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## Interventions to be evaluated

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Titles of the Interventions to be evaluated | Evaluation of the EU support to parliamentary reform in Ukraine from June 2016 to February 2021, including:* Ex-post evaluation of the project ref. 2016/374-814 “Rada za Evropu: Capacity-Building in Support of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine” implemented by UNDP (Action 1)
* Final evaluation of the project ref. 2019/405-178 “EU-UNDP Parliamentary Reform Project” implemented by UNDP (Action 2)
 |
| Budgets of the Interventions to be evaluated | * Action 1: EUR 1,255,926.21
* Action 2: EUR 3,000,000.00
 |
| CRIS numbers of the Interventions to be evaluated | * Action 1: 2016/374-814
* Action 2: 2019/405-178
 |
| Dates of the Interventions to be evaluated | Action 1:* Start: 01/06/2016
* End: 31/05/2018 (initial), 31/08/2018 (extended following Add. 1)

Action 2:* Start: 14/02/2019
* End: 13/02/2021 (initial)
 |

**1.1.1 EU-UNDP Parliamentary Reform Project (PRP): short description**

The overall objective of the EU-UNDP Parliamentary Reform Project (PRP) is to strengthen the functioning of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine (VRU), including its Secretariat, on the path towards building a performing, trusted and transparent parliamentary institution able to effectively carry out its constitutional responsibilities of legislation, oversight and representation in line with best European democratic parliamentary practices.

The project strategy is aligned with the priorities of the EU’s Single Support Framework for Ukraine 2018 – 2020, the Government of Ukraine – UN Partnership Framework 2018–2022, and the UNDP Country Programme Document 2018 – 2022. It is built on achievements and lessons learnt of the EU-UNDP Rada for Europe project (06/ 2016 – 08/18) and will continue to support parliamentary reform, including through supporting the implementation of the VRU’s Roadmap for Internal Reform and Capacity Building of 17 March 2016.

The project was expected to closely coordinate with and complement the second phase of the EU-Association4U project and other EU-funded sectorial initiative, notably to ensure effective prioritisation and planning of legislative process related to the EU-UA Association Agreement at both the parliamentarian and governmental level. Furthermore, the project shall also closely coordinate with and complement activities of other donors projects (e.g. the USAID RADA program).

Specifically, the project strategy responds to the EU Single Support Framework Sector One, “Strengthening institutions and good governance”, with its emphasis on “inclusive and evidence-based policy and legislative development”, and “improved democratic decision-making processes”, through “more effective and efficient legislative structures and procedures at all levels and for all policy areas promoted”, and “improved practices of non-government stakeholders participation in policy making”. The EU/OECD Principles of Public Administration and other relevant standards shall provide guidance as applicable.

The project’s overall approach is also to reflect the EU and UNDP experiences in supporting sector reforms and public administration reform through Ukrainian Reform Architecture, including Reform Delivery Office of the Cabinet of Ministers and Reform Support Teams in the selected ministries under the umbrella of "EBRD-Ukraine Stabilisation and Sustainable Growth Multi-Donor Account" (hereafter – EBRD MDA). For this purpose, a significant part of the project activities was expected to be delivered through an advisory group to the VRU leadership and Secretariat - Parliamentary Reform Office – which was established as a part of the project's implementation mechanism.

In the framework of this assignment, it is expected to evaluate outputs and outcomes of operation of the Parliamentary Reform Office as well as the progress in the implementation of three main Project components, i.e.:

1. #Rada4Reforms

#WellTunedRada. Improvement of the legislative process (introduction of the end-to-end legislative approach through pre- and post-legislative scrutiny, upgrading legislative drafting requirements guidelines, guidelines and analytical tools, strategic planning and prioritization of legislative process with a specific focus on AA-related legislation). In particular, the project will aim at supporting a unified legislative framework covering all actors of legislative initiative, including:

* Strengthening requirements to explanatory notes to draft legislation in the areas of environmental impact assessment, HRBA, gender-based approach etc., including preparation of relevant guidelines and analytical tools;
* Improving quality control of legislative process, notably through improving process and guidelines ensuring coherence and quality of legislative drafting, as well as regular analysis of sample of draft legislation and relevant explanatory materials with regard to their compliance with the applicable requirements and guidelines;
* Building capacity of VRU Secretariat staff in conducting expertise of the draft laws based on new requirements, guidelines and analytical documents linked to legislative drafting.
* Building capacity of relevant stakeholders (MPs, assistants to MPs) in applying upgraded legislative drafting requirements, guidelines and analytical tools;
* Strengthening the Parliament-Government cooperation framework with regard to legislative planning and prioritisation;
* Legislative drafting process and guidelines at both Parliament and Government are streamlined to ensure coherence and quality of legislative drafting.

#OversightRada. Strengthening parliamentary oversight, facilitating new practices of cooperation and coordination between legislative and executive powers (development and support in implementation of the oversight plans of the VRU Committees, including preliminary consultations, preparation of analytical documents (studies) for specific oversight measures, improving the practice of 'Government Hour ' in the VRU, improvement of relevant provisions of the Rules of Procedures (where necessary), enhancing the institutional and procedural framework for the Parliament-Government cooperation with regard to monitoring under international human rights treaties (CEDAW, UPR, CRC, CAT etc.), as well as improving capacity of VRU Secretariat to contribute to such monitoring.

