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# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This outcome evaluation has been commissioned by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Country Office in Ukraine to inform development of a new Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) for 2012-2016. The purpose of this evaluation is to measure UNDP Ukraine Country Programme (CP) 2006-2011 contribution to the CPAP Outcomes and its relevance to national objectives. It focuses on four UNDP CP Outcomes:

1. Accountable, citizen-based government promoted.
2. Access to justice and human rights increased.
3. Sustainable economic development through pro-poor policy reform.
4. Civil society organisations protect and advocate for human rights and justice.

The evaluation focuses on selected 6 UNDP projects and includes an assessment of their effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and relevance against their own objectives, their combined contribution, and the contribution of external factors and actors to achieving 4 CP Outcomes.

UNDP Ukraine conducted an open tender based on competitive bidding to contract the evaluator. The contract to assess progress towards achievement of four CP outcomes and evaluate contribution of 6 UNDP-supported projects to the achievement of target outcomes was awarded to “GFK Ukraine”. The company experts conducted outcome evaluations focused on individual projects during November 2010 – June 2011.

An independent international expert was contracted to develop the format for the inputs of the project-based outcome evaluation reports and provide advice into the evaluation process. The international expert contributed to ensuring consistency of individual projects’ evaluation reports and consolidated key findings and recommendations into one concise report. In line with the international consultant’s Terms of Reference (TOR), the consolidated report focuses on issues of strategic importance and analyzes relevance, outcomes, sustainability and lessons learned at the aggregate level for all 6 projects.

The evaluation was based on key UNDP guidelines to evaluation and combined context, outcome and process evaluation tools and approaches to provide rich and practical information. All data gathered was verified through triangulation or ensuring the credibility of data gathered by relying on data from different sources (primary and secondary data), data of different types (qualitative, quantitative and financial/resource information) or data from different respondents (e.g., beneficiaries, stakeholders, staff, or other).

**The evaluation team acknowledges a number of limitation of the evaluation** that include: political instability and changes that complicated evaluation of some, especially upstream interventions; lack of or limited baseline data for some projects; inconsistent approaches adopted across projects to define outputs, outcomes and indicators of success and some difficulties in arranging interviews with potential informants.

**In all 4 CP outcome areas Ukraine has made partial positive progress, despite UNDP’s positive contribution.** Ukraine’s political and economic realities played a major role in determining opportunities for UNDP engagement and affected projects’ outcomes. Often the political will and commitment to implement comprehensive reforms were lacking that restricted the number of areas for UNDP intervention and limited their potential impact.

**The projects’ outputs were relevant to respective CP outcomes**. Projects’ relevance was ensured through the following UNDP’s strategies:

* UNDP utilized participatory processes in developing project documents;
* Project Boards established to oversee projects’ implementation proved to be effective;
* relevance of downstream interventions/components was ensured through continuous examination of beneficiaries’ needs and expectations; and
* relevance of upstream interventions was ensured through regular consultations with beneficiaries.

**The evidence collected through the evaluation indicates that overall the projects have achieved almost all of their intended objectives and were effective.** Some projects, however, achieved results at a more modest scale than they had been outlined in project documents. There are a number of reasons beyond scope of UNDP influence that affected these outcomes. Policy level interventions did not completely reach their goals because political will to implement some crucial reforms was lacking.

As the projects are diverse in terms of their focus and nature of interventions, specific projects’ impact on achieving 4 CP Outcomes are covered in the Table 1 below.

**Table 1. CP Outcomes and Specific Impact Made by 6 Projects, by Project**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CP outcome/ project** | **Specific Impact, Some Examples** |
| **Equal Opportunities and Women’s Rights in Ukraine Programme (EOWR) contributed to:****Outcome 2. Access to justice and human rights.****Outcome 4. Civil society organizations protect and advocate for human rights and justice.** | **A national gender machinery that promotes gender rights has been established**. Gender programmes were adopted by all the regional state administrations. Coordination councils in charge of gender issues were established in all regions of Ukraine. Gender advisors in 10 regional state administrations were appointed. Gender resource centres were established in 11 regions. **Capacity of the public administration in the area of gender rights has been strengthened**. Capacity of 10 ministries and governmental agencies and regional state administrations in gender mainstreaming was strengthened.**Capacity of Ministry of Justice to conduct gender assessment of legislation has been strengthened**. With the Ministry of Justice the methodological recommendations on gender assessment of legislation were elaborated and the manual was prepared and distributed. The Family Code of Ukraine was subjected to gender assessment by the Ministry of Justice.**Access to justice and human rights through the system of domestic violence prevention and response has been improved**. A large-scale awareness raising campaign «Stop violence!» was conducted. As a result, 27% of the population know about the hotline for combating domestic violence and protecting children’s rights. Capacity of relevant governmental agencies and police district inspectors has been strengthened. **Capacity of the system of education to promote gender rights has been strengthened.** Gender educational centres and departments of gender studies were established at the universities.  |
| **Youth Social Inclusion for Civic Engagement in Ukraine (YSI)****Outcome 3. Sustainable economic development through pro-poor policy reform.** | Potential positive impact on sustainable economic development is expected from extensive capacity building of youth in using information and communication technologies through *Skills for Success Programme*. **6800 pupils were trained within the Project** (versus 3000 planned), including children with disabilities. **Youth centers implemented 115 successful volunteering social projects** for their communities involving local youth and authorities. Close to 2000 volunteers were mobilized in 2010, double the amount in 2009 (945). |
| **Millenium Development Goals (MDG) Project****Outcome 3. Sustainable economic development through pro-poor policy reform.** | **The centrality of MDG framework to Government policies and programs has been widely recognized.** The President publicly committed to link his program of reforms to MDGs. The President’s program on economic reforms contains indicators similar to MDGs indicators. The MDG Ukraine-2010 National Report was presented by the President of Ukraine at UN summit on MDG in September 2010. It was the first time when the highest Ukrainian official accepted the problem of HIV/AIDS in Ukraine at the international level.**MDG framework was accepted and utilized by public servants in preparing strategic planning documents.** MDGs issues and indicators are incorporated in recent government documents. **Inter-ministerial and expert consultations were institutionalized as a standard practice in development of government programmes.** As of 2010, this approach has become a standard practice of government action plan drafting and the Ministry of Economy is committed to continue doing it if the project is terminated.**Forecasting capacity strengthened by establishing practice of regular Consensus Forecast round-tables.** Consensus forecast’s results are frequently used by Ministry of Economy staff to justify their analysis for politicians and withstand the pressure to develop unrealistic budgets. **Professionalism of central and oblast level government officials in strategic planning was improved.** Numerous training sessions on strategic planning attracted many participants and were well received at the oblast level.  |
| **Support to Economic Reforms in Ukraine through the Blue Ribbon Advisory and Analytical Centre (BRAAC) Project****Outcome 3. Sustainable economic development through pro-poor policy reform.** | **Ukraine joined the WTO**. The project experts worked closely with the Trade Department of the Ministry of Economy preparing reports to WTO, giving recommendations for negotiations, revising and drafting changes to legislation to ensure compliance with WTO and EU requirements. Key project expert on WTO issues also advocated Ukraine’s joining WTO by disseminating results of impact study of WTO accession in media. **Consensus on the need of pension reform and its specific measures was built among policy makers and experts.** Pension reform was extensively advocated by the BRAAC. In 2008, BRAAC published and disseminated the analytical report on pension system reform that was highly evaluated and widely used by the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, Pension Fund, and other relevant agencies. As a result, pension reform has been included into the Presidential Program for Economic Reforms for 2010-2014.**Consensus on the necessity of agricultural land market infrastructure development and reforms was built among policy makers at the national and local levels and expert community**. As a result of project’s activities, agricultural land market development was identified as a priority in the Presidential Program for Economic Reforms.**Numerous reform proposals developed by the project were accepted by the President and the Government.** Out of 21 key reform proposals provided by BRAAC in its 2009 report “Recommendations on economic and institutional reforms 2009”, 11 proposals were fully or partially reflected in the Presidential Program of Economic Reforms for 2010-2014.  |
| **Civil Society Development Programme (CSDP)****Outcome 2. Access to justice and human rights****Outcome 4. Civil society organizations protect and advocate for human rights and justice** | Only mid-term project impacts are listed below as the project is expected to be completed in 2012**22 small grant projects (versus 30 planned) have been successfully implemented by the CSO partners with visible impact at the local level** (establishing social and administrative services, improvement of social infrastructure facilities for people with disabilities, revising groundless housing tariffs, cancellation of illegal private housing construction, etc). **Capacity of 40 representatives of the 22 grantees was strengthened** in CSO management and advocacy during four training and networking events. Grant recipients who participated in different CSDP trainings showed high level of their satisfaction with the training received and use the obtained knowledge in their daily work.**The draft law on Civil Society Organizations – work in progress*.*** Analytical, awareness-raising and advocacy work to promote enabling legal environment for the civil society has been started by the Ukrainian Center for Independent Political research (UCIPR) supported by a grant through the CSDP.  |
| **Support to Civil Service Reform (CSR) Project****CP Outcome 1: Accountable, citizen-based government promoted** | **The School for Senior Civil Service Officials was established and well-institutionalized**. It is accountable to MDCS with the mandate to develop and implement training policy for high corps of the civil service. The School management highly evaluated UNDP assistance and support.**The procedures for training need assessment were developed and transferred to the School.****Professionalism of higher civil servants was raised and their leadership skills were developed.** The culture and practice of life-long learning for senior civil servants was introduced and well received in Ukraine. **Awareness about the necessity of adopting a draft Law on Civil Service was raised.** |

**UNDP has performed satisfactorily in developing and implementing its partnership strategies**. Its partnership strategies proved to be appropriate and effective. Success of partnerships can be attributed to the following UNDP strategies:

* continuous dialogue and responsiveness to partners’ needs;
* practicality and rationality in distribution of partners’ roles that takes into consideration their comparative advantages;
* experimentation with various partnerships arrangements. Continuous exploration of new partnership opportunities;
* effective and extensive partnerships with the civil society;
* use of Project Boards that comprise multiple stakeholders; and
* pursuit of synergies among UNDP projects.

**UNDP has been overall effective in promoting sustainability of its projects among its partners.** The following factors positively contributed to projects’ sustainability:

* strong commitment of National Project Directors and partners to projects’ objectives and sustainability;
* development of effective exit strategies or possible follow-on project at the early stages of the project cycle;
* existence of strong relations with national partners that ensured their ownership of the project and its outcomes;
* incorporation of significant capacity building measures into project interventions; and
* strong and strategically focused project management.

**The evaluation identified a number of limitations as well.** They include**:**

* inconsistent degree of focus on results across projects. Some projects overemphasized the importance of activities without proper focus on strategic priorities, outcomes and impacts. Often the linkages between inputs, outputs and CP outcomes were not fully clear in project documentation;
* some possibilities to conduct joint activities of UNDP projects were underutilised;
* knowledge management systems were not fully implemented. There was no clear accumulation of lessons learned and documentation from some UNDP projects was unavailable. Often the projects did not have a consistent approach to identify and analyze lessons learned that limited UNDP capacity to adjust projects to changing political and socio-economic environment; and
* UNDP administrative procedures were too cumbersome for some downstream interventions.

**The evaluation identified a number of lessons learned**. UNDP projects have the highest impact and are the most effective when they are:

* realistic, do not have inflated expectations and pragmatic in terms of technical feasibility and time required to successfully implement them;
* flexible and responsive to national circumstances and Government’s needs;
* aligned with top Government priorities;
* rely on support of committed national partners who assume ownership of the projects and their outcomes;
* strategic and address sustainability aspects from the beginning of a project cycle;
* results-oriented on CP outcomes through all stages of a project cycle;
* based on effective partnership strategies; and
* led by results-focused project managers with strong leadership competencies who establish and maintain trusting relationships with national project directors and diverse stakeholders groups.

