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# List of Acronyms

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| CAF | Civic Action Fund |
| CO | Country Office |
| CSO | Civil Society Organisation |
| GoK | Government of Kyrgyzstan |
| LSG | Local Self-Government |
| M&E | Monitoring and Evaluation |
| PwDs | People with Disabilities |
| RRF | Results & Resources Framework |
| SDC | Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation |
| SDGs | Sustainable Development Goals |
| SIPD | Strong and Inclusive Parliamentary Development Project |
| SMART | Specific; Measurable; Achievable; Realistic; & Time-bound |
| UN | United Nations |
| UNDP | United Nations Development Programme |
| WPS | Women, Peace & Security |

# Executive Summary

The Kyrgyz Republic (Kyrgyzstan) is a country that continues its transition to a democratic state, having seen a significant amount of political turmoil in the past 16 years that has resulted in three occasions in which the government has been overturned, including the most recent event in October, 2020. Through all of this tumult the *Jogorku Kenesh* (Parliament) has been a constitutionally-mandated cornerstone of the political system. Its evolution as a democratic institution has seen periodic leaps forward, such as after the 2010 revolution, and periods of retrenchment. Its 120 MPs, nine committees and staff have established the institution as a strong actor in the political system, having established a reasonable level of horizontal accountability. Yet the need for the Parliament to be more open and engaging of citizens and civils society is a major challenge in the country’s ongoing transition to democracy.

UNDP has been supporting the Parliament, on and off, for more than a decade, but in 2017 it commenced with the implementation of the Swiss-funded *Strong and Inclusive Parliamentary Democracy* (SIPD) Project. The project had two primary objectives – to support the supply (parliament committees) and demand side (civil society) of the political system to establish a robust and institutionalised system of citizen input into the work of the Parliament, especially as it relates to the adoption of laws that reflect citizen interest and the monitoring of government laws and programmes.

Based on the OECD-DAC select evaluation criteria required for this final evaluation of SIPD, the following findings were observed:

**Relevance:** SIPDs outcomes and outputs were designed to reflect the development priorities of the Government of Kyrgyzstan (GoK) as noted in the National Sustainable Development Plan 2013-2017 and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). In addition, the identified priorities for support for the United Nations, UNDP and the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC) were also well-aligned with the project’s objectives. The design of the project was a positive aspect of the project. By working to establish “space” for civil society-parliament engagement and supporting both sides of the bilateral dialogue to be effective in their engagement, the project has zeroed in on a simple, yet key element of the political system that was a challenge to the democratic transition. The project could have benefited from stronger indicators and targets. It also suffered in its implementation due to the modality under which SDC and UNDP agreed to implement the project.

**Efficiency:** In considering the cost-effectiveness of the implementation of the project there were both positive and negative aspects of the means by which the project was delivered. On the positive side, the varied means of technical advice, including access to technical advisory services, national short-term technical expertise and CSO expertise, enabled the project to provide hands-on technical support, with limited costs, to MPs and parliamentary committees, as well as parliamentary staff, to support their efforts to be more inclusive and participatory. The innovative use of competitive small grants to CSOs allowed for flourishing of numerous approaches to civic education and engagement on committees and parliamentary working groups to advance citizen engagement, but also to achieve legislative and oversight reforms. Less positively, the process by which the grants were managed by the project, including the limited human resources and the lack of pre-assessment of potential grantees, resulted in challenges to the grant process. In addition, the turnover of project staff was significant and can mostly be attributed to the donor’s interactions which were perceived as overly active in the day-to-day implementation of the project.

**Effectiveness:** Overall, the project was able to achieve significant results related to three of the four outputs of the project and most of its outcome-level goals. The work of the project was, *de facto*, adaptive in nature. Though the project was not necessarily designed to be flexible in its approach to programming, it was able to make adjustments to its work that resulted in significant achievements. When the work of some committees was slow to gain traction, the project supported working groups at the committee and parliament levels that resulted in the adoption of an M&E tool for the parliament. Despite not being defined as a priority in the project document, the project was able to provide impactful support in developing an action plan for an open and transparent parliament as part of Kyrgyzstan engagement in Open Government Partnership (OGP)[[1]](#footnote-1). SIPDs CSO grants resulted in civil society developing trusted relationships with committees and MPs that resulted, in turn, in a number of laws being amended (Family Code rules related to alimony; Law on Social Benefits; enhanced consultations with Local Self-Governments). It also resulted in select parliamentary committees adopting new, evidence-based methodologies for their oversight work. The one disappointment for the project was its work in support of Public Councils. Repeated delays that were beyond the scope of the project’s control limited the ability to build working relationships between the councils and relevant committees of the Parliament.

**Sustainability:** SIPD was able to ensure that some of its work in support of the Parliament was sustainable beyond the life of the project. In two areas in particular this was observed. First, the space for dialogue between Parliament and civil society, particularly with certain committees and staff, has been established and trusted relationships between both sides have been developed that will outlast the project’s life. Second, the procedures of the Parliament and how it conducts its work has been revised through the adoption of the M&E framework and specific adjustments to committees procedures in conducting oversight. Also, the development of the Open Parliament Initiative Action Plan and the communications strategy for the Parliament have resulted in significant changes to the means by which the Parliament manages its information in a more transparent manner.

**Gender Equality:** Beyond the fact the project benefited greatly from strong women MPs in key leadership roles within the Parliament, the project was able to support the development and adoption of a Gender Equality Roadmap by the Forum of Women MPs. The Parliament also agreed to establish a Speaker’s High Level Council on Gender Equality. These milestones were achieved parallel to specific activities by the project and CSO grantees to ensure the engagement of women in the work of the Parliament which, in turn, resulted in changes to laws to the benefit of women and girls, including the changes to the Family Code related to alimony and child support and the increased access to social benefits by children. The combination of these interventions by the project established space for dialogue and new relationships between MPs and civil society that, in turn, resulted in legislative changes and policy reforms that benefited women and girls.

**Key Recommendations:**

* **UNDPs support to the Parliament must continue, despite constitutional reforms that shift to a presidential political system**
* **Efforts are required to institutionalize the reforms piloted and adopted by the Parliament**
* **At a time of political upheaval, a focus of support should be securing and maintaining space for citizens and civil society in decision-making**
* **Any future support to the Parliament of Kyrgyzstan should be focused on interventions that will allow for sustainable capacity to establish an effective, inclusive and participative institution**

# Introduction

## Context

The Kyrgyz Republic, also known as Kyrgyzstan, is a Central Asian nation that was established in 1991 as an independent state with the collapse of the former Soviet Union. Since 1991 the country has faced political turmoil and political upheaval on a regular basis. This has included the “Tulip Revolution” in 2005 that saw the over throw of the government. In 2010 a second revolution occurred which resulted in the transformation of the political system from a presidential republic to a parliamentary democracy (the only one of its kind in Central Asia). After the 2020 parliamentary elections, peaceful protests over the results were usurped by an uprising which resulted in the removal of the Government of Kyrgyzstan (GoK) and the confirmation of a new President in a presidential election held in January 2021. The new President has pursued constitutional reform, including to shift back to a presidential system of government, which was approved by a popular vote in a referendum in April, 2021.

In the midst of an evolving political system that continues its transition to democracy, the Kyrgyzstan *Jogorku Kenesh* (Parliament) has been a political institution that remained a constant in the system, with some adjustments to its structure and membership. The current iteration of the Parliament consists of 120 members[[2]](#footnote-2) elected through an electoral system based on proportional representation. Candidates are drawn from closed party lists for a single, national constituency. Political parties are required to attain a minimum of 7% of all votes cast to attain seats in the assembly.

The Parliament is currently in its Sixth Convocation (i.e. – Term). This term was to end with the October, 2020 elections, but those results were annulled by the Central Electoral Commission two days after the election and subsequent to protests that broke out, including significant damage to the Parliament building.[[3]](#footnote-3) The MPs elected in 2015 for the Sixth Term are to remain in office for the majority of 2021. With the referendum on the new constitution now complete, it is generally expected, at the time of writing this report, that the next parliamentary election will be held in the fourth quarter of 2021.

The Parliament consists of 120 MPs from six different party factions (i.e. – blocs). There are nine permanent committees within the Parliament. The membership of each committee varies from ten to 17 members per committee. Each committee has a dedicated secretariat with a small number of professional staff that support their work. In addition, the Parliament established a Scientific Research Centre in 2013 with a mandate to support the implementation of the Parliament’s strategic development plan, which is updated at the commencement of each term of the Parliament.

Twenty-three of the 120 MPs are women (19.2%). For the 2015 parliamentary election the electoral code was revised to require that 30% of candidates for each political party are women. The Parliament has an active Forum of Women Deputies (i.e. – woman’s caucus) where all women MPs meet to engage in policy discussions and to advocate for changes that benefit women and girls. One Vice-Speaker of the Parliament is a woman, along with three of the nine committee chairpersons. In 2020, the Speaker of the Parliament established a high-level Permanent Council on Women’s Rights and Prevention of Gender-based Violence. Chaired by the Vice-Speaker, the Council membership includes MPs and representatives of civil society. The mandate of the Council is to support the furthering reforms required to achieve the goal of gender equality – both within the institution and more broadly. This includes the promotion of gender-related policies, laws and regulations.

Beyond the Parliament, the political system in Kyrgyzstan reflects the challenges for a nation transitioning to democracy. V-Dem data has shown that since the 2010 revolution horizontal accountability (i.e. – between the executive and parliament) has increased significantly, but without the corresponding vertical accountability (i.e. – between government and citizens). This has resulted in a competitive political system amongst business and political elites, but with only limited space for citizens in decision-making.[[4]](#footnote-4) This perspective is also noted by Civicus in its annual ranking of the space available in Kyrgyzstan for civil society to participate in the political system. By March 2021 it had rated Kyrgyzstan as a country where civil society space was “obstructed”.[[5]](#footnote-5)

The 2020 edition of *The Economist Democracy Index* also notes the decline in democratic space within Kyrgyzstan.[[6]](#footnote-6) The country now ranks 107 in the world and is ranked as a “hybrid regime”, meaning it has both democratic and authoritarian tendencies. The overall score for Kyrgyzstan is 4.21, the lowest it has been under this index since before the 2010 revolution. Speaking of Eastern Europe the report notes specifically the decline in Kyrgyzstan:

“…the Kyrgyz Republic is now moving closer to authoritarianism and registered the steepest score decline in eastern Europe in 2020, replacing Bosnia and Hercegovina as the lowest-scoring country in the “hybrid regime” category. The conduct of the parliamentary election was flawed which led to violent public unrest and the subsequent annulment of the results. After the annulment, the outgoing parliament approved the extension of its own term and appointed a prime minister who then used pressure to consolidate his power and assume the role of interim president. Unelected officials were allowed to operate without a proper system of checks and balances in place.”[[7]](#footnote-7)

Considering women’s political empowerment, Kyrgyzstan has seen a moderately negative change in its position, according to official data. The World Economic Forum’s Gender Gap Reports have shown little change in women’s position in society. In 2017 the country scored 0.130 (1.000 being a fully gender neutral political system) with regard to women’s political empowerment (a ranking of 92nd in the world). By 2021 the country had a score of 0.108 and was ranked 127 globally.[[8]](#footnote-8)

Amongst this dynamic political system, UNDP has been providing support to GoK and key institutions since Kyrgyzstan’s independence. This has included, from time to time, specific projects in support of the Parliament. In 2017 UNDP received a mandate to implement the *Strong and Inclusive Parliamentary Democracy* (SIPD) Project. The project was funded and designed by the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC) in partnership with UNDP and the Parliament. The project was formulated to provide technical advice and capacity development support to the two sides of the political space in which laws are approved and policy decisions are made. The first side (Outcome 1 of the project) was the “supply side” – the committees of the Parliament who conduct the detailed work of scrutinising draft laws and monitoring the work of GoK. The second side – the “demand side” (Outcome 2) – was focused on building the capacity of civil society and public councils to effectively articulate the voices of citizens and advocate for policy changes on their behalf.

SIPD – as is the norm with SDC-funded development projects in Eastern Europe– was to operate for ten years, divided amongst three phases. The first phase of the project was to end in 2021 with some expectation of renewal. However, with the October 2020 political crisis and the subsequent decisions of the new GoK to pursue constitutional reform focused on a shift away from a parliamentary democracy, SDC determined that it will end its funding of SIPD with the end of the first phase.