2. #RadaPro

#StaffedRada. Based on an HRM Strategy and its annual action plans to be developed and adopted in line with the law "On civil service" and taking into account the lessons learnt from the 2016-2020 PAR Strategy, the project will facilitate new HRM practices in the parliamentary secretariat including secretariats of the parliamentary committees, notably, effective recruitment planning and attraction of candidates, merit-based and transparent selection procedures and tools, coherent performance appraisal system linked to training and remuneration policy, etc. Relevant actions will also be taken to improve transparency and efficiency of the HR policy with regard to assistants to MPs based on initial analysis made by the Rada za Evropu project. This will also include aligning relevant legislation (e.g. law "On parliamentary Committees" and law "On civil service") with the needs and requirements of service and HRM in VRU secretariat and secretariats of the parliamentary committees. Particular attention will be paid to delivering trainings (mainly online) on key topics for parliamentary reform and capacity building for various categories of staff (VRU Secretariat, MPs, assistants to MPs) in close cooperation of the relevant government stakeholders (e.g. National Agency on Civil Service) and other EU funded projects.

#StructuredRada. Based on a targeted institutional analysis (e.g. functional reviews) of the VRU Secretariat, the project will work on improvement of organizational structure to strengthen the VRU Secretariat capacity on legislative scrutiny, communication, civic education, and oversight), management (e.g. internal processes within the VRU Secretariat, budgeting, etc.) and performance framework of the parliamentary Secretariat including parliamentary committees as part of the development of the system of appraisal of staff (see above). This work will be structured in the framework of the Secretariat strategic development plan to be finalized and adopted based on appropriate institutional analysis and engagement with all stakeholders.

3. #Transparent&Service-OrientedRada

#eRada. Implementation of e-Parliament Strategy, including various initiatives such as paperless and other green practices, digital legislative process, registration and voting procedures for MPs, etc. This will also include support to introduction of effective IT-based tools aimed at strengthening citizens’ engagement in the legislative and oversight processes (including electronic petitions, broader involvement of public in discussion on draft legislation and public oversight), development and adoption of relevant legislative framework.

#Rada4U. Ensuring an overall framework for parliamentary communications and civic education through implementation of the Communication Strategy, based on annual action plans, including internal (within the Parliament) and external (with key EU and UA stakeholders) strategic communication, notably on the following topics: 1) parliamentary reform in UA; 2) public administration reform in UA (from Parliament angle); 3) overall reform process in UA (from Parliament angle).

**1.1.2 Rada za Evropu: Capacity-Building in Support of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine (RzE): short description**

The RzE project was launched as an outcome of the joint Verkhovna Rada ‐ European Parliament Needs Assessment Mission carried out between August 2015 and February 2016, whose recommendations provided the basis for the VRU Road Map for Internal Reforms and Capacity Building adopted in March 2016. More specifically, the project was aimed at supporting three reform areas: strengthening the legislative process, enhancing the capacities of the Secretariat, and increasing parliamentary transparency and openness. A particular focus in the work of the project has been on assisting the Verkhovna Rada to make the necessary reforms to enable effective implementation of the provisions of the EU‐Ukraine Association Agreement signed in 2014.

The project began on 1 June 2016, with a three‐month inception phase, ending on 31 August 2016. Its implementation phase began on 1 September 2016 and ended on 31 May 2018. The project was granted a no cost extension from 1 June 2018 to 31 August 2018.

## Stakeholders and beneficiaries of the Interventions

At the political level the stakeholders are: the VRU leadership, Members of Parliament (MPs) and the relevant parliamentary committees (responsible for various areas of parliamentary reform).

At administrative level, the directly concerned category includes leadership and staff of the VRU Secretariat, notably, working in the units directly linked to the main areas of parliamentary reform, as well as assistants to MPS.

As regard to international partners supporting parliamentary reform the stakeholders are: the EU Delegation to Ukraine, DG NEAR (Support Group for Ukraine), European Parliament, UNDP as implementing partner, as well as other donor organisations involved into parliamentary development process.

The final beneficiaries of this Action include:

* Citizens as the right holders and the key beneficiaries of public services reforms;
* Non-governmental organisations representing different interest groups;
* Non-governmental organisations engaged into parliamentary reform;
* Trade unions representing employees;
* Research institutions and think tanks;
* Education and higher education institutions delivering trainings to civil servants and conducting research in fields linked to parliamentary development and public administration.

