



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

UNDP IN UKRAINE

Since declaring independence in July 1990, Ukraine has undergone political and economic transition. Yet it continues to operate far below its human development potential. It has a highly skilled population with a history of technological advance and industrialization; the natural resource base, which favors commercial agriculture, is underutilized; and the country lies at the confluence of the major markets of Europe, Russia and the Far East, where trade is bound to expand rapidly in the years to

come. Creating a policy and institutional environment that would enable the nation to capitalize on its human, natural resource and geographical advantages remains central to ensuring sustainable human development

UNDP has been an active partner in nation building, democratic development, and a shift from a command to a market economy. The Independent Evaluation Office of UNDP conducted an independent country programme evaluation that covered UNDP work from 1997 to 2004.

TOTAL PROGRAMME RESOURCES, 1997-2004: \$62 MILLION

FUNDING SOURCES, 1997-2004



TOTAL ALLOCATION BY STRATEGIC RESULTS OUTCOME, 1997-2004 (\$ MILLIONS)



FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

UNDP has been an active partner in assisting Ukraine through policy change; better planning; greater awareness of human development; and pilot projects demonstrating new ways of addressing human development challenges. Despite frequent political change, UNDP recognized the Government as its primary client and was highly responsive to its requests. High-ranking government officials served as national programme directors of policy reform initiatives. At the same time, UNDP helped build bridges between the Government and academia, non-governmental organizations, community-based organizations and the private sector. It acted in a manner consistent with human rights, through partnerships with multiple stakeholders, and with a focus on durable improvements in living standards.

UNDP was dogged in its pursuit of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). Focusing on their achievement helped to introduce a measure of priority setting. In addition to defining Ukraine-specific MDGs, the Government incorporated them into its long-term development strategy, the 'European Choice'. It adopted a human development perspective on poverty reduction, including the measurement of multiple dimensions of poverty, inclusion of the poor in decision-making and building on grass-roots experience to inform policy-making.

With greater capacities for strategic planning and policy-making, policy research teams at the Ministry of Economic and European Integration regularly generated macroeconomic and sector policy research. A new policy think tank helped develop legislation for a new land code, and initiate regulatory changes to support rural development.

Understanding of HIV/AIDS improved, and the capacity to respond to it in an integrated, cohesive and humane manner began emerging. A State AIDS Commission guides multisectoral implementation of the National Programme on HIV/AIDS. But a wide gulf remained between declared Government intentions and the commitment of budgetary and organizational resources to respond to HIV/AIDS on a large scale.

Starting in 2001, gender equality was included in the Government's annual action programmes, and gender advisors were appointed in all ministries and state committees. Legislation is now regularly monitored for its gender content. A Ministry of Family, Children and Youth Affairs was established. With UNDP input, the State Guarantees of Equal Rights and Opportunities law was prepared, and a law on the prevention of domestic violence passed. Ukraine ratified the Palermo convention, the Optional Protocol of the Convention on the

Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, and the UN Convention for Combating Trafficking in People.

UNDP pilot projects in both Chernobyl and Crimea achieved considerable success for local communities, and regional and local administrations. They helped to promote peace and stability, and to demonstrate that the international community has not abandoned the people of these disadvantaged regions. Other assistance helped the Government develop a process and timetable for ratifying the anti-personnel mine ban treaty. New national legislation prohibits the use of mines by the armed forces and the export of all types of anti-personnel mines.

While governance initiatives were supported in almost all UNDP projects, these generally were limited to participatory dialogues, improvements in legal frameworks, and technical advice and training. Implementation and sustainability of UNDP-supported activities suffered because other dimensions of governance were not adequately addressed.

The imperative of mobilizing resources contributed to a wide spread of activities. Integration of different co-financed projects into a coherent programme that

addresses priority constraints in a given area is difficult, and often complicated by uncertain partner funding. In other cases, the need to mobilize resources for various pilot initiatives diverted attention from capacity-building. As a small source of external assistance, UNDP's impact could be multiplied several times over by helping the Government improve the effective utilization of external assistance, including if more emphasis is placed on decentralized, regional development.

UNDP can continue to play a valuable role by focusing policy attention on the MDGs and by assisting in the development of public policies that can foster sustainable human development. With limited progress made in implementing Ukraine's European Choice, particularly in the areas of social rights, the rule of law, human rights, freedom of speech and of the media, and good administrative governance, UNDP should put more effort into helping the Government define gaps, and develop concrete strategies to foster convergence with accepted European Union (EU) norms and standards. At the same time, UNDP should support Ukraine in its efforts to maintain good relations with all of its neighbours and to address issues of common concern.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- Revisiting the programming framework, with greater selectivity, focus and impact, is warranted. Specifying clearly the linkages between UNDP's assistance inputs, outputs and outcomes can help avoid mission creep.
- UNDP is playing an important leadership role in interpreting, accessing and developing strategies for the achievement of the MDGs. This should continue, both to ensure that human development is integrated into national plans and policies, and to help Ukraine's development partners focus on poverty reduction, health protection, education and environment standards. Fostering convergence between Ukrainian and EU conditions are ways of translating MDG commitments into practice.
- There is a need to refocus UNDP's assistance from supporting economic recovery in general to focusing on exclusion—i.e., on meeting the needs of groups and regions unlikely to benefit from the growth process.
- UNDP should broaden its governance focus beyond training, technical assistance and pilot projects. This requires a better diagnostic understanding and assessment of what is needed to build effective capacity.
- Regional development initiatives require financial support from public and private sources well in excess of what UNDP could provide. This implies a need for partnerships that extend beyond community organizations to include domestic and foreign private investors, multilateral financiers and the financial sector.
- In Chernobyl and Crimea, there is a need to graduate from a small-scale community-development approach to assistance to a more integrated and holistic approach to supporting regional development.
- UNDP needs to consider augmenting its customary approaches to supporting policy reform with arrangements that provide a natural vehicle for Ukraine to graduate from capacity-building as an assistance activity to developing learning institutions that collaborate routinely with strategic partners in neighbouring states.
- Ensuring sound policy advice implies a need for greater selectivity, attention to analysis and quality control.
- UNDP can help build aid management capacity by strengthening government coordination functions, hosting forums on national concerns and encouraging thematic groups related to governance reforms.

ABOUT THE ICPEs

Independent country programme evaluations (ICPEs) are the backbone of the work of the Independent Evaluation Office. They capture evidence of UNDP's contributions to development results and the effectiveness of strategies supporting national development. They enable continued improvement in UNDP programmes, contribute to strengthened national ownership and evaluation capacity, and underpin accountability to national stakeholders and UNDP's Executive Board. To date, over 100 ICPEs have been conducted worldwide.

See the full reports at the Evaluation Resource Centre, erc.undp.org