At the end of the first phase an independent final evaluation was anticipated from the start of the project. This report is the culmination of the process by which the evaluation was conducted.[[9]](#footnote-9)

## Methodology

Given the mandate provided to the evaluator by the ToR for this evaluation, it was important to consider the key components of the proposed review. Three key variables were identified:

**Timing:** The evaluation was conducted during the months of March and April 2021. Interviews were conducted by the evaluator over a three-week period. The final report will be delivered by mid-April.

**Stakeholders Engaged:** The evaluator engaged nearly all stakeholders that had worked with the Project since 2017. The project team produced a list of stakeholders, including beneficiaries, partners, project implementers (staff; technical advisers), implementers, counterparts and SDC/Swiss Embassy to ensure a focused approach to engagement that attempted to gather data and evidence from key stakeholders who can provide qualitative and quantitative evidence for the review.[[10]](#footnote-10)

**Approach:** Given the limited time to conduct the review and the need for remote engagement, the evaluator operated efficiently and effectively. The work was broken down into three stages:

* *Desk Review* – With the assistance of the UNDP Country Office in Kyrgyzstan the evaluator gathered a series of relevant documents that formed the initial basis for gathering of information and evidence.[[11]](#footnote-11)
* *Evidence Gathering* – Based on the initial desk review, the evaluator proceeded to collect the data and evidence: (i) to apply to questions listed in the Analytical Framework[[12]](#footnote-12); and (ii) upon which to base the analysis and findings for the evaluation report. In particular, the evaluator relied on the following tool as the primary means of evidence gathering:
	+ Semi-structured Interviews: The evaluator interviewed a sample of beneficiaries, stakeholder and partners which resulted in 69 interlocutors being interviewed for the review. Each interview lasted from 30-60 minutes.
* *Analysis, Findings & Reporting* – Once the evidence gathering stage was completed, the evaluator applied the evidence and data to indicators/questions listed in the analytical framework. This was followed with a presentation of preliminary findings to the project team. The evaluator then drafted this report and provided a draft to UNDP. Upon feedback and comments received, a final version of the report was produced and submitted.

## Limitations

There were a couple of potential challenges and limitations confronting the evaluation. First, the evaluation was conducted in the midst of a global pandemic which prevented the evaluator from traveling to Kyrgyzstan to participate directly in evidence-gathering. All interviews and interactions were conducted remotely through the Zoom video platform.

Second, as with almost all project evaluations, the evaluator made every effort to ensure that he was not reinforcing current biases that may arise from those that are engaged in the projects’ implementation. These include a tendency to interview more stakeholders from the government benches and for men’s voices to dominate. But it also includes a need to consider how the review is adjusted for response bias for those that may wish the work of the project to continue.

# Findings & Analysis

## Relevance

With a review of the project with regard to relevance as a criterion, the core consideration is the “…extent to which the intervention objectives and design respond to beneficiaries’ global, country, and partner/institution needs, policies, and priorities, and continue to do so if circumstances change”[[13]](#footnote-13). Unpacking this a bit, SIPD must be well-aligned with the national development priorities, the UNDPs Strategic Priorities in Kyrgyzstan, national framework documents, SDGs and SDC strategic priority policies. It is also important to consider if the design of the project had any impact on the ability of the project to achieve the results expected.

### Alignment with Development Priorities

*National Priorities*

The National Sustainable Development Strategy for Kyrgyzstan for the years 2013-2017 was being implemented at the time SIPD was formulated.[[14]](#footnote-14) The Strategy had a number of objectives expected to be achieved. This includes an objective specifically related to democratic governance:

2. Establishing a state governed by the rule of law and ensuring supremacy of law[[15]](#footnote-15)

Under this broad objective are a number of specific objectives, including ones specifically related to transparency, accountability and effective governance.

* *Combatting Corruption* – including a focus on the review of legislation through the lens of anti-corruption measures and principles;
* *Increasing the effectiveness and transparency of governance* – including specific provisions related to
	+ Building a stronger relationship between government and civil society;
	+ Improved public services;
	+ Greater accountability of government; and
	+ Establishing a system of checks and balances.

Considering these priorities, it is clear that SIPD was designed to reflect the same priorities. The two outcomes of the project are focused on the mirror relationship between parliament and civil society. The first outcome focuses on ensuring the parliament sets national strategic priorities based on citizens’ needs. The second outcome focuses on civil society capacity to effectively engage and advocate for its needs to parliament. The former is often referred to as the “supply side” of political governance and the latter as the “demand side”. But no doubt that the two outcomes are well-aligned with the national strategic priorities related to governance reform in Kyrgyzstan.

In addition, the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) also provide some focus on the planned work of the project. The SDGs were approved by all UN member states as part of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.[[16]](#footnote-16) The SDGs are a set of 17 Goals that are meant to define the development priorities at the global level with each member state developing their own set of priorities that reflect these Goals. Among them, SDG-16, speaks to a number of governance issues, including two specific targets that are relevant to the work of SIPD and the Parliament:

Target 16.6: Develop effective, accountable and transparent institutions

Target 16.7: Ensure responsive, inclusive and representative decision-making

Therefore, from these core national development documents it can be concluded that SIPD is well-aligned with GoK development priorities.

*UN & UNDP Priorities*

The United Nations (UN) priorities for a given country are defined in the UN Development Agreement Framework (UNDAF).[[17]](#footnote-17) The 2018-22 UNDAF has as a priority a focus on governance:

**Outcome 2:** By 2022, institutions at all levels are more accountable and inclusive ensuring justice, human rights, gender equality and sustainable peace for all

As part of this outcome, the UN system in Kyrgyzstan committed to work with GoK to achieve this outcome. In turn, UNDP established its Country Programme for the same period of time.[[18]](#footnote-18) That document defines UNDPs work in support of development in the country. This includes two outputs related to the work of the project:

**Output 2.1.** Core functions and capacity of parliament, key government institutions and local authorities strengthened for accountable, transparent and inclusive policymaking and implementation, as well as high-quality public service delivery; and

**Output 2.3.** Women and youth are empowered to participate in decision-making at national and local levels.

Based on these outputs it can be observed that the project is well-aligned with UN and UNDP development priorities, as the project was working at the intersection of parliament and civil society where space was to be created to allow for interactions and active citizen engagement in decision making.

*SDC Strategic Priorities*

The SDC operates in Kyrgyzstan through its strategic cooperation document. The document is the *Swiss Cooperation Strategy Central Asia (2017-2021).[[19]](#footnote-19)* The regional strategy reflects the same priorities for support as the Kyrgyz Cooperation Programme. In particular, the Regional Strategy notes the following with regard to the Swiss priorities in the country:

*“More specifically, in Kyrgyzstan, targeted action will promote increased public service coverage at local level; support increased efficiency and transparency in public financial management; and provide support to reinforce parliamentary systems enabling citizens to hold their government and parliament account- able.”[[20]](#footnote-20)*

Related to this regional document there is the *Switzerland-Kyrgyzstan Cooperation Programme (2017-2021).[[21]](#footnote-21)* The programme notes four priority areas for Swiss support – health, employment and economic development, **governance, institutions and decentralization**, and water, infrastructure and climate change. With regard to the governance, institutions and decentralization pillar, the goal is:

Public institutions deliver efficient and effective services in an inclusive way and are accountable to citizens. Civil society participates in decision-making processes.

One of the specific entry points for such work is noted as “strengthening parliamentary democracy”.

As a result of the national cooperation programme and the regional strategy, it is evident that the SDC engagement and funding of SIPD was directly linked to the strategic priorities of the Swiss Government.

### Project Design

Having noted that the project’s objectives are aligned with development priorities, the next step in its assessment is to determine if SIPD was designed to reflect appropriate outcomes and outputs with specific indicators and targets to measure the results related to their achievement.[[22]](#footnote-22)

*Outcomes & Outputs*

SIPD has an overarching impact objective, two outcomes and two outputs under each outcome.

|  |
| --- |
| **Overall Goal (Impact):** **Citizens benefit from responsive, inclusive and accountable institutions** |
| **Outcome 1:** Parliament sets national strategic priorities in accordance with citizens’ needs, and oversees their implementation by the government. |
| Output 1.1 | Selected parliamentary committees have established and apply consultation mechanisms with citizens, CSOs and local councils for improved consideration of people’s interests in national policy-making |
| 1.2 | Selected parliamentary committees are enabled to effectively oversee the implementation of national strategic priorities by corresponding government agencies |
| **Outcome 2:** Civil society actors promote active citizenship and effectively influence political processes to better serve the needs and priorities of the country’s citizens |
| 2.1 | The Civic Action Fund (CAF) has enabled a diverse range of original domestic civil society initiatives aimed at influencing political processes and promoting civic education |
| 2.2 | Public Councils effectively monitor and evaluate government performance, jointly with CSOs and Parliament |

The overall goal and the outcomes are clearly defined and are relevant to the work of the Parliament, development priorities and have a logical linkage between the two outcomes – one focused on the capacity of the Parliament to engage citizens in its work, while the other is focused on civils society capacity to engage the Parliament.

The four outputs, as defined in the project, were, if achieved, leading to the achievement of the two outcomes. The project should be applauded for a minimalist approach to outputs and outcomes, so as not to spread the project team’s focus too thin. On the other hand, the project could have been designed to unpack the work required to achieve the outcomes a little further. For example, Output 2.1 refers to the Civic Action Fund developed under SIPD, but some of the capacity development aspects of the work with civil society could have been further defined in a separate output, thus allowing for a focus specifically on capacity building for CSOs.

Output 2.2 is focused on Public Councils, a system of advisory and expert services aligned with line ministries. This output seems to be a bit of an outlier in a project focused on parliament and its engagement of civil society and citizens. It is a challenge to see the logical link between this output and the outcomes and overall goal of the project. The output attempts to make a link between the Councils and civil society and the Parliament. The results of the work related to this output will be analysed later in the report, but at the design stage the inclusion of this output should have been based on strong political economy, context and legal analysis to determine if this was a realistic output for results.

*Indicators & Targets*

An overarching principle in defining indicators and targets in a project document is to ensure they comply with five key standards are defined in what is known as SMART[[23]](#footnote-23) indicators – Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Realistic and Time-bound. In addition, given that SIPD was a multi-year project, there should be interim targets that should be achieved and measured for each year in the project life, which allows for incremental progress in achieving the final output target.

Looking at the indicators from a SMART perspective, most indicators do meet the five key components of the defined test. However, not all indicators meet the test. For example, the indicators and targets under Output 1.1 lack specificity. One indicator relates to “*Procedures for taking into account people’s needs are developed and implemented*” with a target that is also unclear (“*Clear procedures are applied*”). Another indicator under this output measures the number of coordinating meetings between parliamentary committees and CSOs, but it is questionable as to whether or not coordinating meetings are the proper measure of greater influence of citizens on the work of the committees. A better measure may have been the number of committee working groups established with CSO membership.

Another example can be observed under Output 1.2. One indicator speaks to the enquiries sent by parliamentary committees to the executive branch measured by how many are “evidence-based”, but this requires a measurement that is a mix of qualitative and quantitative data. In addition, the verification documents noted in the project Logframe do not relate to whether or not the enquiries were evidence-based.

There is also a need for interim targets to ensure incremental development progress can be achieved as the project was implemented. Without annual targets for each indicator there is a challenge in measuring progress until the final evaluation. This can result in less effective monitoring of the project and less of a focus on results achieved. The lack of such annual targets can also be a sign of a limited understanding of the expected inputs and how they will achieve results for each year of project implementation.

For example, under Outcome 1, one indicator measures the number of decisions on rectification issued by committees of the Parliament. The indicator has a final target of 20 decisions per target committee, but this does not include any interim targets. If the project had interim targets, it would ensure that each year there would be activities and effort exerted to progress towards achieving the target and, ultimately, achieving the output and outcome linked to the indicator. Without interim targets it is more challenging for the project team and beneficiaries to plan for increased capacity with incremental increases resulting finally in 20 decision being issued.

### Project Modality

The issue of the format by which the project was implemented is a critical point in this review. It will be discussed under this sub-section and the following one.

To start, decisions were made by SDC, as the donor, and UNDP, as the implementer, that had lasting implications for the project’s structure and, in turn, the project’s ability to achieve results.

SDC has a limited number of modalities for project implementation. One such option is to provide funding to a grantee who contributes at least 50% of the funding for the project from other sources (either internal or other donors). When this modality is applied the implementer is afforded more space to manage the project’s implementation. An example of this modality can be seen in the UNDP electoral support project in Kyrgyzstan, in which SDC is one of many donors to a basket fund that is used to implement the project.