**UNDP’s comparative advantages in the areas of 4 CP outcomes include:**

* expertise and solid experience of working in such politically sensitive areas as strategic policy advice, agricultural policies, civil society development, public administration reforms, human rights and WTO accession;
* leadership positions in promoting MDGs and MDG-focused policies and strategies;
* well institutionalized relations with such lead ministries as the Ministry of Economy, Ministry of Agrarian Policy and the Main Department of Civil Service that play a crucial role in advancing initiatives addressing economic development, poverty reduction and administrative reforms;
* extensive experience in implementing local community development interventions. Effective partnerships established at the regional level;
* extensive expertise in designing upstream and downstream interventions promoting human rights;
* solid expertise and experience in promoting gender equality through integrated and systematic approaches combining policy advice, awareness building, and education interventions at the national and local levels;
* extensive experience of working with civil society organizations and promoting the interests of CSOs at the levels of policy and legislation;
* ability to mobilise high quality local expertise;
* capacity and solid experience in effective implementation of multi-million projects;
* significant corporate expertise in such areas as MDGs, social inclusion, gender rights, public administration reforms and civil society. Ability to quickly identify and deploy internationally recognised experts in various development fields; and
* innovations, flexibility and orientation on results in building effective partnerships.

**UNDP has strong comparative advantages to implement EU-funded projects.** EU remains the largest funding source for development activities in Ukraine. Although the EU may move towards budgetary support and provide funds directly to the Government and its institutions, UNDP should consider actively exploring the areas where it can be involved in implementation of projects funded by the EU. As this evaluation demonstrates, UNDP has a number of comparative advantages in competing for EU funded projects:

* good working relations established with the Government to operate in such politically sensitive areas as human rights, strategic economic planning and public administration reforms;
* solid experience in community development and supporting civil society;
* solid corporate and Ukraine-based expertise in Good Governance and the Rule of Law areas that are the focus of the EU’s National Indicative Programme for Ukraine for the period of 2011-13;
* extensive expertise in the area of social inclusion in Ukraine that is an important area in EU’s agenda;
* operational capacity to effectively and transparently implement EU-funded projects. UNDP has transparent and effective management practices and procurement rules that both the EU and the Government may find attractive in executing EU-funded projects; and
* expertise in complying with EC internal procedures such as project monitoring and verification.

Although UNDP has numerous comparative advantages, **there is a range of factors that can hamper scaling up of UNDP activities in Ukraine in the areas of 4 CP outcomes:**

* Ukraine is a middle income country. As income levels in the country will increase, access to larger financial resources will become more restricted;
* the global recession pressures donor countries to cut their aid budgets and may result in lower than anticipated ODA earmarking and allocations to Ukraine in the future;
* facing the consequences of the global economic crisis and extent of development problems Ukraine is facing, both the Government and donors are looking for possibilities to achieve more with less funding. They are open for collaboration with various partners who can deliver effective support and value for money;
* some donors in their external assistance delivery modalities are moving towards budget support as their trust in the public financial management system of Ukraine grows;
* many donors prefer to deliver their programmes in cooperation with companies and organizations with headquarters in their countries; and
* main competitors of UNDP Ukraine in the reviewed programme area are numerous and diverse.In addition to traditiondevelopment partners, national and international CSOs and consulting firms compete with UNDP for funding. Over the course of the last years, these players significantly strengthened their skills and positions and are capable to compete with UNDP for funding.

**The evaluation team recommends UNDP Country team to consider the following potential CP outcomes and groups of interventions to address them:**

* **Expand a section of CP addressing social inclusion**. One of potential approaches is to work with the relevant ministries and support them in implementing a range of policies and interventions addressing social inclusion. Regardless of the focus area, the projects can combine downstream and upstream interventions to achieve the maximum impact. UNDP interventions addressing social inclusion may focus in particular onsocial inclusion of the youth and support the Government in developing of a comprehensive Strategic Framework for Ukraine’s National Youth Policy that can address multiple needs of the youth to ensure a quality upbringing. Another area of support is inclusion of persons with disabilities (PWD).Ukraine ratified the *International Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities* in 2010. Potential interventions can support the Government in meeting the requirements of the Convention and provide technical support in all areas, including accountability mechanisms, sequence of reforms, sector-specific policies and programs and public reporting requirements.
* **Promote MDGs and support more systemic integration of MDGs into Government strategies, policies and programs.** Although full integration of MDGs into Government policies requires a strong and long-lasting political will, there are positive developments in this area and UNDP is well positioned as a leader in promoting MDGs in Ukraine. UNDP should continue promoting MDGs and support the Committee of Economic Reforms to integrate MDGs into the President’s Program of Economic Reforms and design the quality of life indicators that will be based on MDGs. Specific advice on how to incorporate MDGs into sectoral policies can be provided as well. Capacity of line ministers to prepare Cabinet policy submissions that will incorporate MDGs can be enhanced.
* **Promote strong civil society at the level of policy and through grass roots capacity building interventions.** UNDP developed expertise in strengthening civil society and facilitating the dialogue between CSOs and decision makers at both national and local levels. It is advisable to continue and expand interventions supporting CSOs as achievement of CP outcomes could be accelerated through participation of grassroots communities and local champions. Particular focus can be made on building capacities of civil society organizations in fundraising as they need to compete effectively for funding in a crowded marketplace.
* **Promote gender equality.** As UNDP gained reputation as a leader in promoting gender equality opportunities, it is advisable to continue working in this area. Long-term interventions are needed to ensure a shift of gender stereotypes and improve gender sensitivity – within both the government and the Ukrainian society. UNDP may continue supporting gender mainstreaming into public policy and legislation as well as educational system; focus on improving the system of prevention of domestic violence; and conduct public awareness campaigns on gender equality. It may be beneficial to expand cascade trainings of civil servants to oblast/rayon levels, focus on practical aspects of their work and incorporate gender-related issues into the educational programmes for civil servants.
* **Support the Government in the area of public administration reforms**. As UNDP has some corporate expertise in functional reviews, it can support the Government in restructuring of ministries that could address such problems as lack of strategic focus, operational inefficiencies, weak accountability for results, coordination problems and sub-optimal use of resources.
* **Support the Government in establishing an effective policy lifecycle at both central and line ministries levels.** It is a common belief of experts and stakeholders that the effectiveness of policymaking institutions and processes as well as capacity of public administration should be enhanced. UNDP may provide technical support and help the Government in establishing a policy cycle consistent with the best international practices. It can be accomplished by strengthening capacity of the Cabinet of Ministers’ staff to maintain standards of effective policy cycle and supporting development of internal administrative regulations on key steps and requirements of the policy cycle. A series of training opportunities can be offered as well.
* **Provide targeted policy support in the area of agricultural policy.** UNDP through its BRAAC project established very good working relations with the Ministry of Agrarian Policy and positioned itself as a reliable provider of high quality advice and support in the field of agricultural policies. The Government plans to introduce a number of reforms in this sector, including creation of a transparent market for agricultural land. UNDP’s involvement in this sector is critical to ensure that the interests of rural vulnerable groups are taken into consideration in the process of reforms.

**In the areas of programme design, implementation and management, the evaluation team suggests a number of strategies and changes that can further enhance UNDP positions and improve projects’ effectiveness, impact and sustainability.** Core recommendations include:

* **As a number of strategies were adopted and commitments made, the Government needs extensive support in practical implementation of reform measures**. The Government may benefit from technical assistance on how to prioritize, sequence policies, interventions, and other measures, produce budget estimates, adopt transparent and effective management processes to implement the existing and forthcoming policies as they relate to human development and social inclusion.
* **Enhance strategic long-term focus of interventions and remain flexible.** It is beneficial for UNDP to become more strategic in developing interventions to achieve CP outcomes. Sustainable change requires a long-term, multi-faceted approach that seeks to strengthen institutional, policy, capacity and other foundations in respective CP areas. While the importance of UNDP maintaining a strategic, long-term focus is fundamental to achieving CP outcomes, equal need exists for its interventions to have greater flexibility and enhanced capacity for rapid response to better address emerging issues and changing circumstances especially in upstream interventions where political and economic circumstances may rapidly change.
* **Combine downstream and upstream interventions in projects, where appropriate.** The application of upstream and downstream approaches can be an effective mechanism to build and/or strengthen horizontal and vertical networks and links and achieve sustainable impact at the national and local levels.
* I**ncrease external visibility and actively promote UNDP achievements and capacities**. UNDP should continue promoting itself as a strong partner who can be trusted with implementation of a wide range of initiatives. Public relations campaigns and targeted dissemination of information can be implemented.
* **Enhance results management practices.** UNDP has to demonstrate how and where the organization is making a measurable contribution to human development. Strengthening of results-based management (RBM) practices would help managers to achieve these goals by learning from results and empirical evidence and use that evidence to adjust either the projects under their control or the composition of the portfolio of projects to maximize the contribution of UNDP to CP outcomes.
* **Align monitoring and evaluation processes and practices with the RBM**. Quantifiable baseline data along with indicators should be identified in measurable terms and by date. The Country Office can develop an internal system of outcome monitoring through results-based performance measures on the basis of a new CP. The performance measures would help the projects to stay focused on CP outcomes and monitor their performance from the beginning of the projects.
* **Introduce a Knowledge Management system.** There is no clearinghouse mechanism for the UNDP existing or closed project portfolio. It is beneficial for the Country Office to develop a knowledge management system that is able to collect, synthesize, and disseminate knowledge and make it more readily accessible to staff and partners.
* **Utilise effective partnerships strategies developed through the 2006-2011 CP cycle.** As UNDP has developed extensive partnership networks through its projects, it should continue to explore innovative approaches to partnerships through joint programming, cost sharing and other arrangements, where possible. This evaluation found that multi-stakeholder partnerships currently play important roles both at the operational and policy level. It is recommended for UNDP to:
	+ continue utilising Project Boards that comprise multiple stakeholders. Their involvement helped to adjust the projects to changing political and socio-economic circumstances to benefit from opening windows of opportunity;
	+ maintain continuous dialogues with key stakeholders to gather their feedback on projects’ performance, identify areas for improvement, explore potential partnership arrangements and sustainability measures as well as build their ownership of projects’ outcomes;
	+ encourage experimentation with various partnerships arrangements;
	+ continue exploring innovative strategies of building partnerships with the private sector;
	+ keep partnerships goals oriented and focused on delivering practical results. Without tangible results, many partnerships would not be sustainable;
	+ be flexible and accommodating as partners come with different sets of priorities, views, resources and practices;
	+ review all partnership strategies used by UNDP projects. As this evaluation demonstrates, six projects reveal some lessons and effective practice, but a more systematic analysis and evaluation of partnership experiences across programmes can be conducted; and
	+ strengthen collaboration among UNDP projects. There is a clear room for improvement in creating better synergies among relevant UNDP projects.
* **Enhance focus on sustainability and employ a range of instruments that proved to be successful in ensuring sustainability of programme results.** This evaluation identified a number of successful strategies that helped UNDP to ensure sustainability of programme results. It is recommended to utilize these strategies through the next CP cycle:
	+ pay more attention to the question of exit or possible follow-on project at the early stages of the project cycle;
	+ build strong relations with the national partners to ensure their ownership of the project and its outcomes. It increases their commitment to ensuring project’s sustainability;
	+ address the goals of ensuring project sustainability through all stages of the project cycle;
	+ design local level interventions with the goal of ensuring that they can be upscaled in support of broader policy and programmatic development results;
	+ support CSOs by strengthening their sustainability through such interventions as capacity building in fundraising;
	+ ensure that upstream interventions have a significant capacity building elements; and
	+ use resources of National Project Directors more proactively and seek their input into identifying the areas of potential follow-on projects and sustainability-building measures that are relevant to their ministries/agencies.

# 1. PURPOSE OF EVALUATION

This outcome evaluation has been commissioned by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). UNDP plans its work on the 5-year basis through Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP). The CPAP broadly defines the goals that the Government and UNDP jointly subscribe to and the financial parameters agreed upon. The plan is based on development challenges identified in the UN Common Country Assessment (CCA), and its response as outlined in the UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF). It fully takes into account the concerns and commitments of the Government. Programme components are organized by outcomes and achievement of the outcomes requires specific output targets. The activities that are designed to produce the outputs are outlined in annual work plans, which link success indicators to achievement of activities.

UNDP Country Office in Ukraine started to prepare a new CPAP for 2012-2016. The purpose of this evaluation is to measure UNDP Ukraine Country Programme (CP) 2006-2011 contribution to the CPAP Outcomes and its relevance to national objectives. It focuses on four UNDP CP Outcomes:

1. Accountable, citizen-based government promoted.
2. Access to justice and human rights increased.
3. Sustainable economic development through pro-poor policy reform.
4. Civil society organisations protect and advocate for human rights and justice.