A more detailed overview of stakeholders is provided below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Key stakeholders  | Role(s) |
| EU Delegation to UkraineDG NEAR / Support Group for Ukraine | * Identification and formulation of assistance
* Strategic guidance in the process of assistance implementation
* Monitoring and evaluation of assistance results
* Support to coordination of assistance with other development partners
 |
| European Parliament | * Strategic guidance in the process of assistance implementation
* Monitoring and evaluation of assistance results
* Political dialogue with the Ukrainian Parliament in the framework of Parliamentary Association Committee (PAC)
 |
| Parliament of Ukraine (VRU), including * VRU leadership
* Heads of preliminary factions and political groups
* Head of parliamentary committees directly linked to parliamentary reform issues
* VRU Secretariat leadership
* Heads of structural units of the VRU Secretariat directly linked with the parliamentary reform issues
 | * Strategic guidance in the process of assistance formulation and implementation
* Monitoring and evaluation of assistance results
* Implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the parliamentary reform process
* Coordination of assistance with other development partners
* Ensuring coordination and synergy between EU- and donor-funded initiatives in the area of parliamentary reform
* Support to achievement of assistance’s objectives and specific activities
* Involvement of political and administrative stakeholders
 |
| UNDP (implementing partner) | * Implementation of the assistance
* Coordination with key stakeholders and beneficiaries of the assistance
* Monitoring and evaluation of assistance results
* Coordination of assistance with other development partners
 |
| Other donors and international organisations/development partners providing assistance to the Parliament of Ukraine (USAID, Council of Europe, UK, Germany, etc.) | * Support to coordination of assistance with other development partners
* Support to monitoring of the parliamentary reform process
 |
| EU-funded projects (implementing institutions) working in cross-cutting governance areas (public administration reform, public financial management reform, decentralisation, anti-corruption, Association Agreement (AA) implementation, etc.) | * Support to coordination and synergy within corresponding activities in the area of parliamentary reform
 |
| Non-government organisations (think tanks) working in the area of parliamentary development | * Support to coordination and synergy within corresponding activities in the area of parliamentary reform
* Support to monitoring of the parliamentary reform process
 |

## Other available information

In order to realize this assignment, the Contractor could make use of the Projects’ documents, in particular minutes of Steering Committee’s meetings, analysis, reports etc.

More specifically, the evaluators are encouraged to review a specimen of content materials produced by both projects (reports, opinions, etc.), relevant sociological and analytical researches (external and those commissioned by the project), policy documents related to parliamentary reform adopted during 2016-2020, etc.

The evaluators are also advised to carry out in-depth interviews with the Actions' main stakeholders.

## Objective of the evaluation

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Type of evaluation | 1. Ex-post evaluation of the project ref. 2016/374-814 “Rada za Evropu: Capacity-Building in Support of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine implemented by UNDP (Action 1)
2. Final evaluation of the project ref. 2019/405-178 “EU-UNDP Parliamentary Reform Project” implemented by UNDP (Action 2)
 |
| Coverage | Project ref. 2016/374-814 “Rada za Evropu: Capacity-Building in Support of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine, as well as Project ref. 2019/405-178 “EU-UNDP Parliamentary Reform Project” (in their entirety) |
| Geographic scope | Kyiv, Ukraine |
| Period to be evaluated | 01.06.2016 – 13.02.2021 |

Systematic and timely evaluation of its programmes and activities is an established priority[[1]](#footnote-2) of the European Commission. The focus of evaluations is on the **assessment of achievements**, the **quality** and the **results** of Interventions in the context ofan evolving cooperation policy withan increasing emphasis on **result-oriented approaches and the contribution towards the implementation of the SDGs.**

From this perspective, evaluations should **look for evidence of why, whether or how these results are linked to the EU intervention** and seek **to identify the factors driving or hindering progress**.

Evaluations should provide an understanding of the **cause and effect links** among: inputs and activities, and outputs, outcomes and impacts. Evaluations should serve accountability, decision making, learning and management purposes.

The main objectives of this evaluation are to provide the relevant services of the European Union Delegation to Ukraine, Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine, other interested stakeholders with:

* an overall independent assessment of the past performance of the **project ref. 2016/374-814 “Rada za Evropu: Capacity-Building in Support of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine** and **the project ref. 2019/405-178 “EU-UNDP Parliamentary Reform Project”** implemented by UNDP**;**
* key lessons learned, conclusions and related recommendations in order to improve future Intervention (Action) by means of developing its conceptual (strategic) vision for the period of 2021-2024.

In particular, this evaluation will serve to document the results of the above two projects, their enabling factors and those hampering a proper delivery of results in order to adjust their design or implementing modalities and to inform the planning of the future EU interventions and Actions in the same sector through development of a conceptual (strategic) vision for EU assistance to parliamentary reform in Ukraine for the period of 2021-2024, including logical framework matrix and practical recommendations on assistance’s main elements (overall and specific objectives, risks & assumptions & pre-conditions, results matrix, main activities and sequencing, stakeholders analysis, various options of implementation modalities, etc.).

The main users of this evaluation will be the EU Delegation to Ukraine, DG NEAR Support Group for Ukraine, the European External Action Service, Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine, UNDP and other development partners, Ukrainian policy-makers in the area of parliamentary and public administration reform, the main beneficiaries of the concerned Actions that are involved in the implementation of the interventions to be evaluated and/or its steering.