In the case of SIPD, UNDP could not or did not have the additional sources of funding – either internally or externally[[24]](#footnote-24) – to meet the criteria for a grant. Instead, SDC determined that the project would be implemented through a MPI modality – one that is based on a contractor/donor relationship. This is why the project was awarded based on a direct contract through a tendering process.

From SDCs perspective, this modality required a more hands-on approach to the project’s implementation (the consequences of which will be discussed in the next sub-section). Suffice to say at this stage of the report that the choice of project modality had a negative impact on the project’s ability to achieve results.

|  |
| --- |
| **Lessons Learned: Relevance** |
| **1.1: Project outcome and output indicators must comply with SMART indicator criteria in order to be results-oriented and impactful**  |
| **1.2: Project modality has lasting implications that must be fully understood by all actors to ensure there is a clear understanding of the role of each actor in the project’s implementation.** |

## Efficiency

Efficiency, in terms of development evaluations, refers to the cost-effectiveness of the inputs of the project towards achieving results. As noted by OECD-DAC, efficiency means:

*The extent to which the intervention delivers, or is likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely way. Note: “Economic” is the conversion of inputs (funds, expertise, natural resources, time, etc.) into outputs, outcomes and impacts, in the most cost-effective way possible, as compared to feasible alternatives in the context. “Timely” delivery is within the intended timeframe, or a timeframe reasonably adjusted to the demands of the evolving context. This may include assessing operational efficiency (how well the intervention was managed).*

Looking at different components of the project’s implementation, there were some significant challenges with regard to the implementation of SIPD, but also some innovative approaches (i.e. – adaptive programming; competitive project grants) that showed promise.

### Implementation Modality

A decision was made prior to the commencement of the project with regard to the modality by which the project would be implemented. This decision had implications for the project’s results during Phase 1. SDC would prefer that they partner with other donors to implement a project with a maximum desired input of resources by SDC being 50% of the total costs of a project. This modality – used by the UNDP Kyrgyzstan CO for its electoral project – is viewed more as a partnership by SDC and, therefore, the level of monitoring and control of the project’s day-to-day activities are minimal.

A similar modality was discussed with regard to the implementation of SIPD; however, UNDP was not able to identify another donor and was only able to fund approximately 25% of the project costs from its own sources of funding. This resulted in SDC determining that another modality – known as a Mandate for Project Implementation (MPI) by the Swiss – would be required. This modality is more in line with a donor-contractor/implementer approach to project delivery. In practice, for SIPD, this meant a much more detail-oriented approach to monitoring by the SDC office in Kyrgyzstan.

Based on interviews conducted and documents reviewed for this evaluation, there are various perspectives and understandings as to the impact of the application of the MPI project modality. The common denominator can be seen in the fact that the relationship between the project team and SDC was challenging. There was an overabundance of engagement by SDC staff that at times was perceived as interference in the day-to-day management of the project. It can also be concluded that the turnover in staffing for the project (discussed further below) was at least in part due to the challenging relationship with SDC.

A good example of the challenges that arose from the project modality can be seen in the CAF grant call for proposals. An insufficiently targeted and unclear call for proposals and the absence of guidance to interested CSOs resulted in a delay in issuing grants to selected CSOs under Output 2.1. In September, 2017 the first call for grant applications was cancelled due to the reception of non-eligible proposals and lack of quality (i.e. – not contributing to the project goals). As a member of the Grant Evaluation Commission, SDC had a key role in the review of the applications starting with the first call in 2017 and rejected to agree to finance any proposals just to avoid reputational risks. It was observed by some that the cancelation of that first call for proposals did have some reputational impact for the project.

In addition, UNDPs is structured in almost all Country Offices (COs) to not only deliver projects, but to do so with some flexibility and autonomy. In Kyrgyzstan, UNDP has a long-standing relationship with multiple state institutions based on being an impartial, trusted and norms-based multilateral partner. By leveraging and brokering these relationships UNDP is able to achieve stronger results. If UNDP is required to act as a contractor to a project donor it has less flexibility to leverage such advantages. In addition, one of the selling points for UNDP to be a project implementer is the fact that it has global standard operating procedures that are implemented for all projects.

Yet due to a confluence of decisions and reactions SIPD was implemented differently and this had an impact on its ability to achieve results. For example, the turnover of project staff, which can be directly linked to the modality through which the project was implemented and the subsequent hands-on approach to the donor’s role in project implementation, caused some delay in how the project was implemented. Either directly due to new staff having to address a learning curve or indirectly as a result of UNDP having to manage a more complex relationship with the donor, the modality took some of the focus which could have been placed on project implementation and required greater effort to respond to ongoing management issues.

### Technical Advice

Democratic governance projects, and political governance projects in particular, are based on the transfer of knowledge that will allow for cultural and personal behavioural change that will allow for the application and, eventual institutionalisation, of best practices. This will then lead to more effective, accountable, open and inclusive governance institutions, as promoted in SDG-16.

In the case of SIPD, the project was able to provide technical advice in a cost-efficient manner. This was achieved through a variety of sources of technical capacity. To start, the project had access to a UNDPs Chief Technical Adviser on the Rule of Law based in the CO. By the final year of the project, this person had dedicated approximately 20% of his time to provision of advice to the project team and beneficiaries.

Second, the project relied on national technical experts that were contracted to implement certain activities and even outputs. For example, the provision of budget analysis expertise for the Parliament’s Budget and Finance Committee was provided by SSG Consultants, based in Bishkek, that contracted two national experts that provided ongoing advice and support to the committee.

A third approach involved the engagement of CSOs. Through the call for proposals and the competitive selection of specific CSOs to implement pilot projects, SIPD was indirectly offering technical advice to the Parliament, its committees and MPs. This can be seen, as one example, through the project implemented by the Association of Non-Commercial Organisations for Children. That group supported the Social Affairs Committee to establish a specific working group (with the CSO as a member of that group) to conduct public hearings and then develop a draft law that amended the Law on Social Benefits to make the legislation more inclusive for children.

In all three modalities employed by SIPD, the project provided quality technical advice that achieved results, while doing so with no excessive costs associated with the advice. The use of a part-time technical adviser within UNDP, combined with short-term national expertise and CSO capacity, has enabled the project to ensure timely access to quality advice for the Parliament.

### Management Structure

SIPD was implemented through a dedicated project team which reported to a Project Steering Committee. The Steering Committee consisted of representatives of UNDP, SDC (donor), Parliament (beneficiary) and other partners. The Steering Committee met once a year to provide strategic direction on the implementation of the project. The project team was led by the full-time Project Coordinator and included a Chief Technical Adviser (20% part-time), a full-time project specialist and project administrative assistant and a project assistant (50% time). In 2019 a full-time Grants Manager post was added to the project team.

Given the ambition of SIPDs proposed results, the project team was likely too small for the volume of work to be delivered. This was particularly the case for the management of the CSO grants (discussed below in more detail). But overall, the workload for the project team was significant. Coupled with the challenges of managing a project with significant donor interjection, it should not be a surprise that there was a significant turnover in the staffing for the project.

On two separate occasions the project team departed *en masse*. The first was in 2018 and the second time was late in 2019. The turnover in staffing for the project was a concern noted by some beneficiaries and partners of the project. It required the need for stakeholders to build new relationships with the project team, as reconstituted and to restart the decision-making process with regard to project activities.

A second challenge was with the management of the CSO grants. In retrospect, the amount of work required to manage the grants was underestimated. The UNDP CO developed and implemented the CAF grants in line with UNDPs Low Value Grants Operational Guide.[[25]](#footnote-25) The Guide provides a comprehensive approach to the management of such grants. Yet there were still challenges that required adaptation and support from the project team. Efforts were made to provide capacity development, particularly with regard to report writing and M&E, with trainings conducted in 2019 and 2020. Despite these efforts, the reporting by the CSOs on the funding received was not consistent. Some CSOs, usually those with experience in working with donors, had a good sense of what was required in their reports. Others, usually more inexperienced or newer CSOs, struggled to report their results. The CAF grants could have benefited from a more enhanced initial capacity assessment of each potential grantee. It could have also benefited from sufficient, dedicated staff within the project to manage the grant processes. Alternatively, more experienced CSOs can mentor or partner with newer or less experienced CSOs to support their capacity to propose, implement and report on grants received.

|  |
| --- |
| **Lessons Learned: Efficiency** |
| **2.1: SIPD would have benefited from a clear delineation of roles between UNDP and SDC in the daily management and implementation of the project, with UNDP given the space to manage the project with limited interventions from the donor.** |
| **2.2: Grant management can be a complex process that would benefit from the pre-assessment of potential grantees to ensure capacity to implement and report on grants received.** |
| **2.3: Consistent, timely and quality technical advice – no matter its source – is a key component to achieving results with a political governance project** |

**Supporting Migrant Families to Access Social Benefits**

Through a grant provided by SIPD, the Association of NGOs in Support of the Rights of Children in Kyrgyzstan established a working relationship with the Social Affairs Committee of the Parliament. The objective was to inform the committee on the current rules under the law with regard to children’s access to social benefits. These included the lack of benefits generally for children, despite this being known as one of the most effective means of alleviating poverty. It also included advocacy related to access to benefits for migrant families and the introduction of a child benefit those younger than 1 and one-half years of age.

The CSO had worked with the committee previously, but in a less hands-on manner. In 2019 the CSO worked with the committee to establish a committee working group with MPs, government officials and CSO representation. The working group conducted consultations in Bishkek, Naryn and Talas before developing a methodology for reviewing the Kyrgyz *Law on Social Benefits*. Once the methodology was adopted by the committee, the Association supported consultations between the committee stakeholders, including two focus group meetings, a survey with more than 1,000 participants and 13 separate engagements between the committee and advocate groups.

The work of the committee resulted in 2020 in the recognition of the need to amend the *Law on Social Benefits* to ensure that those families that are residing in an “unofficial” residence (i.e. – a different residence from the address where they are officially registered) can access social benefits. The methodical approach of the Association to build a trusted relationship with the committee, provide technical assistance and to broker citizen engagements, resulted in the law being changed to the benefit of those most in need.

## Effectiveness

When considering effectiveness as an evaluation criterion, it is important to focus on whether or not the project has achieved results. At the end point of Phase 1 the expectation is to determine if the project has achieved results. For this review we will take each of the two outcomes and review the results achieved in delivery of the project.

Before reviewing each outcome, though, it is important to reiterate that the project has been implemented under extremely challenging circumstances. Since early 2020 the COVID-19 Pandemic has impacted almost all aspects of life across the globe and the implementation of development projects in Kyrgyzstan is no exception. In addition, the political turmoil of October 2020 resulting in the change in government and a new process for constitutional reform, has also impacted the ability of SIPD and its various implementing partners to implement the project This report would be remiss if it did not acknowledge that the implementation of the project has been challenged by such major events and its ability to achieve results.

Having noted this caveat, the project did achieve significant results.

**Outcome 1:**

**Parliament sets national strategic priorities in accordance with citizens’ needs, and oversees their implementation by the government.**

**ACHIEVED**

*Committees*

For Outcome 1 there were two primary components (i.e. – outputs) that were expected to be delivered by the implementers to achieve the outcome. First, the project would work with a select number of the Parliament’s committees to expand their capacity to engage citizens in the policy making process. Second, the project would work with committees to enhance their capacity for monitoring key strategic government priorities.

Measured by the indicators and targets identified in the project document, it may be argued that many of those measures were not fully achieved by the project. However, stepping back and looking at the work of the project, it is clear that the Outcome has been achieved.

There are two components to the first output. First, the project was to support the Parliament in playing a key role in setting national strategic priorities. Second, this was to be done based on gathering and knowing the needs of the citizens of Kyrgyzstan.

Looking at the second component first, there were clear indications of increased citizen participation in the work of the Parliament and its committees. To start, the project directly engaged the parliament and its committees to build their capacity to engage citizens. This can be seen in the development of the Open Parliament Action Plan and the Communication Strategy. Both documents contributed reforms within the institution, such as the revised, more interactive website.

Committees also received direct technical support to develop good practices with regard to engagement. This included support for field visits and public hearings for select committees, such as the Social Affairs Committee and the Budget and Finance Committee. The support to the Budget and Finance Committee resulted in a new, more participatory, approach to approval of Annual State Budget resolutions that define mid-term budget priorities for GoK. In 2018 SIPD supported the initial engagement of the public and CSOs by the committee prior to the resolution being adopted by the committee and Parliament.