This evaluation is both retrospective and prospective. It will assist decision-makers in identifying the contribution UNDP has made within a particular area and the extent to which planned outcomes have been achieved. The evaluation focuses on selected 6 UNDP projects and includes an assessment of their effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and relevance against their own objectives, their combined contribution, and the contribution of external factors and actors to achieving 4 CP Outcomes. Table 1 below lists 6 projects and identifies individual project’s expected outputs as they are related to CP Outcomes, as per project documents.

**Table 1. Projects and their Expected Outcomes, as per Project Documents**

| **CP outcome/ project** | **Project’s Expected Outputs as They are Related to CP Outcomes, as per Project Documents** |
| --- | --- |
| **Equal Opportunities and Women’s Rights in Ukraine Programme (EOWR) contributed to:****Outcome 2. Access to justice and human rights increased.****Outcome 4. Civil society organizations protect and advocate for human rights and justice.** | 1. National gender machinery is equipped with legal and financial resources, political commitments revised to legally enforce gender equality laws and regulations.
2. The system of education is free of gender biases and stereotypes, gender balance in programmes, textbooks and education curricula is ensured.
3. System of response to gender based violence is improved.
4. Capacity enhanced of national and regional authorities to elaborate, monitor, implement and report on gender-sensitive strategies/programmes/plans.
5. Policy advice to harmonize legislative framework with Ukraine’s basic law and international obligations to ensure gender equality
 |
| **Youth Social Inclusion for Civic Engagement in Ukraine (YSI)****Outcome 3. Sustainable economic development through pro-poor policy reform.** | 1. Increased organizational management and gender capacity of Youth Centres and volunteer involving organizations;
2. Developed social competencies and skills of youth;
3. Strengthened social solidarity among generations.
 |
| **Millenium Development Goals (MDG) Project****Outcome 3. Sustainable economic development through pro-poor policy reform.** | 1. Strengthening capacity building for economic and social policy development,
2. Improving strategic planning and forecast system,
3. Providing MDGs policy analysis, monitoring and advocacy,
4. Support to social inclusion (added in 2009).
 |
| **Blue Ribbon Advisory and Analytical Centre (BRAAC) Project****Outcome 3. Sustainable economic development through pro-poor policy reform.** | 1. Provide assistance in policy formulation and implementation through high-quality analytical and advisory services. Strategic advice is to be adjusted to the needs expressed by the Government of Ukraine and address present and emerging challenges,
2. Ensure capacity development by on-site training and events specially organised for this purpose,
3. Expand public dialogue on various policy challenges, initiatives of the President of Ukraine, Parliament of Ukraine and Government of Ukraine
 |
| **Civil Society Development Programme (CSDP)****Outcome 2. Access to justice and human rights****Outcome 4. Civil society organizations protect and advocate for human rights and justice** | 1. Selected Ukrainian civil society organizations (CSOs) in seven target regions (Kirovohrad, Lugansk, Lviv, Kherson, Khmelnytsky, Donetsk and Chernihiv regions) have strengthened their a) managerial, b) advocacy and c) monitoring capacity to promote 1) government transparency and accountability, 2) protect the rights of vulnerable groups, such as people with disabilities, detainees and prison inmates, women at risk, disadvantaged children and youth;
2. National and international experts' support, facilitation and coordination of the dialogue between CSOs, parliament and government agencies for developing an enabling legal framework for civil society in Ukraine in accordance with international standards has been delivered.
 |
| **Support to Civil Service Reform (CSR) Project** **Outcome 1. Accountable, citizen-based government promoted** | 1. To sensitise selected Ukrainian civil servants and political decision-makers on the critical place of the new Law on Civil service to facilitate its swift adoption (i.e., Sensitization and awareness raising);
2. To provide the Main Department of Civil Service of Ukraine (MDCS) with the necessary tools in terms of analysis, expert advice and monitoring to successfully conduct its mandate in driving the Ukrainian civil service reform process (i.e., support to SIGMA reviews); and
3. To build the MDCS capacity in designing and delivering relevant and efficient training modules to civil servants in order to support their role and function in the current Ukrainian civil service, on its way towards a more professional and effective civil service (i.e., training capacity within the MDCS).
 |

All 6 projects are managed based on the requirements stipulated in the National Implementation Modality (NEX).[[1]](#footnote-1) National Implementation is an agreed arrangement between UNDP and the Programme Countries, whereby a national institution assumes overall responsibility and accountability for the formulation and effective management (execution) of UNDP led donor funded technical cooperation programmes and projects.

UNDP expects to use the findings and recommendations of this evaluation exercise to inform the formulation of the CP and subsequent CPAP for 2012-2016. The evaluation report contains specific recommendations that hopefully will make a positive contribution to development of new project proposals and help to identify focus, modality of implementation, resource allocation, partnerships and coordination among the relevant projects. The evaluation team hopes that the recommendations will contribute towards an improvement in performance and further strengthen UNDP position in Ukraine.

# 2. EVALUATION APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

UNDP Ukraine conducted an open tender based on competitive bidding to contract the evaluator. The contract to assess progress towards achievement of four CP outcomes and evaluate contribution of 6 UNDP-supported projects to the achievement of target outcomes was awarded to “GFK Ukraine”. The company experts conducted outcome evaluations focused on individual projects during November 2010 – June 2011. The evaluation team examined the extent to which 6 UNDP projects contributed to the intended improvements in CP Outcomes.

An independent international expert was contracted to develop the format for the inputs of the project-based outcome evaluation reports and provide advice into the evaluation process. The international expert contributed to ensuring consistency of individual projects’ evaluation reports and consolidated key findings and recommendations into one concise report. In line with the international consultant’s Terms of Reference (TOR), the consolidated report focuses on issues of strategic importance and analyzes relevance, outcomes, sustainability and lessons learned at the aggregate level for all 6 projects. More detailed information on individual projects’ performance, outputs and outcomes can be obtained from project reports.

The following questions were addressed through the evaluation:

1. Have the right things been done?

* Assess the relevance of the projects’ outputs in the area to respective CP outcomes.
* Assess progress towards the achievement of the outcome, the extent to which the Country
* Programme outcome resulting from the inputs and outputs have been achieved.
* Analyze the underlying factors beyond UNDP’s control that influenced the outcome.
* Examine the comparative advantage of UNDP Ukraine relative to other development organizations in the area.

2. Have things been done right?

* Distinguish the substantive design issues from the key implementation and/or management capacities and issues including the timeliness of results, the degree of stakeholders and partners’ involvement in the completion of results, and how processes were managed/carried out.
* Find out whether UNDP’s partnership strategy has been appropriate and effective. What were the partnerships formed?
* How did the partnership contribute to the achievement of the outcome?
* What was the level of stakeholders’ participation?
* Examine the partnership among UN Agencies and other donor organizations in the relevant field.

3. Are the results sustainable?

* Assess sustainability of CO Programme interventions in these areas.
* Review and assess UNDPs cooperation and engagement with governmental bodies (at national and local levels), civil society actors and local communities in programme/projects design and implementation in the area.

4. How might things be done better in the future?

* Identify innovative approaches and capacities developed through UNDP assistance.
* Based on the analysis of achievements and positioning above, present key findings;
* Draw key lessons and provide clear and forward-looking recommendations (e.g. new CPD Outcome baselines) in order to contribute to the formulation of the future Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP).

This evaluation was independent and objective and followed the principles set out in *Guidelines for Outcome Evaluation* prepared by UNDP Evaluation Office. It was based on the belief that evaluation should be supportive and responsive to the needs of UNDP, rather than become an end in itself. The overall objective of the evaluation was to provide an objective assessment of the contribution of UNDP programme to achieving 4 CP outcomes.

As CP outcomes are influenced by a full range of UNDP activities and interventions of other development partners, as well as the Government’s and other stakeholders’ actions, a complex picture linking UNDP outputs and outcomes has been developed that revealed a “chain of causality”. The evaluation team tried to ensure that the evaluation process and outcomes are:

* participatory as it reflected the views of as many stakeholders, decision-makers, projects’ clients and implementers as possible;[[2]](#footnote-2)
* high quality as it used triangulation (simultaneous use of perception, validation and documentation to analyze information);
* impartial, balanced and based on UNDP guidelines and best practices;
* credible, clear and easy to understand;
* evidence based and action oriented; and
* future oriented in its recommendations with particular focus on sustainability and lessons learned.

In depth evaluations of 6 UNDP projects explored links between particular interventions and their outputs and outcomes. Progress towards the outcomes was captured and analyzed. The focus was made on capturing the contribution of these projects to changes in the country development situation. Achievements and results, shortcomings and lessons learned, and possible improvements and opportunities were identified and elaborated.

The evaluation was based on key UNDP guidelines[[3]](#footnote-3) to evaluation and combined context, outcome and process evaluation tools and approaches to provide rich and practical information. All data gathered was verified through triangulation or ensuring the credibility of data gathered by relying on data from different sources (primary and secondary data), data of different types (qualitative, quantitative and financial/resource information) or data from different respondents (e.g., beneficiaries, stakeholders, staff, or other). The purpose of this analysis was to determine the nature and type of results in relationship to project and CP outcomes. A large set of different and complementary evidence was collected and analyzed by utilizing both qualitative and quantitative methods that included:

* **Consultations with UNDP programme staff and project management** were conducted to identify key informants to be interviewed and to validate the evaluation methodology. The evaluation was impartial and independent but the UNDP and projects’ management was regularly updated about the evaluation progress.
* **Desk review of relevant UNDP project documentation was conducted**. Quantitative and qualitative information was collected and analyzed. Some of the documents that were reviewed included United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF), the Country Program Action Plan (CPAP), Annual Work Plans (AWP), Project Documents, regular monitoring reports, various reports and presentations produced by projects, evaluation reports, training materials and web-sites.
* **Additional research and analytical materials were reviewed to support analysis of the context of UNDP interventions and inform the recommendations of the evaluation exercise.** Reports by international organizations, national and international experts, and other materials were carefully examined.
* **Interviews with UNDP programme managers and staff from relevant projects as well as development partners were conducted** to obtain another perspective in terms of the questions in the Terms of Reference, and to validate preliminary observations and findings made through desk reviews.
* **Semi-structured face to face and telephone interviews with pre-determined sets of questions were conducted with key beneficiaries and partners.** The guides for the key informants interviews were developed. The interviews elicited information describing the linkages, successes and challenges of the projects and their impact on achieving the CP outcomes. The team has met with many UNDP and Government officials, CSOs, project participants, beneficiaries and partners. The interviews were conducted on a voluntary basis, respondents were encouraged to speak frankly about strengths and weaknesses of the projects’ achievements, as well as offer their opinions about UNDP’s potential interventions.
* **Briefing and debriefing sessions with UNDP management** to obtain their strategic guidance and advice on the evaluation design, progress and findings were conducted.
* **Nationally representative opinion poll** to measure gender awareness and effectiveness of ”Stop violence!” campaign to inform evaluation of the EOWR project was conducted.
* **Some projects’ events were attended.** The evaluation team participated in Consensus Forecast round-tables organized by the MDG project.

For the purposes of this evaluation, an outcome evaluation matrix was developed. It focuses on two interconnected areas: country’s progress towards CP Outcomes and UNDP’s degree of contribution (see Figure 1 below). The evaluation attempted to identify quadrants that most correctly reflect Ukraine’s progress and UNDP’s contribution towards achieving 4 CP outcomes, per specific outcome.

**Figure 1. Outcome evaluation matrix**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Progress towards CP is being made, UNDP’s contribution is negative or neutral | Progress towards CP is being made, UNDP’s contribution is positive |
| Progress towards CP is partial or negative, UNDP’s contribution negative or neutral | Progress towards CP is partial or negative, despite UNDP’s positive contribution |

|  |
| --- |
| **Country progress** |

**UNDP contribution**

**Limitations of Evaluation**

**Political instability and changes complicated evaluation of some, especially upstream interventions**. Although specific UNDP’s contributions to CP outcomes were identified and examined, a range and complexity of factors influencing CP outcomes and potential future developments present a complex picture where a wide range of variables affected the outcomes.

**Lack or limited baseline data for some projects**. Some project documents did not contain clearly defined benchmarks and indicators. As a result, the project-outcome link could not be easily detected and evaluators’ findings often rely on the subjective interpretation of the available data and informants’ perceptions.