## Requested services

### Scope of the evaluation

The specific aspects to be evaluated are:

* **The matching of the needs of the key stakeholders outlined in the section 1.3 above:**
	+ To what extent the Actions’ design and implementation approach matched the needs of the VRU and its Secretariat in advancing parliamentary reform agenda (in particular, in following the measures of the VRU Road Map for Internal Reform and Capacity Building[[2]](#footnote-3) and other strategic and reform documents);
* **The materialisation of the expected results to date and the factors influencing it:**
	+ To what extent the measures foreseen in the VRU Road Map for Internal Reform and Capacity Building have been implemented in each reform area to date, namely:
		- legislative capacity and legislative process within the VRU,
		- political oversight of the executive,
		- openness, transparency and accountability of the Parliament to citizens
		- approximating Ukrainian legislation to the EU acquis,
		- administrative capacities,
		- coalition, opposition and dialogue within the VRU,
		- respecting ethical norms and standards within the VRU Secretariat.
	+ To what extent the Actions achieved their expected results and made an impact on implementation of the parliamentary reform in Ukraine, including follow-up of the measures foreseen in the VRU Road Map for Internal Reform and Capacity Building?
	+ The overall effectiveness of the Actions with a particular focus on the progress in implementation of VRU Road Map for Internal Reform and Capacity Building.
* **The performance of the management teams of the implementing partner (UNDP) and its capacity to adapt to changing conditions:**
	+ To what extent project management framework applied in both Actions was adapted to the overall context of the parliamentary reform and capable to reach expected objectives and deliver expected results?
	+ To what extent the UNDP project management teams ensured effective and efficient implementation process, both from technical (policy proposals adopted/implemented by the VRU) and financial points of views (share of budget implementation, cost-effectiveness)?
	+ To what extent the UNDP project management team ensured structured dialogue and coordination within the VRU Secretariat, as well as with the key parliamentary stakeholders (VRU leadership, parliamentary committees, political factions and groups)?
	+ To what extent financial management of the Actions and allocations of their resources contributed to the achievement of expected objectives and results (per each component)?
* **The key mechanisms of the Intervention:**
	+ To what extent implementation logic and mechanisms used in both Actions were effective (what worked, how, in which conditions and for whom) in terms of advancing the parliamentary reform process?
	+ To what extent the Actions’ implementation modality (indirect management with UNDP) was adapted and effective in light of beneficiary needs, parliamentary reform challenges and achieved results (follow-up of measures of the VRU Road Map for Internal Reform and capacity Building)?
	+ Are there any complementary (alternative) implementation modalities that are better suited to the context of parliamentary reform and beneficiary needs?
	+ The relevance and cost-effectiveness of the main implementation approaches (per specific objectives or components of the Actions)?
	+ To what extent a practical framework for measuring, monitoring and evaluating the performance of the Actions was in place?
* **The governance mechanisms of the Actions:**
	+ To what extent the Actions’ governance mechanisms facilitated a structured dialogue on parliamentary reform at both political and administrative levels?
	+ To what extent the Actions’ governance mechanisms were effective in terms of ensuring coordinated and coherent implementation process and delivering planned results?
	+ To what extent the Action’s overall performance was determined by leadership and engagement of the VRU secretariat senior management?
* **The innovative elements of the Actions and the extent to which they were applied / promoted:**
	+ To what extent the operation of the Parliamentary Reform Office established within the Action no. 2 was a value-added element in terms of achieving its objectives and advancing parliamentary reform process?
* **The contribution to more coherent and coordinated parliamentary reform strategic framework and implementation by the VRU of the Roadmap for Internal Reform and Capacity Building:**
	+ To what extent the Actions contributed to the establishment and operation of sustainable reform coordination bodies (center) at both political and administrative levels?
	+ To what extent the Action contributed to the establishment of a donor coordination framework on parliamentary reform under the VRU leadership?
	+ To what extent the project contributed to the establishment of a monitoring and evaluation framework of the parliamentary reform under the VRU leadership?
* **Identification and design of the similar future Action(s) by means of delivering findings, conceptual proposals and operational recommendations for future set up and implementation approaches, including logical framework matrix and main implementation elements (objectives, results, activities, risks & assumptions, mechanisms, etc.)**

The evaluation will assess the Intervention using the six standard DAC evaluation criteria, namely: relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, impact. In addition, the evaluation will assess one EU specific evaluation criterion, which is:

* **the EU added value (the extent to which the Intervention brings additional benefits to what would have resulted from Member States' interventions only);**
* **the coherence between the Actions, the EU strategy in Ukraine and with other EU policies and Member State Actions (particularly, in the area of public administration reform, public financial management, anti-corruption, decentralisation, support to implementation of the EU-Ukraine Association Agreement).**

The definition of the 6 OECD/DAC + 2 EU evaluation criteria is contained for reference in the Annex VII.

**Comments on detected issues related to the visibility of the EU support should be covered as well.**

The evaluation team shall furthermore consider whether gender, environment and climate change were mainstreamed; the relevant SDGs and their interlinkages were identified; the principle of Leave No-One Behind and the rights-based approach methodology was followed in the identification/formulation documents and the extent to which they have been reflected in the implementation of the Intervention, its governance and monitoring.