The Parliament also revised its processes for receiving inputs into draft laws. Previously, the only means of commenting on a draft law by civil society or a citizen was to submit a comment via e-mail to the initiator of the draft law. It is expected to upgrade the website that will allow the Parliament to have the capacity to have direct comments on draft laws via its website. Through the Parliament’s Scientific Research Centre, the Parliament will have the capacity to aggregate and tabulate such comments and provide them to the relevant committee as it scrutinises a draft law.

Indirectly, the project also supported enhanced citizen engagement. The CAF grants included a number of pilot projects where CSOs supported committees of the Parliament to engage relevant citizens. For example, the pilot project implemented by the Union of Local Self-Governments (LSGs) was focused on ensuring consultations with those governments by Parliament prior to passing new laws related to their work.

The second component of the output is to adopt legislative and policy changes based on the inputs of citizens. A number of new and amended laws were adopted due to the work of the project. For example, the Law on Social Benefits was amended, based on citizen needs, to allow for social benefits to be paid to migrant families not living at their official address.

Other changes to laws included the revisions to the Family Code that reflect a stronger system of alimony and child support payments for divorced couples. The changes to the legal framework for alimony were the result of a concerted effort by civil society and a small number of women MPs to address a social issue that was negatively impacting a significant proportion of women and families. The work in achieving the amendments to the Code included a broad consultation with affected citizens and technical support for such amendments.

Output 1.2 focuses on the role of Parliament in monitoring the work of the government. SIPD was to enhance the capacity of select parliamentary committees to conduct oversight. Key results related to this work included the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) framework adopted by the Parliament. The M&E Framework was developed in 2019 through one of the Parliamentary Working Groups that received support from SIPD. The working group received technical support from the project as it developed a draft framework, with two specific methodologies (one for review of laws, the other for review of policies), that was submitted to the Parliament for approval.

In addition, the project and CAF grantees worked with select committees to develop oversight methodologies that have been adopted by those committees for their oversight work. For example, Civic Union worked with the Law and Order Committee to develop a specific process for monitoring police and security sector programming. The Budget and Finance Committee also received from SIPD high quality technical analysis and support. Two national technical experts were contracted by the project to conduct budget analysis and provide such analysis to the Committee in a timely manner as it conducted its review of the annual state budget.

The work on oversight was to be culminated with a change in the Parliament’s legal framework to reflect a new approach to such work. Unfortunately, efforts to adopt an Oversight Law fell short, but the process by which the draft law was developed, including the piloting of M&E tools with two committees – Law & Order and Social Affairs – did achieve a level of new capacity. The hands-on approach to developing and testing the tools with the committees provided direct knowledge transfer to MPs and committee staff. The adoption of the M&E framework through resolution of the Parliament has provided some institutionalisation of the framework.

Separately, support to the Budget and Finance Committee provided opportunities for oversight to be conducted in a participatory manner. The Committee conducted consultations with citizens that were enhanced by support from SIPD. For example, the Committee conducted a series of consultations and public hearings on the National Health Insurance Framework. This included a number of forums held outside of Bishkek. Based on feedback from citizens and CSOs, funding was increased in the annual state budget to reflect some of the citizens’ needs.

Staff working with the Parliament’s committees also received targeted capacity development. The project provided technical assistance to the Parliament to conduct a functional analysis in 2018, but it was not completed due to changes in the political context. A less ambitious attempt to assess the capacity of the staff was conducted in late 2019. As a result of that assessment the project engaged the Academy of Management under the President as state educational institution which in turn resulted in development and provision of three dedicated courses for parliamentary staff – communications, management and analytical capacities. Sixty parliamentary staff completed the courses (20/course).

*Working Groups*

In addition to the work with select parliamentary committees planned under Outcome 1, the project also developed an alternative means of engagement that was also an important tool for achieving the outcome. In the first two years of the project’s implementation (2017-18) the traction attained with the three preferred committees – Constitutional Legislation; Social Affairs; and Budget and Finance – was mixed. For example, the relationship between the project and the Budget and Finance Committee developed positively and quickly, allowing for almost immediate opportunities for new approaches to the committees work.

On the other hand, the relationship with the Social Affairs Committee was more complex. At first there was a lack of interest in engaging the project, at least partially due to the internal politics of the committee itself. Over time and with a recalculation of how to engage the committee, the project was able to see results. In particular, the use of CAF grants to allow select CSOs, such as the Association of NGOs for the Rights of Children, to build a working relationship with the Social Affairs Committee that resulted in broad public consultations and changes to the rules for social benefits in Kyrgyzstan.

A critical component of the adaptive approach to project implementation was the use of working groups within the Parliament to advance the technical work required to produce substantive reforms. With the challenges observed in engaging some committees, the project adapted to sue working groups to advance reforms. There were two types of working groups. The first type of working group was a Parliament Working Group, meaning the group reported to the Parliament (as compared to a specific committee). Three such Working Groups were supported by the project – Open Parliament Initiative, Nationalisation of SDGs and Monitoring and Evaluation.

Much of the work done by these groups was vital to the advancement of concrete proposals for reform within the Parliament’s structure and procedures. These groups were essential to the process of not only providing technical support to the Parliament, but also for building a stronger relationship with civil society. Specifically referring to the Open Parliament Initiative Working Group, the fact that CSOs were at the table and built a strong relationship with MPs in the Group was a key factor in later opportunities for collaboration and results.

As a result of the work with the Parliamentary Working Groups, the establishment of committee working groups with CSO representation became more common. From the CAF grants a number of CSOs engaged specific committees – notably the Social Affairs Committee and the Law & Order Committee – to advocate for more effective oversight methods and the promotion of law reforms. One of the tools to build those key relationships between the CSOs and committees was to establish committee working groups that would have CSO membership. Though these types of working groups were legally possible prior to the work of the project, the frequency and the role of CSOs did improve with support from the project, resulting in a more collaborative approach to law-making and oversight with a key role for civil society at the technical or working level.

For example, Civic Union, a national CSO, received funding to engage with the Law and Order Committee to promote more effective police oversight. In early 2019, the CSO initially faced resistance from the committee, particularly the committee staff, many of whom were former security personnel. By establishing the committee working group, the CSO not only introduced new technical tools for oversight of the security sector, but also built trusted relationships with MPs and staff affiliated with the committee. This did not occur overnight. There were extensive opportunities for engagement, including a field visit to Jalalabad in July 2019, engagement of select government and civil society actors and training sessions. This resulted in a working relationship that, in turn, established new committee oversight methodologies. It also resulted, beyond the scope of the initial CAF grant, in the drafting of a Crime Prevention Draft Law that is currently being debated in the Parliament.

By engaging in support to these two types of working groups, the project was able to show it was capable of adapting to the circumstances within the Parliament. It was also adapting to the context under which the project as operating. When designed, the project did not envision work in support of security sector oversight or open parliament, but both of these issues became key results for the project based on its ability to pivot to work with the working groups.

But the work in support of the working groups was also part of the process by which the project built trusted relationships with the Parliament, its staff and MPs. The process of building such trust may take some time and may require a number of adjustments and starts and stops, but the end result of such an investment is greater opportunities for the introduction, testing and adopting of procedural reforms that will make the Parliament more inclusive and participatory. SIPD was able to take advantage of a parliamentary tool, such as the working groups, and adapted in such a way as to introduce a robust role for civil society to participate in the work of the institution.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Output | Status |
| 1.1 | Selected parliamentary committees have established and apply consultation mechanisms with citizens, CSOs and local councils for improved consideration of people’s interests in national policy-making | **Achieved** |
| 1.2 | Selected parliamentary committees are enabled to effectively oversee the implementation of national strategic priorities by corresponding government agencies | **Achieved** |
| 2.1 | The Civic Action Fund (CAF) has enabled a diverse range of original domestic civil society initiatives aimed at influencing political processes and promoting civic education | **Achieved** |
| 2.2 | Public Councils effectively monitor and evaluate government performance, jointly with CSOs and Parliament | **Not Achieved** |

**Amending the Family Code to Improve Rules on Alimony**

SIPD supported the Centre of Political and Legal Studies (CPLS) with a CAF grant to develop and pilot a methodology for citizen-MP dialogue. As a result of the interactions and MP, Aisuluu Mamashova, identified a concern with regard to women being able to access child support and alimony from their ex-spouse. The current law had many gaps that resulted in such support being the second largest type of case before the courts in Kyrgyzstan. In 2019, the MP introduced a draft law, with technical assistance from CPLS, to amend the *Family Code* to address insufficiencies in the provision of alimony and child support. The draft law made amendments that would:

* Strengthen the rights of women to access alimony;
* Sets a minimum amount for child support for each child between seven and 14 years of age;
* Barring exemptions from such payments; and
* Limits of international travel where non-payment.

In June, 2020, the draft law was approved by Parliament and signed into law by the President in August the same year.

<https://spotlightinitiative.org/news/how-women-are-changing-kyrgyzstans-alimony-laws-better>

<https://cabar.asia/en/divorce-and-alimony-what-do-women-in-kyrgyzstan-struggle-for-in-courts>

**Outcome 2:**

**Civil society actors promote active citizenship and effectively influence political processes to better serve the needs and priorities of the country’s citizens**

**PARTIALLY ACHIEVED**

Outcome 2 focuses on the “demand” side of political governance with a focus on enhancing the capacity of civil society and public councils to effectively advocate and articulate their concerns and those of citizens into the decision-making process of government and parliament in Kyrgyzstan.

Output 2.1 was generally achieved. The output establishes a Civic Action Fund (CAF) that funded bespoke pilot projects by CSOs focused on (i) influencing the political decision-making process; and (ii) enhancing civic education as it relates to the work of the Parliament. In the end, 16 grants were issued and pilot projects implemented through two calls for proposals.

With regard to CSOs influencing the policy-making process, there are a number of strong examples of how the projects funded by SIPD achieved results. For example, the project provided funding to PF Plus, a national CSO focused on the rights of people with disabilities (PwDs), particularly those with hearing and sight deficiencies. The pilot project itself was focused on making the information about the Parliament accessible to PwDs. But, in addition to that effort, the CSO built a coalition that went beyond the work of the pilot project. Advocacy from the coalition resulted in a campaign to achieve the first citizen initiative to have a draft law debated in the Parliament on the use of sign language in post-secondary learning. Tapping into its network of members, and working with another CAF grantee (the Centre for Political and Legal Studies), PF Plus has come closer than any other group in achieving the 10,000 signature threshold for an initiative to be tabled in the Parliament.

In addition, as part of its advocacy work, PF Plus attended meetings at the Parliament. In the process of doing so, its members noted the lack of accessibility for PwDs to enter the Parliament buildings. Their concerns were raised with the Social Affairs Committee and the Parliament’s Administration. When there was no initial action, the CSO implemented an advocacy campaign, including the engagement of the media to expose their concern. Eventually, a wheelchair ramp was built to allow access to the building.

The grants issued for civic education were less impactful, but still generated some results. One challenge was the fact that there were a number of such grants that had similar methodologies and target groups, yet the coordination amongst the grantees seemed limited. The results may have been greater if there were early interventions and planning from the project to ensure strategic guidance, coordination and the brokering of collaboration amongst grantees. A number of programs and modules were developed, but only one was able to reach the point of adoption as a fully endorsed and approved programme. Youth of Osh – a regional CSO – received funding from SIPD to develop curriculum on the political system and role of parliament in Kyrgyzstan. They signed an MOU with National Academy of Education, which allowed for their successful piloting of their curriculum to be adopted by the Academy as a national curriculum that can be used by teachers.

Output 2.2 of SIPD focused on the capacity development of the Public Councils. The Councils are a unique Kyrgyzstan model of advisory bodies that support the work of the line ministries within GoK. Each line ministry has a council made up of technical experts related to their field of work. For example, the Public Council for the Ministry of Finance has a number of economists as members. Established in 2010, their mandate is three fold – to monitor budget spending, promote living standards for citizens and improve the quality of public services.

SIPD worked with the Public Councils Coordinating Group to engage three parliamentary committees – Budget and Finance; Social Affairs; and Constitutional Legislation – to develop a standard methodology for monitoring government activities that would integrate the work of the councils with the work of the parliamentary committees. A standard methodology was drafted but was never approved by the Parliament, but was endorsed by the Public Councils Coordination Group. The project also supported the Coordinating Group to develop and approve its new Strategic Plan (2019-20).

However, the work of the project in support of the Public Councils faced significant challenges. To start, until mid-2018 there was no functioning Coordinating Group to which the project could engage. By mid-2019 the work with the Councils was delayed once again, this time due to the election of the Council members. In 2020, as with most things globally, the pandemic prevented capacity development support, including key trainings for Council members.