**Inconsistent approaches adopted across projects to define outputs, outcomes and indicators of success**. In some instances project documents contained lists of activities and did not cover specific project outcomes and indicators of projects’ success that made challenging the evaluation of projects’ effectiveness and required additional data gathering. In some instances, the evaluation team developed proxy outcome indicators to assess the projects’ contribution to achieving CP outcomes.

**The GFK Ukraine evaluation team reported some difficulties in arranging interviews with potential informants**. As a result, the information obtained through interviews is not as fulsome as the evaluation team had hoped for.

# 3. COUNTRY CONTEXT AND PROGRESS IN TERMS OF FOUR CP OUTCOMES[[4]](#footnote-4)

The CPAP for the period 2006-2010 was based on the CCA carried out by the UNCT in 2004, and on the ensuing UNDAF signed in 2005. The UNDAF was developed to support the Government Action Programme “Toward the People” that provided a favourable environment for progress in human development, as it aimed to secure equality, individual rights and fundamental freedoms for all and to elevate social, economic, and democratic life to a level consistent with European standards.[[5]](#footnote-5)

One of the UNDP CPAP’s major planning assumptions was the possibility of sweeping reforms across all levels of Government, as well as across all sectors of society. The Government’s European Choice aspirations provided the vision for a new country, whose democratic performance would be benchmarked against European Union standards. The UNDP CPAP set a clear agenda to support national priorities enshrined in the Government’s Programmes and assist Ukraine in attaining higher level economic and social standards as well as in implementing its European Choice.[[6]](#footnote-6)

Under the leadership of President Yuschenko, the country embarked on a large-scale transition, adopting western-oriented economic and social policies, renovating its political and administrative apparatus and clearly showing its intention to join such international organizations as European Union (EU) and North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). As a result, the country was granted “market economy status” at the end of 2005 by the EU and the US and started to negotiate its accession to the World Trade Organization (WTO).

Context-specific factors played a critical role in determining the nature and impact of UNDP interventions. **Political instability and global economic crisis were probably the most important factors that negatively affected country’s progress in the areas covered by this evaluation.** Political instability, for example, has created a stalemate in the reform process so that such important reforms as decentralization, judicial and public service reforms were not implemented. Frequent changes of the Governments resulted in radical and frequent reshuffles of senior public administration management. Multiple development programmes of different Governments were non-prioritised and did not have the necessary budget support that undermined continuity of reform measures.

The processes of reforms was further complicated by Constitutional changes introduced in 2006 that gave additional powers to the legislature and shifted the centre of policy making and implementation from the President to Government backed by a Parliament coalition. As a result of these changes, the President lost some of his powers so that concerted reform efforts could not be implemented from one centre.

In a February 2010 election Viktor Yanukovuych was elected president of Ukraine. He formed the Government that adopted an extensive list of reform measures across many sectors. In June 2010 the President presented a Programme of Reforms for 2010–2014 *Prosperous Society, Competitive Economy and Efficient Government*. The Programme addresses reforms in five sectors: 1) create preconditions for economic growth, 2) establish and maintain the most favourable business environment, 3) modernize infrastructure and key sectors, 4) develop human and social capital, and 5) improve efficiency of public administration. A Committee on Economic Reforms responsible for implementation of the Programme was established as a part of the President’s Administration.[[7]](#footnote-7)

**CP Outcome 1: Accountable, citizen-based government promoted**

**Country assessment: Partial progress**

**Democratic institutions withstood the turbulent times of internal political developments and global economic crisis, but public administration remained largely unreformed**. In the area of Public Administration Reform (PAR) the Government did not introduce any major reforms. A law *On Civil Service* was not adopted by the Verkhovna Rada. The Government has failed to build a broad political consensus for reforms and implement the following strategic actions recommended by SIGMA:[[8]](#footnote-8)

* focus on what is doable, in the short term perspective through sectoral improvements aimed at improving the legal certainty and reliability of public action and the management of public funds which in the medium term should accumulate to a systemic reform; priority should be given to reduce arbitrariness in public decision-making, develop administrative justice and reinforce financial management;
* foster a consensus amongst societal and political continuity institutions for future change to the fundamental governance arrangements of the State;
* encourage main constitutional actors to evolve towards creating a democratic institutional environment where the checks, balances and limits to the exercise of power are legally defined and enforced;
* support the emergence of next generation civil service leaders.[[9]](#footnote-9)

Only insignificant public administration reforms were implemented during 2006-2010. As a result, corruption was perceived as widespread. Ukraine ranked 146th out of 180 countries in Transparency International’s Corruption Perceptions Index for 2009. According to the 2009 Global Corruption Barometer survey that measures the extent to which the people in different countries perceive six key sectors and institutions to be corrupt, Ukraine was perceived as the most corrupt country in Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States region.[[10]](#footnote-10)

A ruling of the Constitutional Court of Ukraine in 2010 revoked the Constitutional changes of 2006 so that the President restored his decision making authority. Centralization of power may facilitate implementation of the PAR as they will be managed from one centre. The Government’s goals in the area of PAR are to rationalize the public administration and make government processes more logical and predictable. The size of the public service will be reduced and some powers transferred from the central government to local and municipal levels.

The danger of concentration of power in one centre is that the reforms can be implemented by further centralizing state control, restricting democratic institutions and practices and increasing control functions of the state apparatus. Ukraine recorded the most significant decline in democracy scores between 2008 and 2010 out of the 28 countries in Eastern Europe, according to the Economist Intelligence Unit’s Democracy Index.[[11]](#footnote-11) Many journalists, free speech organisations and opposition parliamentarians expressed concerns about freedom of press as the government becoming more and more remote and impenetrable.[[12]](#footnote-12)

**CP Outcome 2:Access to justice and human rights increased**

**Country progress: Partial progress**

J**udicial system remained weak and dependent on the executive branch.** Control of the judicial branch was exercised primarily through control of the judiciary’s budgets and a wide range of other non-transparent instruments. Compared to executive and legislative branches of Government, the judicial branch was underdeveloped, and this seriously weakened the system of checks and balances. The judicial system had inadequate financial resources, professional competence, independence, and facilities. The independence of judges vis-à-vis the executive branch as well as their protection from undue influences and corruption were not fully ensured and guaranteed. Accusations of biased proceedings in court cases were common. As a result, public confidence in the court system was low.

At the President Yanukovich’s initiative, the Parliament adopted a comprehensive law on the judiciary in the summer of 2010. The Law reflected recommendations of the Council of Europe and its full implementation will result in a total overhaul of the judicial system.

**In the area of the women’s rights and gender equality targeted through UNDP interventions, the progress was partial**. The national legislation recognizes equality of rights of women and men. The *Law of Ukraine on Equal Opportunities for Women and Men* that entered into force on 1 January 2006 established solid institutional and legal foundations for gender equality. No gender restrictions in access to any level of education or the labour market exist in Ukraine. The new Gender Inequality Index (GII) introduced in the global UNDP’s Human Development Report 2010 reflects women’s disadvantages in three dimensions – reproductive health, empowerment, and economic activity. In Ukraine, 8 percent of parliamentary seats are held by women, and 92 percent of adult women have a secondary or higher level of education compared to 96 percent of their male counterparts. For every 100,000 live births, 18[[13]](#footnote-13) women die from pregnancy related causes; and the adolescent fertility rate is 28 births per 1000 live births. Female participation in the labour market is 62 percent compared to 73 percent for men.

The traditionalism and gender-based stereotypes of the Ukrainian society negatively affect gender equality. Domestic violence and human trafficking are some of the most vivid manifestations of inadequacy of the mechanisms protecting women’s rights. While there appears to be no implicit or explicit male bias in the process of formulation and enforcement of various laws and regulations, decision-making processes are not gender-inclusive and gender sensitive.

**CP Outcome 3:Sustainable economic development through pro-poor policy reform**

**Country progress: Partial progress**

**The global economic crisis hit the Ukrainian economy hard, in particular due to pre-existing macroeconomic imbalances, structural weaknesses, and policy shortcomings**. Starting from 2000 until mid 2008 Ukraine enjoyed a strong economic development with annual growth averaging 7.5 percent, among the highest in Europe. Household incomes and employment rates increased, the volume of production and services expanded, and the investment climate improved.

The global economic crisis hit Ukraine hard and in 2009 Ukraine’s GDP contracted by 15 percent. There are objective and subjective reasons behind it. Ukraine’s economy was highly dependent on the export of commodities, steel and agricultural produce so when the world prices and demand fell, Ukraine’s export revenues decreased dramatically. Ukraine was also exposed to international capital markets that resulted in credit squeeze. There was no major restructuring of the economy that would create an investment and innovation-led development model. A distorted political system dominated by competition among interest groups and rent seeking within state agencies limited the scope for effective economic reforms. Table 2 below lists the most problematic factors for doing business in Ukraine, which provides an accurate reflection of the broader governance climate. Earlier structural reforms that included competitive tax rates and membership in the World Trade Organization helped Ukraine to gradually return to the path of economic growth since mid-2010.

**Table 2. The most problematic factors for doing business in Ukraine, top 10, percent of responses**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Policy instability | 15.6 |
| Corruption | 13.9 |
| Access to financing | 10.8 |
| Tax regulations | 9.6 |
| Government instability/coups | 9.5 |
| Inefficient government bureaucracy | 8.8 |
| Inflation | 8.8 |
| Tax rates | 8.4 |
| Restrictive labor regulations | 2.8 |
| Foreign currency regulations | 2.8 |

Source: 2010 World Economic Forum.*The Global Competitiveness Report 2010-2011*,

**Although pro-poor policies and institutions cushioned the social impact of the global economic crisis, the necessary reforms of the social sector were not implemented.** Pursuing short-term political gains, politicians were elected promising unsustainable and poorly targeted social programs that became a heavy burden on the budget.

Quality of public education did not meet the society’s expectations. Around 20% of employers stated that employees/workers had inadequate qualifications to positions/posts held.[[14]](#footnote-14) Education policies and practices failed to:

* address the needs of pre-schoolers and create adequate number of places in nursery schools;
* support children with special needs by making schools accessible; and
* facilitate access to education of children residing in rural areas by providing them with the necessary transportation.

Healthcare system remained unreformed. Bloated hospital infrastructure, low quality of services, limited accessibility of healthcare and a limited number of services provided are some of its current features.

Despite some improvements in social policy, poverty remains a big challenge. Although Ukraine has succeeded in reducing absolute poverty from 9 percent in 2005 to 4.5 percent in 2009, relative poverty according to the nationally defined poverty line has remained stable at the level of 27 percent.[[15]](#footnote-15) The poverty level in rural areas is almost twice as high as in urban areas (38.2 percent against 21.5 percent).[[16]](#footnote-16)

**CP Outcome 4:**

**Civil society organisations protect and advocate for human rights and justice[[17]](#footnote-17)**

**Country progress: Partial progress**

**Civil society has been strengthened but still is insufficiently developed to effectively advocate for human rights and justice as CSOs do in full democracies.** The legal framework for CSOs is outdated that makes the process of establishment of new CSOs cumbersome. Despite these legal barriers, the number of CSOs increased and they are becoming a source of vital experience, expertise and information and are often involved in consultations on important policy matters. Capacities of CSOs strengthened as well, however often their behaviour is based on principles of loyalty either to donors or domestic interest groups. Often the agendas of CSOs are shaped by their funders and some of them do not emphasize the task of building ties with their constituencies and operate only within a particular set of tasks envisaged by the funders.

**In the area of human rights and justice, capacities of CSOs were strengthened**. National-level networks are active in the areas of human rights, democratisation, environment, and regional development. There is a very strong group of CSOs dealing with the issues related to HIV/AIDS, which base their activities on significant donor support. There are some positive developments at the local level where CSOs represent various socially vulnerable groups, such as persons with disabilities; conduct effective fund raising campaigns; deliver some services to their target groups and work with local governments.

**While both the national and local governments do not discourage CSOs participation, they do not always encourage it either.** Consultations with citizens and civil society organisations are mandatory when it comes to draft regulations related to the human rights and individual freedoms, regional or national policy documents and frameworks. Consultations should also be conducted related to the consolidated reports on budget expenditures. The public councils have been established in 77 national executive agencies and in all oblast-level administration bodies. Some elements of the institutional mechanism for the government – civil society consultations and dialogue are in place, but they need significant improvements to be effective.