As part of the Inception Report/Note, the evaluation team is asked to reconstruct the Intervention Logic of the Intervention(s) in order to reflect an updated and shared vision of the intended casual chain underpinning the Intervention(s). This reconstruction shall be based on the existing Logframe/ Intervention Logic, consultation with key stakeholders and on other key documents of the Intervention(s).

### Indicative Evaluation Questions

The specific Evaluation Questions as formulated below are indicative. Based on the latter and following initial consultations and document analysis, the evaluation team will discuss them with the Evaluation Manager[[3]](#footnote-4) and propose in their Inception Report a complete and finalised set of Evaluation Questions with indication of specific Judgement Criteria and Indicators, as well as the relevant data collection sources and tools.

Once agreed through the approval of the Inception Report, the Evaluation Questions will become contractually binding.

Relevance:

1. To what extent:
	1. Was the implementation modality (indirect management with UNDP) and design of the Actions relevant to the overall parliamentary reform context and agenda?
	2. Was the implementation modality and the design of the Actions relevant to the wider political content and based on in-depth consultations with parliamentary stakeholders?
	3. Were and are the objectives and the expected results of the Actions consistent with the VRU Road Map for Internal Reforms and Capacity Building. Are they still relevant in the light of political and policy developments during 2020-2021?
	4. Were and are the Actions’ objectives aligned with the political priorities and needs of the Parliament in the area of parliamentary reform?
	5. Did the Actions adapt to changing political, policy, administrative and other implementation conditions?
	6. Were and are the Actions’ design (scope of activities, resources, working methods) adapted to the capacity building needs and priorities of the VRU Secretariat in terms of implementing the VRU Road Map for Internal Reforms and Capacity Building?
	7. Did the design of the Actions consider the available capacities within the VRU Secretariat, as well as available (planned) budget resources for financing parliamentary reform?
	8. To what extend the Parliamentary Reform Office established within the Action no. 2 was relevant in terms of advancing parliamentary reform process?

Coherence:

1. To what extent:
	1. Were the objectives and activities of the Actions coherent and linked to the VRU priorities and policies in relation to parliamentary reform, particularly, after beginning of operation of the 9th Convocation of the Parliament in September 2019?
	2. Did the Actions ensure coherence and complementarity with other EU programmes (public administration reform, EU-Ukraine Association Agreement implementation, PFM, decentralisation, anti-corruption, civil society engagement in policy making, etc.) and other donors' interventions (including USAID, UK, Germany, Council of Europe, etc.)?
	3. Were the Actions’ design and implementation based on the key requirements for a policy support and institutional building initiative (clear reform agenda, long-term institutional reform plan, reform coordination framework, clear leadership at both political and administrative levels, annual planning and budgeting, monitoring mechanisms, etc.)?
	4. Did the Actions correspond to the evolving needs and constraints of the beneficiaries, the overall political context and the EU priorities in Ukraine, particularly, after beginning of operation of the 9th Convocation of the Parliament in September 2019?

Efficiency:

1. To what extent:
	1. Were the Actions cost-efficient (in general and per each specific objective/component)?
	2. Were the Action’s activities implemented according to the work plan and budget breakdown? In particular, what was share of implemented activities and spent resources at the middle of the implementation period and 2 months before the Action’s end (in total and per each component / specific objective)?
	3. Were the Actions implemented in the most efficient way compared to alternatives (service contract, direct award of grant to a specialised organisation, indirect management, etc.)?
	4. Did the choice of the Action’s specific activities contribute to efficient allocation of the Actions’ resources?
	5. Do the Actions manage to identify and deal with various implementation challenges (risks), political and administrative changes, both within the Action’s implementation team and on the side of the beneficiaries/broader political context? How can risk management be further strengthened?
	6. Did the Actions demonstrate flexibility and proactivity in adapting their implementation logic and approaches to changing political and policy content to maximise the results and further advance parliamentary reform process?
	7. Did the Action’s management teams take measures to optimise available resources (expert inputs, funds, time, administrative costs and tools) for the achievement of the Actions’ results during the implementation period? What further efficiency gains could be reached, including through complementary (alternative) implementation modalities?

Effectiveness:

1. To what extent:
	1. Did the Actions contribute to the implementation of the VRU Roadmap for Internal Reform and Capacity Building within its main components:
		1. legislative capacity and legislative process within the VRU,
		2. political oversight of the executive,
		3. openness, transparency and accountability of the Parliament to citizens
		4. approximating Ukrainian legislation to the EU acquis,
		5. administrative capacities,
		6. coalition, opposition and dialogue within the VRU,
		7. respecting ethical norms and standards within the VRU.
	2. Did the achievement of the Actions’ outputs and outcomes lead to fulfilment of their overall and specific objectives?
	3. Were the Actions’ outputs and outcomes achieved (in general and per each component)? What is the implementation rate of the planned objectives/ activities, results (quantitative and qualitative) of the Actions;
	4. Did outputs delivered by the Parliamentary Reform Office established within the (Action no.2) contribute to the achievement (non-achievement) of the Action’s objectives?
	5. Did operation of the Parliamentary Reform Office established within the Action no.2 constitute a value added element to the Action’s overall effectiveness?
	6. Did the Action identify and address the major factors influenced the achievement or non-achievement of the outcomes. What were these factors?
	7. Was the Actions’ monitoring and evaluation framework (including performance indicators) appropriate to measure the outputs, outcomes and impact? How can these elements be further improved?
	8. Did the Action’s specific component(s) achieve greater outputs and outcomes than other?