As a result of the efforts and challenges noted, there is no indication of institutional change that came about as a result of the support provided by the project and the relationship between the Parliament and the councils was not developed to the same extent observed between the Parliament and civil society.

Overall, the project was able to achieve results at the outcome level. More citizens were engaged by the Parliament as a result of the work of SIPD. That increased engagement did result in changes to government policies that benefited citizens who did engage. Oversight was enhanced and government spending and programmes were adjusted based on Parliament’s work in monitoring the government. These results were achieved, in part, through the provision of support to CSOs to more effectively engage the Parliament, its committees and the MPs. Stronger, trusted relationships were developed between key CSOs and key MPs, committees and parliamentary working groups. These new relationships are multi-faceted, with an exchange of information and expertise alongside the facilitation of citizen voices into the work of the Parliament. A synergy developed within the project where these separate outputs and outcomes were able to create an eco-system within political governance that allowed for a stronger dialogue between citizens and their elected representatives.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Objective/Outcome** | **Status** |
| **Overall Goal (Impact):** Citizens benefit from responsive, inclusive and accountable institutions | **Achieved** |
| **Outcome 1:** Parliament sets national strategic priorities in accordance with citizens’ needs, and oversees their implementation by the government. | **Achieved** |
| **Outcome 2:** Civil society actors promote active citizenship and effectively influence political processes to better serve the needs and priorities of the country’s citizens | **Partially Achieved** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Lessons Learned: Effectiveness** |
| **3.1: The project was most effective where it acted as a knowledge broker and facilitator to establish and support dynamic relationships between the Parliament on the one side and technical expertise and CSO perspective on the other side** |
| **3.2: Results are more likely to be achieved where the Parliament, its committees and MPs build trusted relationships with partners and those relationships are leveraged over time to introduce new approaches and ideas** |
| **3.3: Competitive pilot project funding is more impactful then non-competitive grants, as the former awards those CSOs that are able to build and deliver innovative, cost-effective approaches to engaging the Parliament** |
| **3.4: The project benefited from an adaptive approach to programming that recognised that some interventions will fail, but that the long-term objective will be achieved through the lesson learned from such failures.**  |

## Sustainability

Sustainability, as an evaluation criterion, focuses on the extent to which the results achieved will extend beyond the life of the project. It is intended to measure the long-term effect of the project on the beneficiaries of its work.[[26]](#footnote-26)

### Sustainable Space for Dialogue

The major area where sustainability of project activities could be observed was with regard to the relationship between civil society and the Parliament. SIPDs efforts to facilitate or convene space for such a relationship to flourish was visible in numerous activities. By all accounts, there was a relationship between the two entities prior to the project commencing, but in the past four years there has been an evolution in the relationship. Previously, the interactions between CSOs and Parliament were more *pro forma* or *ad hoc*.

With the support of the project, there are clear indications of a more robust, ongoing and nuanced relationship. Parliament, especially through its committees, has a better understanding of the added value of CSOs. CSOs have assumed a multi-faceted role in support of the Parliament, including policy advocacy, technical expertise and opinion aggregators.

This new relationship can be seen through a number of examples of the work of the project:

* **Open Parliament Initiative Working Group:** Though not an initial priority for SIPD, once GoK joined the OGP, the Parliament fully embraced the need for its own action plan. The project was able to support the collaboration between CSOs and Parliament through the working group. This working group was a new model for CSO engagement and one that has become more common subsequently.
* **Law and Order Committee:** Grants provided to specific CSOs to work with the committee resulted in a trusted relationship between the two groups and the adoption of oversight rules and new legislation related to crime prevention.
* **Social Affairs Committee:** Separate funding of CSO projects with this committee also resulted in a new, trusted relationship that has resulted in changes to legislation and greater engagement of citizens.
* **Improved external communications:** The project’s support to the Parliament’s Press Service has allowed for a new, more open, approach to the work of the institution. In 2020 livestreaming of committee meetings was commenced with support from SIPD. The website of the Parliament is being redesigned to allow for more direct input from citizens into the work of the Parliament. In the past, if someone wanted to make a comment on a draft law, for example, they would be required to send their comments via e-mail to the imitator of the draft law. The new website is expected to allow for direct comment on a draft law and the accumulation and aggregation of such comments to be shared with a committee considering the draft law.

### Changes to Procedures and Processes

A second area where the project achieved sustainable results was with regard to the processes and procedures employed by the Parliament. In particular, there were two key processes that were revised and enhanced with support from the project:

**Oversight Procedures:** Though the end result was not the adoption of new legislation related to the oversight function of the Parliament, the project was able to pilot and establish, *de facto*, a series of new measures and methods for conducting oversight. The testing of oversight procedures by CSOs and technical experts with the Law and Order Committee and the Social Affairs Committee resulted in the adoption of a resolution by Parliament to recognise the new methods as a standard practice.

**Transparency:** As with oversight, the ultimate goal of the adoption of an Open Parliament Action Plan was not achieved, but, *de facto*, the Parliament has started to implement many of the provisions from the plan. This includes the updating of the website to be more active in seeking citizen input, the livestreaming of committee meetings and a revised process for publishing draft laws to allow time for public input.

**Civic Education:** SIPDs support to civic education also showed sustainable results. A number of CSOs were funded to develop civic education programmes, each with a somewhat different approach. At least one of those projects, implemented by *Youth for Osh* resulted in education modules being approved for distribution to post-secondary institutions by the national Academy of Education.

In addition, this report would be remiss if it did not note that a number of laws and procedures were amended through support from SIPD. These include:

* + - Law Amending the Investment Law;
		- Crime Prevention Law;
		- Amendments to Law on Social Benefits;
		- M&E Framework adopted for Parliament;
		- Amendments to the Annual State Budget;
		- Family Code amendments related to the regulation of alimony obligations;
		- Parliamentary resolution on approval of the monitoring and evaluation of the laws and programs;
		- Law on Republican Budget for 2020 and forecast for 2021-2022;
		- Law on Mandatory Medical Insurance for 2020 and Forecast for 2021-2022; and
		- Parliamentary Decree on Approval of Budget Resolution for 2020 and Forecast for 2021-2022.

|  |
| --- |
| **Lessons Learned: Sustainability** |
| **4.1: The project’s focus on facilitating relationships between CSOs and Parliament resulted in the establishment of sustainable relationships** |
| **4.2: The project showed that sustainability does not only come from changes to legal frameworks, but by cultural and behavioural changes that can occur where piloting new approaches occurs** |

## Gender

It is important to note that overall the project benefited greatly from MPs who were champions of change and gender equality. This group of MPs was a small percentage of the total 120 MPs, but their ability to steer the project activities through the Parliament for *de jure* and *de facto* change was critical to the success of the project. And amongst those MP champions, some of the most effective MPs at facilitating change were women MPs who had key leadership posts, such as a Vice-Speaker and a Committee Chairperson.

SIPDs work related to gender equality was both results-oriented and integrated into the broader outcomes and outputs of the project. To start with the latter point, SIPD was designed without any specific outputs and/or outcomes related to gender equality. The quality assurance review that occurs within UNDP prior to the approval of project may have flagged this as an issue. However, in retrospect, not having a specific, dedicated output or sub-output related to gender goals was actually a liberating approach to the project’s implementation. Instead of gender equality being ring-fenced and the focus of one output, the project was free to ensure gender equality-oriented activities were mainstreamed throughout the project.

To start, in 2020, SIPD worked with the Vice-Speaker of the Parliament (a senior woman MP), the Forum of Women MPs and others to support the establishment of the Council on Women's Rights and Prevention of Gender-based Violence under the Speaker of the Parliament. The Council supports efforts to promote gender equality and women’s empowerment, including changes to key legislation. The Council comprises relevant MPs, nine CSOs and representatives from state institutions. Prior to the Council being created there was no Parliamentary-level committee and/or designated body to deal specifically with gender equality.

In 2018-19 the project worked with the Forum of Women MPs to develop and approve a Roadmap on Gender Sensitivity in Parliament. The action plan provided a clear set of objectives, including the provision of technical advice and analysis on the gaps in the Parliament rules and the main national legislation with regard to gender equality. The project, in addition to such analysis, also supported targeted trainings on gender analysis tools related to the scrutiny of draft legislation.

More specifically, Outputs 1.1 and 1.2 are related to building the capacity of the Parliament’s committees to conduct their law-making and oversight functions in and effective and participatory manner. For both of these outputs there were key interventions related to gender equality. For the law-making output, SIPD contracted two CSOs, through a competitive selection process, to support the Parliament’s Forum of Women MPs to support a process of developing draft law proposals related to gender-based violence, sexual harassment and domestic violence.

The CSOs worked with the Forum of Women MPs to conduct field visits outside of Bishkek to hear from local women and organisations. The CSOs also provided technical advice to the Forum to support the analysis and drafting of proposals for amending relevant laws. The relationship with the Forum has been nurtured over a number of years and the Forum is a venue within the Parliament that is open to collaborating with CSOs. To date there have been no amendments to laws, but the proposed amendments to the Law on Domestic Violence are close to final approval in the Parliament.

In addition, one CSO was contracted to work with the Women’s Forum on developing a gender roadmap for the Parliament. The roadmap was drafted after a series of consultations and field visits. The roadmap was adopted by the Forum. An effort to amend the Parliament’s procedures to require gender impact analysis for all its work was rejected. However, the process by which the roadmap was developed is a model that can be replicated for other gender-related legal framework amendments.

The CAF grant provided to CPLS resulted in changes to the Family Code that allow for better enforcement and collection of alimony and child support benefits. The CSO supported the establishment of an MP-citizen dialogue forum which resulted in one MP gaining a better understanding of the impact of the current alimony rules. As a result of such consultations the MP drafted amendments to the Family Code, with technical support from CPLS, that were eventually adopted and approved by Parliament that will enhance the rules for alimony and child support to the benefit of women and girls.

With regard to the oversight work by committees, the project funded pilot projects by national and local CSOs to support their engagement with committees. Amongst these pilot projects was work directly related to issues of importance to women and girls. For example, the project provided funding to establish migrant family advocacy groups. Many families have migrated from their registered address to larger urban centres for work purposes. The law in Kyrgyzstan did not allow these families to receive social benefits at their unofficial address. The project supported field visits and consultations, along with the establishment and support to a small number of advocacy groups, that resulted in the Law on Social benefits being amended to allow such families to receive the benefits to which they are entitled.

The project also worked with UNDPs global project on Parliaments, Women, Peace and Security, through Norwegian funding) to pilot the support to the Parliament’s Women’s Forum to develop a Women, Peace and Security (WPS) roadmap, consultations and field visits to advance the agenda on women’s role in establishing and maintaining peace.