**UNDP’s CSDP project supported CSOs at the local level to address important social issues**

* New / innovative services established for children and youth with disabilities in Chernihiv, Drohobych and Radekhiv
* Training and consultation support provided to rural youth and children without parental care in Kherson and Khmelnytshky oblasts
* Public audit related to accessibility of public venues conducted in Lviv, Luhansk and Sverdlovsk and advocacy activities conducted related to people with disabilities (PWD)
* New / innovative services established for single mothers in Chernihiv
* Data-base created for citizen groups in Khmelnytshkyi oblast, in order to facilitate the establishment of housing associations in order to improve the maintenance of buildings
* Interactive web-site created to support social enterprises (small and medium size businesses) in Lviv and Vynnyky.

# 4. EVALUATION FINDINGS

**In all 4 CP outcome areas Ukraine has made partial positive progress, despite UNDP’s positive contribution.** Ukraine’s political and economic realities played a major role in determining opportunities for UNDP engagement and affected projects’ outcomes. Often the political will and commitment to implement comprehensive reforms were lacking that restricted the number of areas for UNDP intervention and limited their potential impact. High level analysis of projects’ contribution to achieving CP outcomes is provided below. More detailed information and analysis of all 6 projects can be found in the Annex that contains executive summaries of individual projects reports.

## 4.1 Relevance

**The projects’ outputs were relevant to respective CP outcomes**. UNDP’s projects were closely aligned with the national development agenda. In the course of implementation, the projects maintained overall relevance to the needs and priorities of the target beneficiaries.

Projects’ relevance was ensured through the following UNDP’s strategies:

* **UNDP utilized participatory processes in developing project documents.** UNDP project documents have been drawn up in partnership with the Government, CSOs, donors and other relevant stakeholders. This has ensured both government ownership and alignment with national priorities so that the projects met the identified demand and need for UNDP support.
* **Project Boards established to oversee projects’ implementation proved to be effective.** Stakeholders were involved into monitoring projects’ progress that helped UNDP to ensure the projects’ relevance to Government and beneficiaries’ needs and priorities. Project Boards were meeting at least twice a year and for more complex projects quarterly to review the work plans and achievements and discuss any changes to project documents, as necessary. Project Boards helped to enhance projects’ responsiveness to partners and beneficiaries’ needs and achieve cost-savings.
* **Relevance of downstream interventions/components was ensured through continuous examination of beneficiaries’ needs and expectations.** CSDP, for instance, has studied the needs of the grants recipients to provide them with the training and consultative support they needed. As a result, the relevance of the trainings was highly appreciated by the participants.
* **Relevance of upstream interventions was ensured through regular consultations with beneficiaries.** Upstream components/interventions tried to ensure relevance through consultations with the respective Government ministries and other stakeholders.

The MDGs project, for example, addressed such weaknesses of strategic economic planning in Ukraine as a lack of longer-term vision, absence of a clear set of priorities and a declarative nature of programs, which are not supported with the necessary institutional and financial resources. As these limitations resulted in poor targeting and inefficiencies of pro-poor policies and were acknowledged by both senior Government executives and independent experts, the interventions selected by the project were highly relevant. The project’s interventions such as inter-ministerial and expert consultations and targeted trainings strengthened the Ministry’s capacities in strategic planning. The project’s interventions, in particular, strengthened capacity in consensus forecasts so that the Ministry of Economy was able to better justify its forecasts and withstand the political pressure to prepare unrealistic budgets. The project implemented activities to incorporate MDG framework into strategic planning and issued a high quality MDG report that was well received by the Government, but MDGs are still not fully integrated into Government strategic documents and policies.

UNDP’s CSR project was too ambitious in setting its targets and its evaluation of the Government’s willingness to undertake major public administration reforms and implement SIGMA’s recommendations in the area of civil service focusing on promoting a professional, merit-based and neutral civil service. The assumptions of the project document that the law *On Civil Service* would be adopted and that the Government would implement SIGMA’s recommendations did not materialize. The project adapted to new political realities and ensured its relevance by focusing its main efforts on establishing and institutionalizing the School for Senior Civil Service Officials. As a result, 78% of its budget was allocated for building training capacity within the MDCS.

UNDP’s CSDP project’s interventions were relevant to the needs of CSOs and goals of promoting human rights in Ukraine. The project focused on human rights in a very broad sense and supported CSOs that promote not only political and individual rights, but also social, economic, cultural and environmental rights. Such a widened scope of human rights attracted new CSOs that address a much broader range of issues through human rights approach. The project also targeted CSOs at the local level where CSOs protecting and advocating for human rights and justice are much weaker than national CSOs. Some aspects of strategic importance to civil society development however were missed. Training opportunities were not focused on developing fundraising skills that, according to the interviewed experts, are some of the most important capacity building needs of CSOs in Ukraine as CSOs are excessively dependent on international funding.

UNDP’s EOWR Programme demonstrated a good degree of flexibility and responsiveness in adjusting its activities to the needs and requests of the governmental agencies. For example, the Programme conducted analysis on the situation of women within the Ministry of Interior and Ministry of Defence in response to ministries’ requests.

UNDP’s YSI project strengthened capacity of selected youth centres through trainings of their staff in project management, fundraising, development of volunteerism, teambuilding, leadership and communications skills, computer skills, healthy lifestyles promotion, and children’s security in Internet. It helped the centres to organize various types of events and social projects that addressed local needs. The project, however, was unable to establish strong working relations with the Ministry of Family, Youth and Sports, which was the project’s implementing partner that limited its overall relevance, impact and sustainability.

**UNDP’s BRAAC project effectively supported World Trade Organization (WTO) accession of Ukraine**

BRAAC project experts worked closely with the Trade Department of the Ministry of Economy preparing reports to WTO, giving recommendations for negotiations, revising and drafting changes to legislation to ensure compliance with WTO and EU requirements. Due to this support, Ukraine joined WTO in 2008.

WTO accession has brought and would continue bringing significant benefits to Ukraine, including positive impact on elimination of poverty and promotion of social inclusion. The vast majority of households gained from WTO accession, and the poor gained at least as much as the average household. Benefits came from increased foreign direct investment (FDI), increased productivity owing to an inflow of imported technology and the improved conditions of Ukrainian exporters who got easier access for Ukrainian goods to global market and better protection against discrimination.

## 4.2 Effectiveness

Effectiveness focuses on results, not processes and examines the extent to which UNDP’s projects produced their planned outcomes. **The evidence collected through the evaluation indicates that overall the projects have achieved almost all of their intended objectives and were effective.**

In CSDP project, the interviews with stakeholders confirmed that UNDP’s implementing partners ensured high quality of applications for small grants. Effective monitoring was ensured through field visits and the grantees’ reporting system. Most of the projects implemented within the small grants scheme were largely successful, bringing visible results and success stories (e.g., establishing social and administrative services, improvement of social infrastructure facilities for people with disabilities, revising groundless housing tariffs, cancellation of illegal private housing construction, improvement of effectiveness and transparency of technical inventory bureau). The best practices of the project were published in the brochure ”Success Stories: A Recipe for a Thriving Civil Society in Ukraine”.

Some projects achieved results at a more modest scale than they had been outlined in project documents. There are a number of reasons beyond scope of UNDP influence that affected these outcomes. Policy level interventions did not completely reach their goals because political will to implement some crucial reforms was lacking.

The EOWR programme, for instance, according to the experts and partners interviewed was more effective in its educational and communication activities than in policy-making efforts mostly due to a lack of strong political will to adopt the necessary legislative changes and strengthen functionality of national gender machinery. Cascade trainings (training small groups of trainers who then pass the knowledge to wider audiences in the series of trainings) were identified as an effective tool of forming the critical mass of governmental officials, education professionals, and police officers familiar with gender issues.

The EOWR’s interventions in the area of improving the system of response to gender based violence were very effective. According to the opinion poll conducted by GfK Ukraine within January 17-30 of 2011, 37% of those who have seen or heard materials on domestic violence produced by the EOWR in the last 2 years would call the hotline in case of domestic violence in their family or their friends’ families (versus 28% of those who haven’t seen or heard any related materials). As a result, the number of calls to the hotline on family violence has significantly increased with the start of the “Stop Violence!” campaign (367 calls in 2007, 1345 – in 2008, 3756 – in 2009, 6244 – in 2010).

The YSI project, in particular, was effective in the area of developing social competencies and skills of the youth. According to a survey among the pupils who passed Computer Technologies and Future Profession course, 87% found that the course helped them in their choice of the profile of future studies and 98% would recommend it to friendswho will need to make a choice of profession. The absolute majority of surveyed teachers and parents of the children with disabilities confirmed positive changes in children’s skills. The project, however, was unable to engage all the youth centers in cooperation and experience sharing activities.

## 4.3 Impact

As the projects are diverse in terms of their focus and nature of interventions, specific projects’ impact on achieving 4 CP Outcomes are covered in the Table 3 below.

**Table 3. CP Outcomes and Specific Impact Made by 6 Projects, by Project**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CP outcome/ project** | **Specific Impact, Some Examples** |
| **Equal Opportunities and Women’s Rights in Ukraine Programme (EOWR) contributed to:****Outcome 2. Access to justice and human rights.****Outcome 4. Civil society organizations protect and advocate for human rights and justice.** | **A national gender machinery that promotes gender rights has been established**. Gender programmes were adopted by all the regional state administrations. Coordination councils in charge of gender issues were established in all regions of Ukraine. Gender advisors in 10 regional state administrations were appointed. Gender resource centres were established in 11 regions. **Capacity of the public administration in the area of gender rights has been strengthened**. Capacity of 10 ministries and governmental agencies and regional state administrations in gender mainstreaming was strengthened.**Capacity of Ministry of Justice to conduct gender assessment of legislation has been strengthened**. With the Ministry of Justice the methodological recommendations on gender assessment of legislation were elaborated and the manual was prepared and distributed. The Family Code of Ukraine was subjected to gender assessment by the Ministry of Justice.**Access to justice and human rights through the system of domestic violence prevention and response has been improved**. A large-scale awareness raising campaign «Stop violence!» was conducted. As a result, 27% of the population know about the hotline for combating domestic violence and protecting children’s rights. Capacity of relevant governmental agencies and police district inspectors has been strengthened. **Capacity of the system of education to promote gender rights has been strengthened.** Gender educational centres and departments of gender studies were established at the universities.  |
| **Youth Social Inclusion for Civic Engagement in Ukraine (YSI)****Outcome 3. Sustainable economic development through pro-poor policy reform.** | Potential positive impact on sustainable economic development is expected from extensive capacity building of youth in using information and communication technologies through *Skills for Success Programme*. **6800 pupils were trained within the Project** (versus 3000 planned), including children with disabilities. **Youth centers implemented 115 successful volunteering social projects** for their communities involving local youth and authorities. Close to 2000 volunteers were mobilized in 2010, double the amount in 2009 (945). |
| **Millenium Development Goals (MDG) Project****Outcome 3. Sustainable economic development through pro-poor policy reform.** | **The centrality of MDG framework to Government policies and programs has been widely recognized.** The President publicly committed to link his program of reforms to MDGs. The President’s program on economic reforms contains indicators similar to MDGs indicators. The MDG Ukraine-2010 National Report was presented by the President of Ukraine at UN summit on MDG in September 2010. It was the first time when the highest Ukrainian official accepted the problem of HIV/AIDS in Ukraine at the international level.**MDG framework was accepted and utilized by public servants in preparing strategic planning documents.** MDGs issues and indicators are incorporated in recent government documents. **Inter-ministerial and expert consultations were institutionalized as a standard practice in development of government programmes.** As of 2010, this approach has become a standard practice of government action plan drafting and the Ministry of Economy is committed to continue doing it if the project is terminated.**Forecasting capacity strengthened by establishing practice of regular Consensus Forecast round-tables.** Consensus forecast’s results are frequently used by Ministry of Economy staff to justify their analysis for politicians and withstand the pressure to develop unrealistic budgets. **Professionalism of central and oblast level government officials in strategic planning was improved.** Numerous training sessions on strategic planning attracted many participants and were well received at the oblast level.  |
| **Support to Economic Reforms in Ukraine through the Blue Ribbon Advisory and Analytical Centre (BRAAC) Project****Outcome 3. Sustainable economic development through pro-poor policy reform.** | **Ukraine joined the WTO**. The project experts worked closely with the Trade Department of the Ministry of Economy preparing reports to WTO, giving recommendations for negotiations, revising and drafting changes to legislation to ensure compliance with WTO and EU requirements. Key project expert on WTO issues also advocated Ukraine’s joining WTO by disseminating results of impact study of WTO accession in media. **Consensus on the need of pension reform and its specific measures was built among policy makers and experts.** Pension reform was extensively advocated by the BRAAC. In 2008, BRAAC published and disseminated the analytical report on pension system reform that was highly evaluated and widely used by the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, Pension Fund, and other relevant agencies. As a result, pension reform has been included into the Presidential Program for Economic Reforms for 2010-2014.**Consensus on the necessity of agricultural land market infrastructure development and reforms was built among policy makers at the national and local levels and expert community**. As a result of project’s activities, agricultural land market development was identified as a priority in the Presidential Program for Economic Reforms.**Numerous reform proposals developed by the project were accepted by the President and the Government.** Out of 21 key reform proposals provided by BRAAC in its 2009 report “Recommendations on economic and institutional reforms 2009”, 11 proposals were fully or partially reflected in the Presidential Program of Economic Reforms for 2010-2014.  |
| **Civil Society Development Programme (CSDP)****Outcome 2. Access to justice and human rights****Outcome 4. Civil society organizations protect and advocate for human rights and justice** | Only mid-term project impacts are listed below as the project is expected to be completed in 2012**22 small grant projects (versus 30 planned) have been successfully implemented by the CSO partners with visible impact at the local level** (establishing social and administrative services, improvement of social infrastructure facilities for people with disabilities, revising groundless housing tariffs, cancellation of illegal private housing construction, etc). **Capacity of 40 representatives of the 22 grantees was strengthened** in CSO management and advocacy during four training and networking events. Grant recipients who participated in different CSDP trainings showed high level of their satisfaction with the training received and use the obtained knowledge in their daily work.**The draft law on Civil Society Organizations – work in progress*.*** Analytical, awareness-raising and advocacy work to promote enabling legal environment for the civil society has been started by the Ukrainian Center for Independent Political research (UCIPR) supported by a grant through the CSDP.  |
| **Support to Civil Service Reform (CSR) Project****CP Outcome 1: Accountable, citizen-based government promoted** | **The School for Senior Civil Service Officials was established and well-institutionalized**. It is accountable to MDCS with the mandate to develop and implement training policy for high corps of the civil service. The School management highly evaluated UNDP assistance and support.**The procedures for training need assessment were developed and transferred to the School.****Professionalism of higher civil servants was raised and their leadership skills were developed.** The culture and practice of life-long learning for senior civil servants was introduced and well received in Ukraine. **Awareness about the necessity of adopting a draft Law on Civil Service was raised.** |