Impact:

1. To what extent:
	1. Did the Actions contribute to long-term intended results (expected impact)?
	2. Will the Actions contribute to the expected impact in coming 1-2 years?
	3. Did the Actions make an impact on institutional set-up of the VRU Secretariat (including staff, organisation, funding), particularly, in the context of implementation of the VRU Roadmap for Internal Reforms and Capacity Building?
	4. Did the Action’s specific components achieve greater impact than another?
	5. Do the Actions’ activities and outputs (results) build a causal relationship with the Actions’ outcomes (objectives)?
	6. Were there unintended (positive or negative) effects of assistance in implementation of the parliamentary reform?
	7. Have the Action’s outcome(s) been achieved to date and what factors are hindering their achievement?
	8. How can the future Action address potential implementation challenges to maximise its effectiveness and impact?

Sustainability:

1. To what extent:
	1. Were the Actions’ deliverables and results integrated in the VRU’s institutional set up (legal framework, Roles of Procedures, institutional strengthening of the VRU secretariat, etc)?
	2. Did the Actions contributed to increase of budget funding for achieving objectives of the parliamentary reform?
	3. Have the Actions’ beneficiaries ensured the future sustainability of the outputs and outcomes?
	4. Was the VRU leadership involved in high level political dialogue to ensure the Actions’ sustainability (institutional, financial) and the VRU’s ownership of the implemented Actions? How can sustainability be further reinforced in the framework of a future Action?

Other questions to be considered:

1. What are the key lessons of the Actions, in general and per each component.
2. Based on lessons learnt and evaluation results, what would be a suitable conceptual (strategic) vision for EU assistance to parliamentary reform in Ukraine for the period of 2021-2024, including logical framework matrix and practical recommendations on assistance’s elements (overall and specific objectives, risks & assumptions & pre-conditions, results matrix, main activities and sequencing, stakeholders analysis, various options of implementation modalities, etc.).
3. How to reinforce the synergy with the appropriate EU and other donor funded projects?
4. Did the activities undertaken operationalize a HR & GE approach?
5. Did the intervention monitoring systems capture progress towards long-term results on HR & GE?
6. To what extent have gender equality and the empowerment of women been addressed in the design, implementation and monitoring of the project?

## Phases of the evaluation and required outputs

The evaluation process will be carried out in five phases:

* Inception
* Desk
* Field
* Synthesis
* Dissemination

The outputs of each phase are to be submitted at the end of the corresponding phases as specified in the synoptic table in section 2.3.1.

### Synoptic table

The following table presents an overview of the key activities to be conducted within each phase and lists the outputs to be produced by the team as well as the key meetings with the Contracting Authority and the Reference Group. The main content of each output is described in Chapter 2.3.2.

| **Phases of the evaluation** | **Key activities** | **Outputs and *meetings*** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Inception Phase**  | * Initial document/data collection
* Background analysis
* Inception interviews (EUD, UNDP & Project Management Team, VRU, other stakeholders)
* Stakeholder analysis
* Reconstruction (or as necessary, construction) of the Intervention Logic, and / or description of the Theory of Change (based upon available documentation and interviews)
* Methodological design of the evaluation (Evaluation Questions with judgement criteria, indicators and methods of data collection and analysis) and evaluation matrix
 | * Kick-off meeting with the Contracting Authority and the Reference Group (remote conference)
* Inception report
* Slide presentation of the Inception Report
 |
| **Desk Phase**  | * In-depth document analysis (focused on the Evaluation Questions)
* Interviews (particularly, with the Actions’ beneficiaries and key partners / subcontractors)
* Identification of information gaps and of hypotheses to be tested in the field phase
* Methodological design of the Field Phase
 | * Desk Note
* Slide presentation of key findings of the desk phase
* Meeting with Reference Group (remote conference).
 |
| **Field Phase**  | * Gathering of primary evidence with the use of interviews, focus groups, surveys and other appropriate techniques
* Data collection and analysis (linked to the hypotheses to be tested in the field and in view of filling the gaps, if defined during a desk phase)
 | * Initial meetings at country level with project team and stakeholders as defined in the section 1.3
* Intermediary Note
* Slide Presentation of key findings of the field phase
* Debriefing with the Reference Group (remote conference)
 |
| **Synthesis phase**  | * Final analysis of findings (with focus on the Evaluation Questions)
* Formulation of the overall assessment, conclusions and recommendations
* Reporting
 | * Draft Final Report
* Executive Summary according to the standard template published in the EVAL module
* Final Report
* Slide presentation
* Meeting with Reference Group (remote conference)
 |
| **Dissemination phase** | * Organisation of the final presentation seminar (remote conference or face-to-face meeting depending on sanitary situation in Ukraine in the context of COVID-19 pandemic
 | * Final presentation seminar
* Slide presentation
* Two-pager about key findings and recommendations of the evaluation
 |

### Inception Phase

This phase aims at structuring the evaluation and clarifying the key issues to be addressed.