The examples noted show a pattern in the work of SIPD. By working with qualified CSOs to build long-term, trusted relationships with MPs and committees, the space created for such dialogue has resulted in numerous opportunities for specific issues to be raised, discussed, analysed and reforms proposed. Not all reforms are approved, but the process by which such reforms have resulted in strong proposals has allowed for a lasting capacity and space for ongoing advocacy, dialogue and reforms related to gender equality and the rights of women and girls.

|  |
| --- |
| **Lessons Learned: Gender Equality** |
| **5.1: Instead of defining a specific output or outcome related to gender equality, a project should strive to ensure that gender equality is integrated into all aspects of its work through targeted indicators and measurement of results.** |
| **5.2: The project built capacity of women MPs through the hands-on application of tools and procedures. This showed itself to be more results-oriented than a more traditional approach of knowledge sharing through static events (i.e. – trainings; seminars).** |
| **5.3: Identifying and providing technical support to champions of gender equality in a parliament is critical to developing women as leaders within the institution.** |
| **5.4: A project should focus on brokering relationships and establishing space for dialogue amongst political actors and then allowing such actors to organically develop networks and coalitions that promote gender equality.** |

# Lessons Learned

#

|  |
| --- |
| **Lessons Learned: Relevance** |
| **1.1: Project outcome and output indicators must comply with SMART indicator criteria in order to be results-oriented and impactful**  |
| **1.2: Project modality has lasting implications that must be fully understood by all actors to ensure there is a clear understanding of the role of each actor in the project’s implementation.** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Lessons Learned: Efficiency** |
| **2.1: SIPD would have benefited from a clear delineation of roles between UNDP and SDC in the daily management and implementation of them project, with UNDPO given the space to manage the project with limited interventions from the donor.** |
| **2.2: Grant management can be a complex process that would benefit from the pre-assessment of potential grantees to ensure capacity to implement and report on grants received.** |
| **2.3: Consistent, timely and quality technical advice – no matter its source – is a key component to achieving results with a political governance project** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Lessons Learned: Effectiveness** |
| **3.1: The project was most effective where it acted as a knowledge broker and facilitator to establish and support dynamic relationships between the Parliament on the one side and technical expertise and CSO perspective on the other side** |
| **3.2: Results are more likely to be achieved where the Parliament, its committees and MPs build trusted relationships with partners and those relationships are leveraged over time to introduce new approaches and ideas** |
| **3.3: Competitive pilot project funding is more impactful then non-competitive grants, as the former awards those CSOs that are able to build and deliver innovative, cost-effective approaches to engaging the Parliament** |
| **3.4: The project benefited from an adaptive approach to programming that recognised that some interventions will fail, but that the long-term objective will be achieved through the lesson learned from such failures.**  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Lessons Learned: Sustainability** |
| **4.1: The project’s focus on facilitating relationships between CSOs and Parliament resulted in the establishment of sustainable relationships** |
| **4.2: The project showed that sustainability does not only come from changes to legal frameworks, but by cultural and behavioural changes that can occur where piloting new approaches occurs** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Lessons Learned: Gender Equality** |
| **5.1: Instead of defining a specific output or outcome related to gender equality, a project should strive to ensure that gender equality is integrated into all aspects of its work through targeted indicators and measurement of results.** |
| **5.2: The project built capacity of women MPs through the hands-on application of tools and procedures. This showed itself to be more results-oriented than a more traditional approach of knowledge sharing through static events (i.e. – trainings; seminars)** |
| **5.3: Identifying and providing technical support to champions of gender equality in a parliament is critical to developing women as leaders within the institution.** |
| **5.4: A project should focus on brokering relationships and establishing space for dialogue amongst political actors and then allowing such actors to organically develop networks and coalitions that promote gender equality.** |

# Recommendations

1. **UNDPs support to the Parliament must continue, despite constitutional reforms that shift to a presidential political system**

Recent transitions from parliamentary to presidential political systems (e.g. – Turkey; Sri Lanka) have shown that the Parliament will continue to play a vital role in law-making (even if no longer an exclusive role). This is despite the establishment of presidentially-mandated commissions and councils that were expected to usurp the role of the legislative branch. Its role with regard to oversight will become even more important with the clearer division of powers between the legislative and executive branches. With a new electoral system and a reduced number of seats, the Parliament may even be a more engaging institution. No matter the results of the next parliamentary election, the Parliament will still have a vital role to play in the political system and the good work completed to-date should not be lost, but enhanced through ongoing technical support.

1. **Efforts are required to institutionalize the reforms piloted and adopted by the Parliament**

Much of the work of SIPD showed promise, but the final stage of institutionalisation – the adoption of new legal frameworks – was not achieved in most cases. Any future work in support of the Parliament should be focused on the adoption of legal frameworks that will solidify such reforms. Specifically, areas of focus should include:

* Adoption and implementation of the civil society engagement strategy;
* Adoption of the Open Parliament Initiative Action Plan;
* Approval of an oversight law;
* Adoption and implementation of M&E frameworks for each committee; and
* Endorsement of the Gender Equality Roadmap by the Parliament
1. **At a time of political upheaval, a focus of support should be securing and maintaining space for citizens and civil society in decision-making**

After the events of October 2020 Kyrgyzstan’s political system is in flux. This means some spaces that have existed for citizen engagement may be reduced while others will open. UNDP should be supporting the securing of space for dialogue between citizens and civil society on one side and political leadership on the other. In some cases, that space may be established within the Parliament. But such efforts should not be focused only on Parliament and UNDP should be exploring other venues and platforms for dialogue. Examples of potential space for dialogue may include:

* Enhanced digital capacity by Parliament to receive citizen inputs to its work;
* Strengthened parliamentary procedures to require routine public consultations and committee powers to summon executive branch to account;
* Dedicated funding for committees and MPs to engage citizens and civil society outside of Parliament;
* Support to key institutions (academia; think tanks) to establish and maintain dialogue venues and space, such as annual conferences and less formal, but routine, interactions between executive legislative and citizen representatives; and
* District and constituency level public forums on specific topics of concern.
1. **Any future support to the Parliament of Kyrgyzstan should be focused on interventions that will allow for sustainable capacity to establish an effective, inclusive and participative institution**

Building on the work and modalities employed during SIPD, any future support to the Parliament should focus on UNDPs role as a knowledge broker and facilitator, by providing strategic and technical support that allows for trusted relationships to flourish in support of the Parliament’s work. In particular, such support should include:

1. Establishing permanent budget analysis capacity within the Parliament (i.e. – a Parliamentary Budget Office);
2. Institutionalisation of CSO membership on parliamentary committee working groups;
3. Adoption and implementation of revised oversight procedures; and
4. Support for post-legislative scrutiny.
5. **Design any future project with the Parliament based on SMART indicators that have annual or interim targets along with a final target**

UNDPs standard RRF template calls for indicators with annual interim targets in addition to a final target. This model of project indicators should be used for future projects as it allows for a more accurate measurement of progress. In addition, all indicators should be developed based on SMART indicator principles to ensure they are effective at measuring the results expected.

1. **Any future support to the Parliament and/or the political governance system should be based on interventions that use more active tools to transfer knowledge**

Where SIPD had the most success it used tools for capacity development and knowledge sharing that were based on active engagement and hands-on learning. The “coaching while doing” approach allowed MPs and parliamentary staff to see the added value in such interventions, which, in turn, resulted in greater cultural and behavioural changes from the institutional top the individual level.

1. **UNDP and the donor must ensure there is a clear understanding of the role of the donor in the management and detailed implementation of any future project.**

Prior to approval of any future project, UNDP must ensure there is a clear understanding between UNDP, the donor and beneficiaries as to the role played by the donor in management of the project. Optimally, UNDP should be provided with the flexibility to implement any such project with limited technical interventions from the donor.

1. **Utilise CSO Low Level Grants as a means of achieving strong, disparate results with the Parliament**

The CAF grants showed great promise, with some innovative work and impactful results achieved by grantees. By funding local initiatives that have been selected based on a competitive selection process, the project can focus on supporting the building of sustainable relationships between civil society and the Parliament. A similar tool can be employed in the future with the Parliament, but must include sufficient pre-assessment for each grantee or the promotion of partnerships to ensure all grantees have the capacity to deliver, monitor and report their work.
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TERMS OF REFERENCE

**International expert to conduct Final Evaluation of**

**the Strong & Inclusive Parliamentary Democracy Project (Phase 1)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Assignment Title | International Expert on Final Evaluation of SIPD project (Phase 1) |
| Type of Contract | Individual Contract |
| Supervisor | UNDP SIPD Project Coordinator and UNDP Chief Technical Advisor Rule of Law |
| Location | Home-based |
| Country | Kyrgyz Republic |
| Estimated working days | 20 effective working days (February – March 2021) |

1. PURPOSE OF THE FINAL EVALUATION

In line with UNDP Evaluation guidance, rules and procedures, as well as UNDP M&E Policy, the UNDP Country Office in the Kyrgyz Republic is commissioning a final evaluation of the implementation of the Strong and Inclusive Parliamentary Democracy SIPD (Phase 1), which is currently funded and implemented in partnership with the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC). This final evaluation is intended to analyze project s progress and results, identify problems and constraints that have been encountered in implementation, formulate important best practices and lessons to be learned. The evaluation will also be forward looking and provide preliminary recommendations for the future design and implementation of a new parliamentary project, advice on forthcoming strategic direction and priorities for the Parliament and consider options for future delivery and implementation which promote ownership, sustainability and increased efficiency and effectiveness.

1. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

Since 2017, under the framework of its Country Programme Document (CPD) 2018-2022, UNDP in the Kyrgyz Republic has been implementing the Strong and Inclusive Parliamentary Democracy (SIPD) project with an estimated budget of CHF 3.8 million and funded by the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC).

Please provide Project Information:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Project Title | Strong and Inclusive Parliamentary Democracy |
| Project ID | 00101685 |
| CPD Outcome and Output | Outcome #2: By 2022, institutions at all levels are more accountable and inclusive ensuring justice, human rights, gender equality and sustainable peace for all.Output 2.1. Core functions and capacity of parliament, key government institutions and local authorities strengthened for accountable, transparent and inclusive policymaking andimplementation, as well as high-quality public service delivery. |
| Project dates | May 1, 2017 – March 31, 2021 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Project budget | USD 3,455,000 (Phase I) |
| Project expenditure at the time ofevaluation | USD 2,558,788 |
| Source of funding | Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation |

The project aims at supporting the Parliament to better exercise its oversight functions, as well as to embed institutional accountability, inclusive democracy and realization of the rule of law in the Kyrgyz Republic. In particular, the project has the overall objective of ensuring that citizens benefit from responsive, inclusive and accountable institutions. The intervention is designed around the achievement of the following two outcomes:

* + Outcome 1: Parliament sets national strategic priorities in accordance with citizens’ needs, and oversees their implementation by the government;
	+ Outcome 2: Civil society actors promote active citizenship and effectively influence political processes to better serve the needs and priorities of the country’s citizens.

As the establishment of multi-stakeholder partnership is a strategic modus operandi of the project, from the inception phase throughout the implementation of all the activities, the SIPD project works with a variety of key actors at the national level, including the parliament, three parliamentary committees and the parliament’s apparatus; government offices, line ministries and agencies; Local Self-Governments; the Chamber of Accounts: the Ombudsman; civil society actors and organizations and Public Councils.

The project was initially designed to provide long-term presence, spanning the performance cycle of two parliamentary convocations (2015-2020 and 2020-2025), multiple coalition government terms with undefined duration and two presidential terms (2017-2023 and 2023-2029).

Within this context, UNDP in the Kyrgyz Republic intends to hire an International Expert to conduct a final evaluation of the implementation of the SIPD project, for a period of 24 working days commencing on the 20th of January 2021 as per requirements set forth in this Terms of Reference (TOR).

1. EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHOD

The final evaluation is intended to assess the degree to which SIPD project has been able to deliver against the overall objective, the outcomes, the deliverables and the strategies and implementation mechanisms being applied during project implementation (2017-2021). In particular, the review is expected to assess relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, impact, progress and results of the project, identify problems and constraints that have been encountered in project’s implementation, as well as formulate important good practices and lessons to be learned, as defined and explained in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and included with this ToR (section D). The evaluation shall also provide recommendations for the future design and implementation of an eventual new project in support to the Parliament, including suggestions for strategic priorities, delivery options and modalities of implementation that promote sustainability, increased efficiency, effectiveness, civic engagement and national ownership.

The evaluation is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with relevant government, line ministries and parliament actors, including but not limited to: government officials, political parties representatives, MPs, officials of the parliament apparatus and members of the parliament committees, representatives of the president’s office and members of the presidential apparatus, members of Local-Self Governments, representatives of civil society organizations and Public Councils, members of the Chamber of Accounts, UNDP staff and management, donor representatives, and collaborating UN agencies and development partners. The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. Also, evaluation should employ a combination of both qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods and instruments.

The interview will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: Key Stakeholders:

* Members of the Parliament
* Parliamentary staff;
* CSOs
* Public Councils Other stakeholders:
* President’s Office
* Government
* Chamber of Accounts;
* Development partners working with parliament (NDI, OSCE, DFID, Westminster Foundation, Fredrich Ebert Foundation etc.)

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the Project document, project progress reports, mid-term review, Lessons-learned study report, relevant national strategic and legal documents, any other files, documents and materials that the evaluator considers useful for the evidence-based assessment. The list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in Annex A of this Terms of Reference.

It is recommended that the evaluation methodology includes the following: Documentation review (desk review), In-country visits and Interviews with relevant stakeholders and UNDP personnel. The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned.