## 4.4 Partnership strategies

**UNDP has performed satisfactorily in developing and implementing its partnership strategies**. Its partnership strategies proved to be appropriate and effective. The partnerships positively contributed to the achievement of the CP outcomes.

**Success of partnerships can be attributed to the following UNDP strategies**:

* Continuous dialogue and responsiveness to partners’ needs.
* Practicality and rationality in distribution of partners’ roles that takes into consideration their comparative advantages.
* Experimentation with various partnerships arrangements. Continuous exploration of new partnership opportunities.
* Effective and extensive partnerships with the civil society.
* Use of Project Boards that comprise multiple stakeholders.
* Pursuit of synergies among UNDP projects.

UNDP’s CSR project in consultation with the MDCS and other projects ensured clear separation of roles and responsibilities of all projects supporting MDCS. Effective partnership avoided overlapping of efforts and facilitated effective sharing of information and promotion of successful practices. The project missed, however, an opportunity to build working relations with the National Academy of Public Administration that provides both pre and in-service training in the area of public administration. Such a partnership could have potentially resulted in alignment of training strategies and curricula and sharing of effective practices between the School and the Academy.

In the area of women and children’s rights, the partners maintained clear division of areas of focus. The UNDP’s EOWR has focused on state policy, education and domestic violence; International Labour Organization - on promoting gender equality on labour market, Council of Europe – on adapting legislative framework to European standards, the United Nations Children’s Fund – on helping children in difficult life circumstances (pilot project in Khmelnytsky region), Safege – on information and awareness campaign. However, the EOWR areas of focus partially overlapped with those of the Council of Europe in the area of improving legislative framework and Safege in the area of awareness building against domestic violence. The EOWR also worked with a wide range of ministries and government agencies in strengthening their capacities in gender mainstreaming that included Ministry of Interior, Ministry of Education and Science, Ministry for Family, Youth and Sport, Ministry of Defence, Ministry of Justice, Ministry of Economy, Ministry of Labour and Social Policy, Ministry of Culture and Tourism, Ministry of Health Care, State Committee of Television and Radio Broadcasting, National Commission on Public Ethics.

UNDP’s CSDP project and its partner, International Renaissance Foundation (IRF) practically and rationally delineated their roles and parameters of supporting CSOs in the area of protecting of human rights. IRF has focused more on protecting the rights of the poor citizens and local communities, while CSDP supported CSOs promoting the rights of such vulnerable groups as people with disabilities, convicts and former convicts, women and youth.

UNDP pursued innovations in partnerships and forged alliances with such partners in the Business Sector as Intel. Through its cooperation with the Intel Corporation and implementing its international innovative learning tool - Skills for Success Program, the YSI project offered two courses: Computer Technologies for Local Community for pupils of 5-7 classes and Computer Technologies and Future Profession for pupils of 8-10 classes. These courses were taught in schools as extracurricular classes by the programme facilitators.

The YSI project benefited from experiences of such UNDP projects as Human Security for Ukrainian Youth Project and Chernobyl Recovery and Development Programme. It collaborated with such currently active projects as Community Based Approach to Local Development, Municipal Governance and Sustainable Development Programme and Crimea Integration and Development Programme.

## 4.5 Sustainability

Sustainability is about being strategic and looking to the future. Sustainability does not mean only that the systems, activities, and practices established by the projects continue beyond their completion. It means also building on project’s achievements to advance to another level, by extending efforts into other areas.

**UNDP has been overall effective in promoting sustainability of its projects among its partners.** Sustainability of interventions depends on a wide range of factors that are often beyond UNDP’s control. The partners demonstrated different degrees of their institutional, technical and financial commitments to projects’ objectives.

**The following factors positively contributed to projects’ sustainability**:

* strong commitment of National Project Directors and partners to projects’ objectives and sustainability;
* development of effective exit strategies or possible follow-on project at the early stages of the project cycle;
* existence of strong relations with national partners that ensured their ownership of the project and its outcomes;
* incorporation of significant capacity building measures into project interventions; and
* strong and strategically focused project management.

The MDG project’s relatively high degree of sustainability can be attributed to long-term working relations that the project established with the Ministry of Economy. A significant number of officials responsible for strategic planning in the Ministry of Economy received extensive trainings from the project and they apply many strategies and tools learned in their work. Consultations have been institutionalized as an integral element of the process of developing strategic planning documents. The Ministry committed to conduct consensus forecast seminars itself, if the project does not support them any longer. A robust system of strategic planning, however, has not been institutionalized in the Ministry. In the area of support of MDGs implementation in Ukraine, sustainability of project’s achievements depends to a large extent on political will as MDGs are still not mainstreamed into government policy and decision making processes.

Some elements of the EOWR programme are more sustainable than the others. In the area of improving the system of response to gender based violence, 27% of the Ukrainian population knows about a hotline for combating domestic violence and protecting children’s rights. The approval of the action plan of the “Stop Violence!” campaign by the Cabinet of Ministers also ensures future sustainability of Programme’s efforts. In the area of strengthening the national gender machinery, sustainability of the EOWR interventions depends on the political will and continued institutional support. The Ministry of Family, Youth and Sports, which is the main governmental partner of the EOWR, is planned to be integrated into the Ministry of Education and Science, and when the evaluation was conducted it was still unclear what institution will be in charge of gender-related issues. As the EOWR built capacity of a wide range of ministries and agencies, there are still hopes that the capacity building efforts of the Programme will form the critical mass of gender sensitive specialists, and that the government will accept the recommendations and draft legislation documents produced by the Programme, as well as its work for developing the next *State Programme to Ensure Gender Equality in the Ukrainian Society*. The EOWR’s efforts aimed at the system of education are sustainable. Gender lessons at schools, gender education centers and departments at universities, gender education forum and other activities supported by the project helped to establish a network of educational professionals with expertise in gender issues. This network will positively contribute to sustainability of project results.

**UNDP’s Support to Civil Service Reform project ensured sustainability of the**

**School for Senior Civil Service Officials**

One of the core objectives of UNDP’s Support to Civil Service Reform project was to establish a School for Senior Civil Service Officials within the Main Department of Civil Service (MDCS). Many senior public servants were reassigned or had to leave the public service as a result of the Presidential elections that limited the project impact. The project main strategic accomplishment is that it established the School and positioned it as a key in-service training and knowledge mobilization institution for senior Government management. School secured a very positive image among senior public servants. It managed to develop an internal structure, including competent staff and professional curricula. UNDP’s project brought the necessary expertise in training of senior public servants and adapted it to the local circumstances that proved to be instrumental in making School a respected leader in providing training of senior Government management. The project was completed in December 2010 but the School’s sustainability was ensured. The School has been successful in raising funds from other donors including CIDA, Danish government, and USAID; School’s role has been reflected in the Decree of Cabinet of Ministers on Training Programs and Concept of the Development of High Corps of Civil Service, and the budget financing for the School was increased for 2011. High level of project’s sustainability can be attributed to the MDCS senior management that played a key role during project preparation and implementation exhibiting high ownership, commitment, and a clear strategic vision.

The YSI project is only partially sustainable. According to the evaluation conducted by the National United Nations Volunteers in 2010, 28 out of 52 youth centres are expected to be sustainable. In a number of cases youth centres were able to attract support from local businesses and local authorities that positively contributed to their sustainability. Overall, sustainability of youth centres depends greatly on the attitudes and priorities of their leaders and members and national and local socio-economic conditions. The project tracked its progress towards targets through quarterly progress reports and no annual reports were developed for 2009 and 2010. It limited the project’s ability to focus on outcomes, identify lessons learned and make the necessary adjustments to strengthen its sustainability.

The BRAAC Project’s results are somewhat sustainable. The reform agenda was set in Ukraine and the Program of Economic Reforms for 2010-2014 announced by the President Yanukovych incorporates many of reform proposals advocated by BRAAC. Ukraine joined WTO and has been negotiating Free Trade Area with the EU and the Government committed to pass legislation on pension reform. Capacity building activities of the project were limited to facilitating access of Ukrainian professionals to the best international expertise, and providing assistance and consultations in the process of policy making. The project’s consultants did not work directly with civil servants to ensure effective knowledge and skills transfer and often performed the functions of civil servants that limited the extent of project’s sustainability

Although ensuring sustainability of interventions supporting CSOs beyond the programme life-span is always a challenge, CSDP delivered targeted training opportunities on such topics as “Effective Management of CSOs”, “Managing Human Resources”, “Working with Volunteers”, “Financial Management of CSOs”, “Mobilizing Local Resources for CSO Sustainability”, ”Communications Strategy of CSOs”, “Negotiation Skills” that contributed to supporting CSOs sustainability. The opportunities to focus trainings more explicitly on building fundraising skills of CSOs that could have positively contributed to their sustainability were missed. The project strategically focused on establishing strong relations with local authorities and communities that helped many grant recipients ensure local authorities’ and communities’ involvement to their projects that positively contributed to their sustainability.

## 4.6 Key limitations

**Inconsistent degree of focus on results across projects**. Some projects overemphasized the importance of activities without proper focus on strategic priorities, outcomes and impacts. Often the linkages between inputs, outputs and CP outcomes were not fully clear in project documentation. For example, BRAAC project’s reports contain extensive information on the number of draft laws reviewed, analytical notes prepared, conferences and round tables conducted that exceeded the planned project’s outputs. Although extensive analytical work was undertaken and recommendations submitted to decision makers, it was insufficient follow-up so it is difficult to assess how the recommendations were used in decision making processes.[[18]](#footnote-18) In the case of CSDP project the results and resources framework is to some extent unrealistic, as it proposes outputs that should be rather defined as outcomes (e.g. output 2 “An enabling legislative and policy environment created for a better functioning civil society in Ukraine“). The report by the Danish Institute for Human Rights on CSDP also recommends making the outputs more realistic and measurable. The EOWR provided extensive description of project’s activities in annual reports, but the reports do not have the same format and tend to be more descriptive than analytical.