The phase will start with initial background study, to be conducted by the evaluators from home. It will then continue with a kick-off session (via teleconference) between the relevant EU services (EU Delegation to Ukraine, DG NEAR Support Group for Ukraine and European Parliament), representatives of the Beneficiary (VRU) and the evaluators. Half-day presence of evaluators is required. The meeting aims at arriving at a clear and shared understanding of the scope of the evaluation, its limitations and feasibility. It also serves to clarify expectations regarding evaluation outputs, the methodology to be used and, where necessary, to pass on additional or latest relevant information.

In the Inception phase, the relevant documents will be reviewed (see annex II).

Further to a first desk review of the political, institutional and/or technical/cooperation framework of EU support to parliamentary reform in Ukraine, the evaluation team, in consultation with the Evaluation Manager, will reconstruct or as necessary construct, the Intervention Logic of the Intervention to be evaluated.

Furthermore, based on the Intervention Logic, the evaluators will develop a narrative explanation of the logic of the Intervention that describes how change is expected to happen within the Intervention, all along its results chain, i.e. Theory of Change. This explanation includes an assessment of the evidence underpinning this logic (especially between outputs and outcomes, and between outcomes and impact), and articulates the assumptions that must hold for the Intervention to work, as well as identification of the factors most likely to inhibit the change from happening.

Based on the Intervention Logic and the Theory of Change the evaluators will finalise i) the Evaluation Questions with the definition of judgement criteria and indicators, the selection of data collection tools and sources, ii) the evaluation methodology, and iii) the planning of the following phases.

The methodological approach will be represented in an Evaluation Design Matrix[[4]](#footnote-5), which will be included in the Inception Report. The **methodology of the evaluation should be gender sensitive**, **contemplate the use of sex- and age-disaggregated data and demonstrate how actions have contributed to progress on gender equality**.

The limitations faced or to be faced during the evaluation exercise will be discussed and mitigation measures described in the Inception Report. Finally, the work plan for the overall evaluation process will be presented and agreed in this phase; this work plan shall be in line with that proposed in the present ToR. Any modifications shall be justified and agreed with the Evaluation Manager.

On the basis of the information collected, the evaluation team should prepare an **Inception Report**; its content is described below:

* Intervention logic
* Stakeholder map
* Methodology for the evaluation, incl.:
* Evaluation Matrix: Evaluation Questions, with judgement criteria and indicators, and data analysis and collection methods
* Consultation strategy (as needed)
* Field visit approach [including the criteria to select the field visits]
* Analysis of risks related to the evaluation methodology and mitigation measures
* Work plan

The evaluation team will then, if needed, present the Inception Report to the Reference Group via a teleconference.

### Desk Phase

This phase is when the document analysis takes place. The analysis should include a brief synthesis of the existing literature relevant to the Intervention. Among others, the evaluators shall pay attention to the following documents:

* Research and analytical papers on parliamentary reform in Ukraine (implementation of the VRU Roadmap on Internal Reform and Capacity Building) prepared by relevant international or Ukrainian organisations;
* Analytical papers on parliamentary reform prepared in the framework of the EU-funded projects (subject to the evaluation) and other donors funded projects (USAID Rada, UK, Council of Europe, etc.);
* past evaluations of the EU support to parliamentary development (reform) in ENI or IPA countries, as well as other researches analysing the role of Parliaments on governance and reform processes;
* strategic, legislative and policy documents adopted by the VRU or its Secretariat in the area of parliamentary reform (or linked to VRU Roadmap on Internal Reform and Capacity Building) adopted during 2019-2021
* official reports on implementation of the VRU strategic documents in 2019-2020

Furthermore, the evaluators shall conduct ad-hoc analysis of state of implementation of the VRU Roadmap on Internal Reform and Capacity Building, as well as key VRU strategic documents (HRM Strategy, E-Parliament strategy, communication strategy, etc.).

The analysis of the relevant documents shall be systematic and reflect the methodology developed and approved during the Inception Phase.

Selected phone / face-to-face (where possible in the context of COVID-19 pandemic) interviews with the project management, the relevant EU services and key partners in Ukraine shall be conducted during this phase to identity relevant documentation and support the analysis of secondary sources.

The activities to be conducted during this phase should allow for the provision of preliminary responses to each evaluation question, stating the information already gathered and its limitations. They will also identify the issues still to be covered and the preliminary hypotheses to be tested.

During this phase the evaluation team shall fine-tune the evaluation tools to be used during the Field Phase and describe the preparatory steps already taken and those to be taken for its organisation, including the list of people to be interviewed, dates and itinerary of visits, and attribution of tasks within the team.

At the end of the desk phase a **Desk Note** and a Slide Presentation will be prepared; its content is described below:

* Preliminary answers to each Evaluation Question, with indication of the limitations of the available information;
* Preliminary analysis of state of implementation of the VRU Roadmap on Internal Reform and Capacity Building, as well as key VRU strategic documents (HRM Strategy, E-Parliament strategy, communication strategy, etc.)
* Data gaps to be addressed, issues still to be covered and hypotheses to be tested during the field visit;
* Update of the field visit approach (if relevant)
* Update of the work plan of the following phases (if relevant)

A presentation by the evaluation team to the Reference Group, if needed, will take place via teleconference.

