secretary (Economic Section), Embassy of Japan | [koji.tsutsui@mofa.go.jp](mailto:koji.tsutsui@mofa.go.jp)  TEL: +380-(0)44-490-5500  Mob: +380-(0)50-336-1176  <http://www.ua.emb-japan.go.jp/itpr_uk/ua_embassy.html>  ***Meeting will be held at the Embassy premises: 4 Muzeiny Lane*** |
| 11:00 | Departure to Boryspil Airport | | |
| 14:00 | Flight to London | | |
| **Monday, 28 February (via skype)** | | | |
| 10:30 | Project “Economic and Social Recovery of Donbas Region” | Mr. Mustafa Sait-Ametov, Project Manager (via skype) | mustafa.sait-ametov@undp.org  Mob. +38 050 317 84 73  skype: mr\_sait-ametov |

1. Note that the assessment of achievement against CPD 17, which was initially part of the ToR, was removed from the scope of the evaluation during the briefing meeting with UNDP on 1 February 2017. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The average financial amount for outcome evaluations is, according to UNDP’s Independent Evaluation Unit, USD 50.000, i.e. five times the amount of the resources allocated to this assignment. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. See, for example, the 2016 Governance portfolio outcome evaluation, as well as the 2016 UNPF 2012-2017 Forward-Looking Evaluation and Comparative Advantage Analysis. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. For example the Joint UN Strategy on HIV/AIDS in Ukraine 2012-2016. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. See Draft UNPF 2012-2017 Forward-Looking Evaluation and Comparative Advantage Analysis, p. 32. At the beginning of the UNFPA period in 2012, UNDP had estimated its needs to be MUSD 57; in 2016, the organisation’s budget was MUSD 169. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. See, for example, the 2-15 Recovery and Peacebuilding Assessment conducted jointly by the UN, the EU, and the WB at <http://www.refworld.org/pdfid/55a4b76c4.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Data extrapolated from the Mid-Term Evaluation of the project “Strengthening SME membership organisations” [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. CBA III Third Quarterly Report 2016 at https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B38yW\_liDT9aR2tQS2VVVmswNFk/view [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. See for example the 2016 Factsheet on Youth Policy in Ukraine published by the Partnership between the Council of Europe and the European Union on youth issues at <http://pjp-eu.coe.int/documents/1017981/9038134/Ukraine_Country+sheet_2016.pdf/492169a9-0ba0-44ab-ae00-3d0a076d5864>. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. See Final Project Review Report of the project Strengthening National Capacities for Effective Youth Development and HIV/AIDS Response in Ukraine as well as various media reports, for example <http://www.ilga-europe.org/news/latest-news/ukraine-finally-approves-anti-discrimination-clause>. Due to the shortage of time allocated to the evaluation, the evaluator was not in a position to meet with representatives of the LGBT network to clearer corroborate the contribution made by the UNDP project. It would seem relevant to acknowledge the importance of the provisions in the EU-Ukraine Association Agreement in this aspect, and which also seems to have to a considerable degree shaped this result. On the flipside, it is an illustration of the long way that Ukraine still has to go on LGBT rights issues. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. See Final Project Review of the Strengthening National Capacities for Effective Youth Development and HIV/AIDS response in Ukraine project, p. 2. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)