**Some possibilities to conduct joint activities of UNDP projects were underutilised.** The evaluation team found that the opportunities for better cooperation among UNDP projects were not fully utilized. It is beneficial to promote synergy of relevant UNDP projects. CSDP could have worked closer with the Community Based Approach to Local Development Project since the activities are being implemented in parallel in seven target oblasts. Collaboration opportunities among BRAAC, CSDP and EOWR projects could have been explored as well. The School for Senior Civil Service Officials, established in the course of implementation of UNDP CSR project, for instance, may have served as good institutional mechanism for capacity building of government officials and networking on reform issues advocated by BRAAC. BRAAC experts’ participation in School activities would have strengthened project’s capacity building efforts by expanding their audience.

**Knowledge management systems are not fully implemented**. There was no clear accumulation of lessons learned and documentation from some UNDP projects was unavailable. Often the projects did not have a consistent approach to identify and analyze lessons learned that limited UNDP capacity to adjust projects to changing political and socio-economic environment.

**UNDP administrative procedures were too cumbersome for some downstream interventions**. In the case of CSDP project that provided grants to CSOs, some partners suggested that more simplified grants approval and reporting processes could have streamlined the project execution.

# 5. LESSONS LEARNED AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The evaluation identifies a number of lessons learned. UNDP projects have the highest impact and are the most effective when they are:

* realistic, do not have inflated expectations and pragmatic in terms of technical feasibility and time required to successfully implement them;
* flexible and responsive to national circumstances and Government’s needs;
* aligned with top Government priorities;
* rely on support of committed national partners who assume ownership of the projects and their outcomes;
* strategic and address sustainability aspects from the beginning of a project cycle;
* results-oriented on CP outcomes through all stages of a project cycle;
* based on effective partnership strategies; and
* led by results-focused project managers with strong leadership competencies who establish and maintain trusting relationships with national project directors and diverse stakeholders groups.

The next CP is being developed in different political circumstances and is driven by more realistic expectations.[[19]](#footnote-19) The Government of Ukraine, formed in February 2010, has actively engaged in the formulation and adoption of a set of social and economic development plans, strategies and policies. Whether the political will to implement them is credible and sustainable remains to be seen. The International Monetary Fund (IMF) conditionalities and a desire of the political leadership to consolidate power may create a favourable environment for a number of significant reforms. There are some important development priorities that have to be addressed by the Government that are directly linked to 4 CP Outcomes examined in this report.

In the area of democratic governance and human development, the country has to strengthen its public sector governance. Central and local government mandates and responsibilities should be clearly delineated with the goal of improving public services delivery. Participatory decision-making processes and practices should be strengthened at the national and local levels.

The legislative framework in the area of civil society should be modernized and reflect the best international practices. CSOs should strengthen their institutional capacity and become more sustainable and less dependent on donors’ funding.

Significant efforts should be undertaken to reduce poverty and eliminate barriers to social inclusion. Although Ukraine managed to reduce absolute poverty from 9 percent in 2005 to 4.5 percent in 2009, the relative poverty measure according to the nationally defined poverty line has remained stable at the level of 27 percent. The poverty level in rural areas is almost twice as high as in urban areas (38.2 percent against 21.5 percent).

Progress of the Government towards achieving MDG goals is uneven. There is a clear need to strengthen the Government practices of monitoring the MDG targets and strengthen capacities of various institutions to implement MDG-based policies and human development strategies.

The goals of gender equality should be actively pursued. Representation of women in the Parliament at 8% is very low and well below the nationally set MDG target of 30%. The gap between incomes of women and men remains significant, at around 25 percent.

UNDP aligned its assistance and programming with the Government priorities, programmes and policies. The discussion below was informed by this evaluation exercise. It identifies specific potential areas of UNDP interventions and provides some suggestions how programme design, implementation and management can be further enhanced.

## 5.1 Potential areas of interventions

UNDP has considerable influence in the area of 4 CP outcomes covered by this evaluation. UNDP enjoys a reputation of being responsive to Government needs in implementing both upstream and downstream interventions. It has demonstrated flexibility and responsiveness to the needs and circumstances of its development partners. UNDP’s solid management practices and effective and transparent procurement procedures secured trust of both the Government and the donors for funds administration.

UNDP cannot be the most capable agency involved in multiple sectors and areas at the same time. There are some areas in which it has clear competitive and comparative advantages. The analysis below may inform UNDP comprehensive competitive and comparative advantages assessment, but it is limited in its scope as it is based on the evidence from 6 projects.

**UNDP’s comparative advantages in the areas of 4 CP outcomes include:**

* Expertise and solid experience of working in such politically sensitive areas as strategic policy advice, agricultural policies, civil society development, public administration reforms, human rights and WTO accession.
* Leadership positions in promoting MDGs and MDG-focused policies and strategies.
* Well institutionalized relations with such lead ministries as the Ministry of Economy, Ministry of Agrarian Policy and the Main Department of Civil Service that play a crucial role in advancing initiatives addressing economic development, poverty reduction and administrative reforms.
* Extensive experience in implementing local community development interventions. Effective partnerships established at the regional level.
* Extensive expertise in designing upstream and downstream interventions promoting human rights.
* Solid expertise and experience in promoting gender equality through integrated and systematic approaches combining policy advice, awareness building, and education interventions at the national and local levels.
* Extensive experience of working with civil society organizations and promoting the interests of CSOs at the levels of policy and legislation.
* Ability to mobilise high quality local expertise.
* Capacity and solid experience in effective implementation of multi-million projects.
* Significant corporate expertise in such areas as MDGs, social inclusion, gender rights, public administration reforms and civil society. Ability to quickly identify and deploy internationally recognised experts in various development fields.
* Innovations, flexibility and orientation on results in building effective partnerships.

**UNDP has strong comparative advantages to implement EU-funded projects.** EU remains the largest funding source for development activities in Ukraine. The EC cooperation with Ukraine is framed by a Partnership and Cooperation Agreement (PCA), which entered into force in 1998, and the EU-Ukraine Action Plan adopted in 2005.  The PCA established an institutional framework for EU-Ukraine policy dialogue. The Association Agreement is currently under negotiation and its adoption will significantly deepen Ukraine’s political association and economic integration with the EU. The EU signed with Ukraine a Memorandum of Understanding on the National Indicative Programme for Ukraine for €470 million Euros for the period of 2011-13. It focuses on Good Governance and the Rule of Law, on the preparations for the entry into force of the Association Agreement and Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Area, and on Sustainable Development.[[20]](#footnote-20)

Although the EU may move towards budgetary support and provide funds directly to the Government and its institutions, UNDP should consider actively exploring the areas where it can be involved in implementation of projects funded by the EU. As this evaluation demonstrates, UNDP has a number of comparative advantages in competing for EU funded projects:

* Good working relations established with the Government to operate in such politically sensitive areas as human rights, strategic economic planning and public administration reforms.
* Solid experience in community development and supporting civil society.
* Solid corporate and Ukraine-based expertise in Good Governance and the Rule of Law areas that are the focus of the EU’s National Indicative Programme for Ukraine for the period of 2011-13.
* Extensive expertise in the area of social inclusion in Ukraine that is an important area in EU’s agenda.
* Operational capacity to effectively and transparently implement EU-funded projects. UNDP has transparent and effective management practices and procurement rules that both the EU and the Government may find attractive in executing EU-funded projects. As public procurement system is still weak in Ukraine and is perceived by many as inefficient or corrupt when less quality products or services are procured and firms invest into building “connections” instead of improving their economic performance. If EU-funded projects are implemented by UNDP in cooperation with the Government, it will eliminate risks to integrity in public procurement for EU-funded projects.
* Expertise in complying with EC internal procedures such as project monitoring and verification.

Although UNDP has numerous comparative advantages, there is a range of factors that can hamper scaling up of UNDP activities in Ukraine in the areas of 4 CP outcomes:

* Ukraine is a middle income country. Although the total official development assistance (ODA) to Ukraine, excluding debt increased from 618 million USD in 2008 to 668 million USD in 2009, it is unlikely that this is a long-term trend. As income levels in the country will increase, access to larger financial resources will become more restricted.
* Total ODA, excluding debt from EU institutions to Ukraine declined from 242 million USD in 2008 to 177 million USD in 2009.[[21]](#footnote-21) As EU institutions are important UNDP’s partners, it negatively affected the organization’s ability to scale up its activities.
* The global recession pressures donor countries to cut their aid budgets and may result in lower than anticipated ODA earmarking and allocations to Ukraine in the future.
* Facing the consequences of the global economic crisis and extent of development problems Ukraine is facing, both the Government and donors are looking for possibilities to achieve more with less funding. They are open for collaboration with various partners who can deliver effective support and value for money.
* Some donors in their external assistance delivery modalities are moving towards budget support as their trust in the public financial management system of Ukraine grows.
* Many donors prefer to deliver their programmes in cooperation with companies and organizations with headquarters in their countries. For example, the Government of Canada announced in October 2010 that it is contributing over $36 million in support of six projects aligned with the Government of Ukraine’s reform plan. Five projects are focussed on creating a climate for sustainable economic growth, while a sixth project will help improve juvenile justice services and programs. These projects are implemented by Canadian agencies and companies.[[22]](#footnote-22) The recent Sweden’s Strategy for development cooperation with Ukraine also indicates that there are Swedish actors with preparedness and capacity to help Ukraine meet its undertakings and to harmonise its judicial sector and law enforcement with the EU’s regulatory framework such as the Swedish Police.[[23]](#footnote-23)
* Main competitors of UNDP Ukraine in the reviewed programme area are numerous and diverse.In addition to traditiondevelopment partners, national and international CSOs and consulting firms compete with UNDP for funding. Over the course of the last years, these players significantly strengthened their skills and positions and are capable to compete with UNDP for funding.

**Potential CP outcomes and groups of interventions to address them**

**Expand a section of CP addressing social inclusion**. UNDP supported the Government of Ukraine in establishing a system for collecting, analyzing and monitoring the social inclusion indicators. Extensive analytical and awareness raising work in the area of social inclusion in Ukraine was conducted. Social groups vulnerable to exclusion and specific barriers to their social inclusion were identified. Specific policy recommendations to advance social inclusion were developed. One of potential approaches is to work with the relevant ministries and support them in implementing a range of policies and interventions addressing social inclusion. Regardless of the focus area, the projects can combine downstream and upstream interventions to achieve the maximum impact. Two examples of potential areas of UNDP interventions addressing the goals of social inclusion are provided below.

**1. Support social inclusion of the youth**. UNDP has developed some expertise in the area of youth acquired through its YSI project. In the next CP cycle, UNDP may consider supporting development of a comprehensive Strategic Framework for Ukraine’s National Youth Policy. The state’s investments in youth are considerable, but they are made within a variety of different fields, including education, healthcare, cultural activities, and employment and often lack a strategic focus. The existing youth policies are often too broad to effectively address the specific needs of different youth groups. That is why youth policy remains ineffective, poorly targeted, and formalistic, and is treated as a low priority among the state’s domestic policies. This can be explained by uncertainty in the conceptual approach to youth policy.

Although targeted interventions addressing the needs and obstacles to social inclusion faced by the orphans, street children and other vulnerable groups of the youth should be implemented, Ukraine’s national policy should be not only problem-oriented but future-focused. It can address multiple needs of the youth to ensure a quality upbringing. It can address such areas as promotion of healthy lifestyles, aligning education and training with the needs of the labour market, promotion of job opportunities in the public administration for the youth, promotion of youth entrepreneurship. The issues of poverty, prevention of HIV/AIDS and other areas as they relate to the youth can be addressed as well. In supporting the Government to develop and implement its youth policy, it is advisable for UNDP to build partnerships with such institutions as the Ministry of Education, Science, Youth and Sport, State Service for Youth and Sports, Academy of Pedagogical Sciences, and youth work placement centres. Particular focus can be made on strengthening CSOs representing the youth and supporting their dialogue with Government decision makers at the national and local levels.

It is recommended to continue supporting existing and creating new youth centres and strengthening partnership with schools to promote educational and social opportunities for youth in rural areas. Effective partnership with Intel and other IT corporations can be extended as IT skills are critically important for human development of the youth. Trainings to rural youth in such areas as employment, money management and entrepreneurship skills can be delivered to decrease the gaps in opportunities between rural and urban youth.