### Field Phase

The Field Phase starts after approval of the Desk Note by the Evaluation Manager. Depending on the sanitary situation in Ukraine in the context of COVID-19 pandemic the field phase may fully or party take place remotely upon agreement of the Contracting Authority.

The Field Phase aims at validating / changing the preliminary answers formulated during the Desk phase and further completing information through primary research.

If any significant deviation from the agreed work plan or schedule is perceived as creating a risk for the quality of the evaluation or not respecting the end of the validity of the specific contract, these elements are to be immediately discussed with the Evaluation Manager and, regarding the validity of the contract, corrective measures undertaken.

In the first days of the field phase, the evaluation team shall hold a briefing meeting with the project management, Delegation and VRU Secretariat and other relevant stakeholders.

During the field phase, the evaluation team shall ensure adequate contact and consultation with, and involvement of the different stakeholders; with the relevant government authorities and agencies. Throughout the mission the evaluation team will use the most reliable and appropriate sources of information, respect the rights of individuals to provide information in confidence, and be sensitive to the beliefs and customs of local social and cultural environments.

At the end of the field phase, the evaluation team will summarise its work, analyse the reliability and coverage of data collection, and present preliminary findings in a meeting with the EU Delegation, the Reference Group].

At the end of the Field Phase an **Intermediary Note** and a Slide Presentation will be prepared; its content is described below:

* Activities conducted during the field phase
* Difficulties encountered during the field phase and mitigation measures adopted
* Final analysis of the state of implementation of the VRU Roadmap for Internal Reform and Capacity Building, as well as other VRU strategic documents
* Key preliminary findings (combining desk and field ones), including preliminary proposal concerning strategic framework of future assistance to parliamentary reform.

### Synthesis Phase

This phase is devoted to the preparation by the contractor of **two distinct documents**: the **Executive Summary** and the **Final Report**, whose structures are described in the Annex III; it entails the analysis of the data collected during the desk and field phases to answer the Evaluation Questions and preparation of the overall assessment, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation.

The evaluation team will present, in a single Report with Annexes, their findings, conclusions and recommendations in accordance with the structure in Annex III; a separate Executive Summary will be produced as well, following the compulsory format given in the EVAL module (see Annex III).

The evaluation team will make sure that:

* Their assessments are objective and balanced, statements are accurate and evidence-based, and recommendations realistic and clearly targeted.
* When drafting the report, they will acknowledge clearly where changes in the desired direction are known to be already taking place.
* The wording, inclusive of the abbreviations used, takes into account the audience as identified in art. 2.1 above.

The evaluation team will deliver and then present in Kyiv, Ukraine (or via teleconference) the **Draft Final Report** to the Reference Group to discuss the draft findings, conclusions and recommendations. One day of presence is required of – as minimum – the team leader.

The Evaluation Manager consolidates the comments expressed by the Reference Group members and sends them to the evaluation team for the report revision, together with a first version of the Quality Assessment Grid (QAG) assessing the quality of the Draft Final Report. The content of the QAG will be discussed with the evaluation team to verify if further improvements are required, and the evaluation team will be invited to comment on the conclusions formulated in the QAG (through the EVAL Module).

The evaluation team will then finalise the **Final Report** and the **Executive Summary** by addressing the relevant comments. While potential quality issues, factual errors or methodological problems should be corrected, comments linked to diverging judgements may be either accepted or rejected. In the latter instance, the evaluation team must explain the reasons in writing. After approval of the final report, the QAG will be updated and sent to the evaluators via EVAL Module.

### Dissemination phase

The Final Report shall be presented to the main stakeholders during a seminar to take place in Kyiv, Ukraine (depending on sanitary situation) or via teleconference. The expected number of participants is up to 40 people. The seminar's agenda shall include:

* Presentation of key findings and recommendations of the evaluation
* Questions-Answers session
* Discussion on the objectives, scope and implementation modalities of a future action in support to parliamentary reform in Ukraine
1. COM(2013) 686 final “Strengthening the foundations of Smart Regulation – improving evaluation” - <http://ec.europa.eu/smart-regulation/docs/com_2013_686_en.pdf>; EU Financial regulation (art 27); Regulation (EC) No 1905/200; Regulation (EC) No 1889/2006; Regulation (EC) No 1638/2006; Regulation (EC) No 1717/2006; Council Regulation (EC) No 215/2008 [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. VRU Resolution of 17 Mach 2016 "On measures with regard to implementation of the recommendation on internal reform and strengthening institutional capacity of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine" [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. The Evaluation Manager is the staff of the Contracting Authority managing the evaluation contract. In most cases this person will be the Operational manager of the Action(s) under evaluation. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. The Evaluation Matrix is a tool to structure the evaluation analysis (by defining judgement criteria and indicators for each evaluation question). It helps also to consider the most appropriate and feasible data collection method for each of the questions, [↑](#footnote-ref-5)