1. EVALUATION OBJECTIVES AND CRITERIA

This final evaluation is intended to provide UNDP with an objective assessment of the SIPD in delivering against goal, outcomes and deliverables of the project as articulated in the Project Document between UNDP in the Kyrgyz Republic and the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation. It shall provide also clear recommendations for the future direction of any new project interventions. The findings of the final evaluation should:

* Provide a full assessment of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, progress and results of the SIPD since the launch of Phase I in 2017
* Provide a complete analysis and evaluation of the key results and impact indicators as set out in the AWP 2018 and in the related M&E frameworks developed
* Provide a comprehensive overview of the project’s key challenges and lesson learned
* Provide a snapshot assessment of the project’s value for money, including the optimal use of resources to achieve the intended overall goal, outcomes and deliverables
* Provide guidance on the state of the project intervention in order to inform future decisions regarding the strategic direction of a possible future new phase in line with parliamentary and UNDP’s priorities in the democratic governance sector
* Assess whether the current focus areas that the project is engaged in are the most relevant for the improvement of parliament’s effectiveness in the Kyrgyz Republic and whether the SIPD is still well positioned to effectively and efficiently support the vision and priorities of the Kyrgyz Republic, to strengthen parliamentary democracy and to meet the needs of the citizens for more responsive, inclusive and accountable institutions
* Identify any activities which should be eventually expanded in a new phase; and any ‘quick win’ initiatives that a new project should engage in; determine whether there are certain activities that a new project should not be engaged in or pursue
* Identify risk factors that may hinder progress and propose risk mitigation/management strategies to ensure success and effective implementation of a new project.

The evaluation of the project performance will be carried out, based on expectations set out in the Project Results and Resources Framework (RRF), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation. The evaluation will at minimum cover the criteria of: Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Sustainability and Impact.

The evaluation will be guided by the following criteria and questions: Relevance:

1. To what extent SIPD’s activities are relevant to enhancing parliamentary democracy in Kyrgyzstan?
2. To what extent SIPD work in strengthening parliamentary democracy is consistent with and responding to current and emerging national and local policies, priorities and needs of the intended beneficiaries?
3. To what extent does this work sustain the current vision and priorities of the Kyrgyz Republic and its people, support civic engagement, public participation and trust and contribute to foster Agenda 2030 for Sustainable Development?
4. To what extent is the project coordinated with other initiatives in the field of work with parliament and strengthening parliamentary democracy?
5. How well the design and implementation of the project address the needs of most vulnerable groups in the country?
6. To what extent did UNDP project adopt gender-sensitive and human rights-based approach? Effectiveness:
7. How effective have the SIPD’s strategies, approaches and activities been towards achieving the

project’s intended objectives and targets?

1. What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives?
2. Has the SIPD successfully leveraged its partnerships with relevant governmental agencies, civil society and other beneficiaries? Is the cooperation with the selected partners leading to the most effective results?
3. What observed initial changes can be attributed in general terms to SIPD’s activities and outputs?
4. How should the development approach/theory of change adjust for future programming?
5. To what extent have women and marginalized group benefited from the project results?
6. To what extent have the results at the outcome and output levels generated results for gender equality and women empowerment?
7. To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to the needs of the national constituents and changing partner priorities?

Efficiency:

1. Have SIPD’s resources (funds, expertise, time, staffing) available to the project been utilized in the most appropriate and economic way possible towards the achievement of results?
2. Was the applied grant mechanism adequate to enhancing collaboration between parliament and civil society? Did it lead to more civic engagement in strengthening parliamentary democracy?
3. How have partnerships influenced the efficiency of the project in delivering against its portfolio?
4. What realistic new delivery options the project shall consider to maximize efficiency and cost- effectiveness?
5. To what extent has the project increased the synergies between the UN/UNDP programmes/projects?
6. To what extent did UNDP promote cross-cutting issues like gender equality, women empowerment, human rights?
7. To what extent have project funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner?
8. To what extent have resources been used efficiently? Have activities supporting the strategy been cost-effective?

Sustainability:

1. To what extent will the benefits of the SIPD’s work in this area continue?
2. Is the level of national ownership and the measures that serve to enhance national capacity enough to guarantee the sustainability of results?
3. Is there a resource mobilization strategy in place for the project to ensure the continuation of benefits?
4. To what extent do national partners have the institutional capacities in place to sustain the outcome- level results?
5. To what extent are policy and regulatory frameworks in place that will support the continuation of benefits?
6. To what extent have partners committed to providing continuing support (financial, staff, aspiration, etc.)?
7. Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of the project outputs?
* Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outputs and the project’s contributions to country programme outcomes and outputs?
* 8) To what extent do stakeholders support the project’s long-term objectives?

Transversal themes (gender, social inclusion conflict sensitivity, capacity building & partnership):

1. To what extent transversal themes were integrated into the project’s activities?
2. To what extent SIPD is addressing discrimination against, inequality and/or exclusion of marginalized and vulnerable groups? Were vulnerable groups’ needs and priorities reflected in the project design, interventions, monitoring (disaggregated data) and reporting?
3. To what extent did the partners (parliament, CSOs) enhance their capacities as an outcome of the project?
4. MAINSTREAMING

The evaluation is also expected to assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP cross-cutting priorities and six Signature Solutions, including Gender equality and women empowerment, Vulnerable groups, LNOB, etc.

* Is the gender marker data assigned to this project representative of reality?
* To what extent has the project promoted positive changes in gender equality and the empowerment of women? Were there any unintended effects?
1. FINAL DELIVERABLES

The International Expert will be expected to produce the following deliverables within the 24 effective persons days:

1. Preparation (Desk Review) and development of methodology
2. Draft Evaluation Inception Report (min 10 pages): Prior to embarking on the data collection exercise and desk review, the International Expert will be required to prepare an inception report which

details the understanding of what is being reviewed and why; how it proposes to answer the main evaluation questions; and the work-plan of the review. This should be produced before the evaluation starts (before any formal evaluation interviews and surveys or country visits).

1. Evaluation Mission (in-country interviews, meetings, as well as presentation of preliminary findings)
2. Draft Final Evaluation Report: The International Expert will be required to submit a draft report for review to UNDP and SDC to ensure that it meets the required quality criteria.
3. Evaluation Brief (Presentation): If required, the International Expert will be requested to present the initial findings and recommendations of the report to UNDP, government counterparts, donors, and other justice sector development partners, as appropriate.
4. Final Evaluation Report: Following receipt of UNDP’s and SDC’s initial comments, the International Expert will be required to submit a final report which clarifies and addresses any clarifications requested in the initial review.
5. TEAM COMPOSITION AND EVALUATOR ETHICS

The evaluation team will be composed of 1 international consultant. The International consultant has responsibility over submission of final report. The evaluator selected should not have participated in the project preparation and/or implementation and should not have conflict of interest with project related activities. The project will provide an interpreter to accompany the international consultant during the mission to Kyrgyzstan. The qualification for International consultant is reflected below.

Evaluation consultant will be held the highest ethical standards and re required to sign a Code of Conduct (Annex

1. upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations. The consultant must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection of data and reporting on data. The consultant must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where that is expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses with the express authorization of UNDP and partners.
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|  |
| --- |
| Mr. Simone Boneschi – *Chief Technical Advisor on Rule of Law UNDP* |
| Ms. Véronique Hulmann – *Ambassador of Switzerland to the Kyrgyz Republic* Ms. Nathalie Semoroz – *Programme Manager SDC*Ms. Elena Zakirova – *National Programme Officer SDC* |
| Ms. Tatiana Gorborukova – *Program Associate UNDP* Mr. Zhenishbek Arzymatov - *Senior Advisor SIPD*Ms. Altynai Abdyldaeva – *SIPD Project Specialist*  |
| Ms. Aigul Baiburaeva - *former Coordinator SIPD*Mr. Joldosh Osmonov - *former Coordinator SIPD* |
| Mr. Lucien Aegerter – *former Programme Manager SDC*Mr. Baktybek Takenov – *Director of the Scientific Research Center*Ms. Anara Bazarbaeva - *Acting Head of Sector of the Scientific Research Center* |
| Ms. Aida Mambetova – *Deputy Head of the Department of the Committee on Constitutional Legislation*Ms. Kamila Beishenbek kyzy - *Head of the Department of the Committee on Constitutional Legislation* |
| Ms. Maria Isanova - *Chief of the Department of the Committee on Social Affairs, Education, Science, Culture and Health*Ms. Chatyrkul Bekisheva – *Sector manager of the Department of the Committee on Social Affairs, Education, Science, Culture and Health* |
| Ms. Bermet Ubaidillaeva - *Gender Mainstreaming Specialist UNDP*Ms. Anara Niyazova – *Gender Expert**Ms. Balgaky Dosalieva - Gender Expert*  |
| Mr. Ibraim Nurakun Uulu – *former Head of the Parliament’s Press Service* Ms. Elvira Kozubekova - *head of the Sector of the Press Service of Parliament*Ms. Janyla Kupeshova – *deputy Head of the Parliament’s Press Service*  |
| Ms. Elnura Kazakbaeva – *Expert to support the Parliamentary Working Group on implementation and achievement of SDG in the Kyrgyz Republic* |
| **CSO Grantees*** **Meeting with Institute of Public Analysis**

Ms. Alina RyskulovaMs. Rita Karasartova * **Meeting with Center for Political and Legal Studies**

Mr. Dzhanar TentievMr. Konstantin Konkin * **Institute of Youth Development**

Ms. Ajara KasymalievaMs. Arina Efremova **Group II (Cooperation Grants):*** **Meeting with LSG Union**

Mr. Almanbetov Omurbek Ms. Nadejda Dobretsova Ms. Ainura Chandybaeva Ms. Elina Sakkaraeva* **Meeting with Precedent**

Ms. Iliana Jedigerova Ms. Dinara Oshurakunova * **Meeting with Crossroads CA**

Mr. Shairbek DzhuraevMs. Varvara Lokteva* **Meeting with Burana Institute**

Mr. Ruslan Jalil * **Meeting with Youth of Osh**

Mr. Azat Muradyl  Ms. Adel Sagyndykova* **Meeting with Elazar**

Mr. Narynbek Sariev* **Meeting with Media School Yntymak (Osh)**

Mr. Daniyar Sadiev Mr. Bakai Kalmatov* **Meeting with PF Plus**

Ms. Aidai Tolonova * **Meeting with Civic Union**

Mr. Timur Shaihutdinov * **Meeting with Association of NCO**
* Ms. Natalia Shipp
 |
| Meeting with Ms. Natalia Nikitenko – *Member of Parliament*, *Chief of the Committee on law and order, fighting crime and combating corruption* |
| Meeting with  Ruslan Iliasov,  National Consultant for quality assurance of the reporting of CAF grantee organizations |
| Meeting with Mr. Aaly Karashev - *Member of Parliament, member of the committee on constitutional legislation, state structure, judicial-legal issues and regulations of the Parliament* |
| Meeting with Mr. Abduvahap Nurbaev – *Member of Parliament,* *Vice-Chairman of the Committee for international affairs, defense and security and*Ms. Natalia Slepchenko - *Expert to support the Parliamentary Working Group on implementation and achievement of SDG in the Kyrgyz Republic* |
| Mr. Tolon Abdyrov - *Chairman of the Board of Public Councils*Mr. Azamat Dikambaev - *Expert to support implementation of 2019-2020 Strategic Plan of Public* *Councils* Mr. Alexander Tretiakov - *Expert to support application of methodology of public monitoring of governance performance*  |
| Ms. Dinar Turdumalieva – *Expert on improving parliamentary oversight of budget* Mr. Temir Burzhubaev – *Expert on Increasing openness of Parliament’s budget and inter-budgetary processes* |
| Ms. Tatiana Tretiakova - *Expert on monitoring and evaluation of implementation of legislations, state programs*Mr. Nuridin Nurakov - *Expert to develop methodology for M&E of legislative acts* |
| Ms. Gulmira Mamatkerimova – *Expert on strengthening parliamentary oversight*Mr. Kurmanbek Turdaliev - *Expert on strengthening parliamentary oversight* |
| Mr. Kanat Sadykov – *Legal expert on introduction of e-petition system*Mr. Aibek Djolbunov – *IT* *expert on improvement of public hearings and e-petition system* |
| Ms. Aizhan Musaeva - *Expert to support the Parliamentary Working Group for the building of the Open Parliament* Ms. Kamila Beishenbek kyzy - *Head of the Department of the Committee on Constitutional Legislation, State System, Judicial and Legal Affairs and Regulations of the JK*  |
| Ms. Dinara Oshurahunova - *Advocacy expert to support establishment and institutionalization of the Dialogue Platform for systematic collaboration between Parliament and CSOs* |
| Mr. Ermek Adylbekov - Parliamentary Program Manager NDI |
| Mr. Ruslan Myrzalimov - *Parliament Strengthening Manager Palladium* |
| Ms. Guljamal Toktombaeva – Program Officer OSCE |

# Annex 3: List of Documents Reviewed

Project Half-Year and Annual Reports

Project Yearly Plans of Action (YPOs)

Project Documents

Project Annual Work Plans

Grant Management Documents

Evaluation Reports

WPS Project Documents

Back to Office Reports

Constitution of Kyrgyzstan

Relevant Legislation

Parliament Internal Regulations

Gender Sensitive Roadmap

Parliamentary Communication Strategy

Open Parliament Draft Action Plan

UNDAF

CPD

Technical Papers Commissioned by the Project

CAF Evaluation Report

Parliamentary Website Data

National Development Strategy (2018-2040)

National Sustainable Development Strategy (2013-17)

SIPD Lessons Learned Report

# Annex 4: Responses to Key Evaluation Questions

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Questions** | **Answers** | **Evidence** |
| **Relevance** |
| To what extent SIPD’s activities are relevant to enhancing parliamentary democracy in Kyrgyzstan? | Highly relevant. Focus on establishing space for CSO and citizen engagement key | * CSOs new role in committee working groups
* Increased interactions with citizens
 |
| To what extent SIPD work in strengthening parliamentary democracy is consistent with and responding to current and emerging national and local policies, priorities and needs of the intended beneficiaries? | SIPD was well-aligned with national development priorities when designed. As priorities changed, support adapted. | * National Sustainable Development Plan (2014-17)
* Support to OPI Working Group
 |
| To what extent does this work sustain the current vision and priorities of the Kyrgyz Republic and its people, support civic engagement, public participation and trust and contribute to foster Agenda 2030 for Sustainable Development? | Project reflected and supported civic engagement and many of the results achieved were directly related to citizen concerns and SDG priorities | * Amendments to Law on Social Benefits
* Increased field visits by committees
 |
| To what extent is the project coordinated with other initiatives in the field of work with parliament and strengthening parliamentary democracy? | Limited formal coordination between implementers | Interviews with implementers |
| How well the design and implementation of the project address the needs of most vulnerable groups in the country? | Focus on interventions related to women, youth and People with Disabilities | * PwD advocacy for accessible Parliament
* Proposed amendments to Law on Domestic Violence
* Civic education for youth
 |
| To what extent did UNDP project adopt gender-sensitive and human rights-based approach? | Project integrated gender and HR approaches into all aspects of its work | * Percentage of CSO projects focused on marginalised groups
* Increased social benefits for migrant families
 |
| **Efficiency** |
| Have SIPD’s resources (funds, expertise, time, staffing) available to the project been utilized in the most appropriate and economic way possible towards the achievement of results? | Yes. Project used cost-effective measures to deliver activities and the delivery of high quality technical advice for Parliament. | * Part-time CTA
* National technical capacity
* CSO knowledge sharing
 |
| Was the applied grant mechanism adequate to enhancing collaboration between parliament and civil society? Did it lead to more civic engagement in strengthening parliamentary democracy? | Grant system was highly effective. Competitive nature of the process resulted in better quality projects and greater results | * Laws amended from CSO grants
* More citizens engaged
* New procedures established in Parliament of citizens and CSO feedback
 |
| How have partnerships influenced the efficiency of the project in delivering against its portfolio? | Partnerships with CSOs and technical experts allowed for an extension of capacity of then project to deliver results | * Technical advisors to Budget & Finance Committee
* Gender expertise for Women’s Forum
 |
| What realistic new delivery options the project shall consider to maximize efficiency and cost- effectiveness? | * Sufficient staffing to manage grant programme
* Less turnover of project staffing
 | N/A |
| To what extent has the project increased synergies between the UN/UNDP programmes/projects? | Limited evidence of project being integrated with other UNDP and UN initiatives |  |
| To what extent did UNDP promote cross-cutting issues like gender equality, women empowerment, human rights? | Project was highly effective at promoting gender equality and women’s political empowerment. HR addressed through specific interventions with key committees. | * Development of gender roadmap
* Support to Women’s Forum
* Support to Social Affairs Committee
* Support to Law & Order Committee
 |
| To what extent have project funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner? | Overall the project as able to deliver results in a timely manner, but there was a delay in issuing grants for CSO projects | * Grant Programme documentation
* Annual Reports
 |
| To what extent have resources been used efficiently? Have activities supporting the strategy been cost-effective? | Overall the project was implemented in a cost-effective manner | * Part-time CTA
* Results achieved through CSO grants
 |
| **Effectiveness** |
| How effective have the SIPD’s strategies, approaches and activities been towards achieving theproject’s intended objectives and targets? | Project achieved specific results that show outcome level achievement. One exception was support for Public Councils. | * Laws amended
* Parliament procedures amended
* Reports from Public Council technical experts
 |
| What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the objectives? | * Building trusted relationships between Parliament and technical experts
* Focus on establishing space for Parliament-CSO engagement
* Competitive grant programme
* Adaptive nature of project implementation
 |  |
| Has the SIPD successfully leveraged its partnerships with relevant governmental agencies, civil society and other beneficiaries? Is the cooperation with the selected partners leading to the most effective results? | SIPD acted as a strategic knowledge broker and facilitator to leverage its relationship with Parliament to test and try new approaches to its work that were more inclusive and participatory | * OPI Working Group support
* Support to parliamentary committee working groups
* Timely, high quality technical advice to committees
 |
| What observed initial changes can be attributed in general terms to SIPD’s activities and outputs? | * More open and transparent Parliament
* Committee meetings livestreamed
* Revised website allowing direct feedback on draft laws
* Revised procedures for oversight of laws and programmes by Parliament
* Gender roadmap
 |  |
| How should the development approach/theory of change adjust for future programming? | Much can be replicated from SIPD for future project support, but could also include establishing venues or space for CSO dialogue with political actors outside of Parliament |  |
| To what extent have women and marginalized group benefited from the project results? | Significant sings of benefit from SIPD | * Proposals for amendments to laws related to domestic violence, sexual harassment and gender-based violence
* Extended social benefits for migrant families
* Crime prevention draft law developed
 |
| To what extent have the results at the outcome and output levels generated results for gender equality and women empowerment? | Laws have been amended that benefit women and girls; Forum of Women MPs has new capacity to conduct evidence-based approach to law development | * Gender roadmap
* CSO reports
* Law proposals
 |
| To what extent has the project been appropriately responsive to the needs of the national constituents and changing partner priorities? | Highly responsive to partner needs and highly adaptive approach to project implementation; Some CSO projects that showed results were not provided with extra funding to continue work, despite requests | * OPI Working Group
* Grantee project reports
* Parliament’s Communications Strategy
 |
| **Sustainability** |  |  |
| To what extent will the benefits of the SIPD’s work in this area continue? | Will depend on the new constitutional structure, but some reforms have achieved status of institutionalisation | * Communication Strategy
* OPI Action Plan
* M&E procedure for oversight
* Gender roadmap
* New laws adopted
 |
| Is the level of national ownership and the measures that serve to enhance national capacity enough to guarantee the sustainability of results? | Likely, yes. But significant change in MPs in next convocation and/or results of constitutional reform may impact sustainability |  |
| Is there a resource mobilization strategy in place for the project to ensure the continuation of benefits? | No. |  |
| To what extent do national partners have the institutional capacities in place to sustain the outcome- level results? | Some CSOs that delivered pilot projects have developed new capacity and relationships with parliament; New capacity within Parliament (communications; scientific research centre) will allow for institutional reforms | * Grantee reports
* Committee reports
* Revised legislation
* Communication Strategy
* Interviews with MPs and staff of Parliament
 |
| To what extent are policy and regulatory frameworks in place that will support the continuation of benefits? | Limited changes in legal framework; some changes in Parliament procedures | * M&E Framework
* Gender roadmap
 |
| To what extent have partners committed to providing continuing support (financial, staff, aspiration, etc.)? | Some relationships between CSOs and parliament committees have continued; Limited access to external resources identified | * Grantee interviews
* Grantee reports
 |
| Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of the project outputs? | Yes. Donor withdrawal of funding beyond Phase 1 |  |
| Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outputs and the project’s contributions to country programme outcomes and outputs? | Constitutional reforms may impact role of Parliament in political system;Electoral reforms may reduce representation of women and youth |  |
| To what extent do stakeholders support the project’s long-term objectives? | All indications are full support for ongoing work by UNDP with the Parliament |  |
| **Gender** |  |  |
| To what extent transversal themes were integrated into the project’s activities? | Project was highly effective at integrating GE tools and themes into all aspects of implementation | * Support to Forum of Women MPs
* Grantee Reports
* Amendments to legislation
* Proposed amendments to legislation
 |
| To what extent SIPD is addressing discrimination against, inequality and/or exclusion of marginalized and vulnerable groups?  | Indirectly supporting such goals though grantee pilot projects for marginalised families and PwDs | * Grantee Reports
* Grantee interviews
 |
| Were vulnerable groups’ needs and priorities reflected in the project design, interventions, monitoring (disaggregated data) and reporting? | Some data was disaggregated; project design considered GESI principles | * Project Document
* Project reports
 |
| To what extent did the partners (parliament, CSOs) enhance their capacities as an outcome of the project? | Significant increase in capacity of Parliament and CSOs | * Gender roadmap
* Grantee reports
* Grantee interviews
* Revised legal framework related to GESI issues
 |

1. In November 21, 2017 – The Open Government Partnership (OGP) announced the Kyrgyz Republic has become first country in Central Asia to join the partnership, an international platform of 74 countries and 15 subnational governments. OGP is a multilateral initiative that aims to secure concrete commitments from governments to promote transparency, empower citizens, fight corruption, and harness new technologies to strengthen governance. OGP aspires to support both government and civil society reformers by elevating open government to the highest levels of political discourse, creating a supportive community of like-minded reformers from countries around the world. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The recently approved constitutional reforms will see the Parliament reduced to 90 members [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-54432030> [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. See: <https://www.v-dem.net/en/news/elections-kyrgyzstan-backlash-against-democracy/> [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. <https://monitor.civicus.org/country/kyrgyzstan/> [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. 2020 Democracy Index; The Economist Intelligence Unit; 2020; London, UK <https://pages.eiu.com/rs/753-RIQ-438/images/democracy-index-2020.pdf?mkt_tok=NzUzLVJJUS00MzgAAAF8akL3f8kqGy_S6e8QyLLdt_hI1T9BXtnQPOv6AOucyv_71xnTLX-4Xna96jbxY2qUUND5Bp46uM_9cAaYGWXayt3uyE6UVwznylvAq5s4xQ> [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. *Ibid*; p.35 [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Global Gender Gap Report (2021) World Economic Forum <https://www.weforum.org/reports/global-gender-gap-report-2021> [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. The Terms of Reference for this review can be found in Annex 1 to this report. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. A list of key informants engaged in this evaluation are listed in Annex 2. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. A list of documents reviewed for this report are listed in Annex 3. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. The Analytical Framework questions with corresponding answers can be found in Annex 4 to this report [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. *Supra*: Note 3 [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. Kyrgyzstan National Sustainable Development Strategy (2013-17) <http://donors.kg/en/strategy/172-national-sustainable-development-strategy-2013-2017> [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. *Ibid*; pp. 10-29 [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/21252030%20Agenda%20for%20Sustainable%20Development%20web.pdf [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. <https://kyrgyzstan.un.org/sites/default/files/2020-02/UNDAF%2018052017%20eng%20fin.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. <https://www.kg.undp.org/content/kyrgyzstan/en/home/about-us/legal-framework.html> [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. <https://www.eda.admin.ch/dam/deza/en/documents/laender/swiss-cooperation-strategy-central-asia-2017-2021_en.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. *Ibid*; p.18 [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. <https://www.eda.admin.ch/dam/countries/countries-content/kyrgyzstan/en/2019/switzerland-kyrgyzstan-cooperation-programme-2017-2021_en.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. At this stage in the review the goal is to assess if the outcomes and outputs were appropriate at the time of formulation. The detailed assessment of each and whether or not it is on-track for being achieved will be reviewed under the Effectiveness section of this report. [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
23. https://www.ucop.edu/local-human-resources/\_files/performance-appraisal/How%20to%20write%20SMART%20Goals%20v2.pdf [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
24. In the end, UNDP was able to fund 25% of the project through internal resources (i.e. – TRAC II) [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
25. <https://popp.undp.org/UNDP_POPP_DOCUMENT_LIBRARY/Public/PPM_Design_Grants%20Operational%20Guidance.docx> [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
26. The ToR for this evaluation did not require as a criteria for the review to consider the *Impact* of the project, but this criteria will be included under this section of the report. [↑](#footnote-ref-26)