Several donors are providing funds for specific youth projects in Ukraine. UNFPA and USAID are working with reproductive health and safe behavior issues for youth; UNICEF is working on children’s health and protecting children’s rights; ICF «International HIV/AIDS Alliance», UNDP and other donors are working on combating HIV epidemic which is spread mainly among youth; several donors are working with youth in the sphere of education and international cooperation – in particular, the Delegation of the European Union has several youth programs. Except for UNDP, the only donor that promotes educational and social opportunities for youth is Peace Corps Ukraine but it is not focused on rural communities. The partners do not promote the state youth policy that opens a window of opportunity for UNDP to engage with the newly created Ministry of Education, Science, Youth and Sport.

**2. Support inclusion of persons with disabilities (PWD).** Another vulnerable group that face numerous barriers to social inclusion are the persons with disabilities (PWD). Ukraine ratified the *International Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities* in 2010.The Convention is a comprehensive document that contains fifty articles. It encompasses such issues as the unique needs of women and children with disabilities, access to law and its protection, liberty of movement and right to a nationality, independent living and community integration, opportunities for a meaningful education, access to adequate health care and the right to equal opportunity in employment. The Government would have to introduce changes to sector-specific legislation, regulations, and policies to improve access of persons with disabilities to education, employment, information, and social and health care systems to comply with the Convention. In addition, the Government will have to establish the mechanisms necessary for ensuring compliance with the *Convention*.

UNDP is well positioned to support social inclusion of PWDs. The barriers to social inclusion of PWDs were identified in UNDP’s *Social Inclusion in Ukraine: European Choice and Social Sector Institutions* and forthcoming National Human Development report. Practical recommendations how to address them were developed as well. UNDP has practical experience in implementation of interventions supporting PWDs obtained through its *Social Inclusion of People with Disabilities through Access to Employment* project*.* Potential interventions can support the Government in meeting the requirements of the Convention and provide technical support in all areas, including accountability mechanisms, sequence of reforms, sector-specific policies and programs and public reporting requirements.

**Promote MDGs and support more systemic integration of MDGs into Government strategies, policies and programs.** Although full integration of MDGs into Government policies requires a strong and long-lasting political will, there are some positive developments in this area and UNDP is well positioned to continue to be a leader in promoting MDGs in Ukraine. UNDP should continue promoting MDGs and support the Committee of Economic Reforms to integrate MDGs into the President’s Program of Economic Reforms and design the quality of life indicators that will be based on MDGs. Specific advice on how to incorporate MDGs into sectoral policies can be provided as well. Capacity of line ministers to prepare Cabinet policy submissions that will incorporate MDGs can be enhanced. Skills on how to analyze policy issues through the prizm of MDGs, develop alternative policy options, conduct inter-ministerial consultations can be strengthened. Training on how to effectively communicate economic analysis to top decision-makers and wider public in plain and user-friendly language can be provided as well.

In addition to policy advice, more awareness and orientation seminars at the regional level on MDG localization can be delivered. Targeted interventions enhancing skills and capacity of local government officials to integrate the MDGs into local development planning can be expanded and cover all regions. The establishment of the Presidential Committee on Economic Reforms opens new opportunities to expanding MDGs and social inclusion analysis and monitoring to regional level. The regional committees for economic reforms have been organized at the oblast level. Within regional committees, working groups for different direction of reforms are organized. One of the working group is responsible for social sphere reform and improving quality of life.[[24]](#footnote-24) UNDP can support these working groups by analyzing their needs, providing trainings and establishing mechanisms to monitor quality of life indicators within MDG framework at the regional level.

In the areas supported through the MDG project, the World Bank provides supports to the Ministry of Economy in capacity building for macroeconomic forecasting, and these interventions complement the work of the MDG project. The development partners provide extensive support of the Ministry of Finance in the area of budget planning. Such areas as MDGs and MDGs-focused policies and interventions, consultative processes in elaboration of government programmes, forecasting, strategic planning and capacity building in planning across the Government are the areas where UNDP maintains comparative advantage.

**Promote strong civil society at the level of policy and through grass roots capacity building interventions.** UNDP developed expertise in strengthening civil society and facilitating the dialogue between CSOs and decision makers at both national and local levels. CSDP, for instance, has developed significant experience in facilitating cooperation of CSOs with the Government at the community level. It is advisable to continue and expand interventions supporting CSOs as achievement of CP outcomes could be accelerated through participation of grassroots communities and local champions. Particular focus can be made on building capacities of civil society organizations in fundraising as they need to compete effectively for funding in a crowded marketplace. It is unlikely that the Government will be able to afford sustaining large numbers of CSOs on its own.

Core areas that can be supported by UNDP include:

* make the legal framework for CSOs consistent with the international standards so that the establishment of new CSOs would not be hampered by an obsolete normative framework;
* conduct a series of interventions to support financial sustainability of CSOs;
* promote collaboration among CSOs; and
* strengthen CSOs’ capacities to participate in public consultations and advocate the interests of its members.

Broad based participation of CSOs in the national policy process should continue to be supported as it can improve design of policies and strategies, make them better informed and targeted. It will empower CSOs by fostering a sense of inclusion and by strengthening the voice and influence in decision making. It may be beneficial for CSDP to collaborate in this area with such UNDP projects as Community Based Approach to Local Development, Crimea Integration and Development Programme, Municipal Governance and Sustainable Development Programme, and Chornobyl Recovery and Development Programme.

Capacities of the Government in the field of public consultations with CSO should be strengthened as well so. Civil servants should be trained on how to collect and use the information obtained through consultations to improve the information base and assess all potential consequences of government decisions, including the fiscal impact and evaluate whether the policy/program addresses the actual needs of the target groups.

There are multiple partners promoting access to justice and human rights and supporting civil society. CSDP has regular contacts with such multiple partners as the European Commission Delegation, USAID (UNITER Project), International Renaissance Foundation (more with Civil Society Impact Enhancement Program than with Rule of Law Program), SIDA, OSCE, East Europe Foundation, and Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation. The close cooperation is established only with the UNITER Project in the area of promoting draft legislation concerning civil society development. CSDP developed good working relations with the Ministry of Justice of Ukraine. As UNDP’s CSDP project established good working relations with multiple partners operating in the area of supporting CSOs, UNDP is well positioned to continue implementing downstream and upstream interventions supporting development of civil society in Ukraine.

**Promote gender equality.** As UNDP gained reputation as a leader in promoting gender equality opportunities, it is advisable to continue working in this area. Moreover, UNDP continuous involvement is needed because a change of the Government put in decision making positions individuals with insufficient awareness and knowledge of the importance of gender issues. Long-term interventions are needed to ensure a shift of gender stereotypes and improve gender sensitivity – within both the government and the Ukrainian society.

UNDP may continue supporting gender mainstreaming into public policy and legislation as well as educational system; focus on improving the system of prevention of domestic violence; and conduct public awareness campaigns on gender equality. It may be beneficial to expand cascade trainings of civil servants to oblast/rayon levels, focus on practical aspects of their work and incorporate gender-related issues into the educational programmes for civil servants. As the interventions strengthening the system of prevention of domestic violence proved to be highly relevant and effective, it is recommended to promote legislation and infrastructure improvements in the areas of punishment of perpetrators and protection of victims; continue cascade training of police officers; support incorporation of gender-related issues into the educational programmes for police officers; communicate success stories on police help to the victims of domestic violence to general public; and facilitate horizontal coordination and integrated response to domestic violence of different governmental agencies (law enforcement institutions, social and medical services institutions, educational establishments). Such issues as gender balance in the civil service and in retrenchment, gender stereotyping in public service employment, and performance and training opportunities of women in the public service can be addressed as well.

Several donors and international organizations are involved in the area of gender equality and women’s rights in Ukraine, and the UN agencies (UNDP, UNICEF, UNFPA, ILO) are among the most active, dealing with the gender issues within their respective mandates. UNDP has been working with gender issues since 1997, and was involved in policy development, awareness raising, and capacity building. SIDA is the major donor in the field, having funded most of UNDP’s activities on gender issues.

OSCE implements some activities aimed at building capacity of the local authorities in gender mainstreaming and working with domestic violence perpetrators; IOM is dealing with human trafficking problem in Ukraine; IRF is at times supporting limited number of projects on various gender-related issues (e.g. Public Monitoring of the State Program on Gender Equality till 2010 project). Other donors (for instance, CIDA, SDC and USAID), though not financing gender projects, are mainstreaming gender approach into programmes and projects they fund – taking account of both the differences and the inequalities between men and women in programme planning, implementation, and assessment.

Currently Women’s and Children’s Rights in Ukraine Action launched by the EU is the most large-scaled intervention in the area of gender equality. It has reasonable distribution of function between its components: UNDP is focused on state policy, education and domestic violence, ILO - on promoting gender equality on labour market, Council of Europe - on adapting legislative framework to European standards, UNICEF - on helping children in difficult life circumstances (pilot project in Khmelnytsky region), Safege – on informational and awareness campaign. However, the Programme’s functions partially overlap with the functions of the Council of Europe (in the area of improving legislation framework) and Safege (in awareness campaign against domestic violence).

The important advantages of the UNDP’s EOWR is its long-term integrated and systematic approach to gender mainstreaming. It has the strongest working relations with the authorities among all donor projects in the field to work on policy level. The project has significant expertise in implementing effective awareness campaigns among the general public and civil servants, teachers, and police officers. UNDP is well-positioned to continue and expand its interventions in the field of gender equality.

**Support the Government in the area of public administration reforms**. In December 2010 the Presidential Decree envisaging reduction of the number of ministries from 20 to 16, as well as reduction of the number of central government agencies almost in half was adopted. The second stage of administrative reform will focus on reducing the number of civil servants in local administrations.

One of the reforms of the central Government bodies should ensure clear division of responsibilities among ministries and agencies. As UNDP has some corporate expertise in functional reviews, it can support the Government in restructuring of ministries that could address such problems as lack of strategic focus, operational inefficiencies, weak accountability for results, coordination problems and sub-optimal use of resources. The scope of functional reviews could be wide ranging and include assessment of systemic and structural constraints, organization structures, establishment and staffing levels, and management systems.

As UNDP has conducted some work with SIGMA in the context of its CSR project, it may be beneficial to explore the opportunities for further collaboration with SIGMA. SIGMA expertise may be needed to support all aspects of Government public administration reforms.

UNDP may also promote its positive experience with the model of the School for Senior Civil Servants and support development of in-service training centres with such key ministries as the Ministry of Economy and Ministry of Finance. In the Ministry of Economy the in-service training centre can constitute a part of the MDG Project as it has been successful in conducting seminars on strategic planning for Ministry and oblast administration staff. In supporting in-service training centres, UNDP may consider establishing partnership arrangements with the National Academy of Public Administration that will allow targeting a wider audience of public servants, alignment of the relevant curricula and sharing successful practices.

The areas supported by the CSR are targeted by multiple partners. When UNDP’s CSR project was completed, the School for Senior Civil Service Officials managed to secure funding from such donors as CIDA, Danish Government, USAID and UK Department for International Development (DFID) that demonstrates the School’s ability to manage donors’ funds and execute projects. Pre-service and some in-service civil service training interventions targeting broader audiences are implemented by the National Academy of Public Administration through its Twinning project funded by EU. CIDA-funded project implemented by a Canadian company "Ukrainian Civil Service Human Resources Management Reform (UCS-HRM)" supports MDCS in reforming of the classification system in connection to the remuneration system for civil servants; introducing of new approaches to the annual evaluation of the performance of civil servants; and reforming of the system of professional training for civil servants.

UNDP may explore the possibilities for potential cooperation in various areas of PAR with all partners. Once the areas are identified, UNDP may consider approaching potential donors to support the necessary interventions.

**Support the Government in establishing an effective policy lifecycle at both central and line ministries levels.** UNDP interventions contributed to building consensus on reforms so that many politicians, civil servants and experts share the common beliefs and ideas on what should be implemented to advance human development of the country.

It is a common belief of experts and stakeholders that the effectiveness of policymaking institutions and processes as well as capacity of public administration should be enhanced to implement these reforms. One of the first priorities identified by stakeholders through the interviews, is a need to enhance state’s capacity in effective policymaking and coordination so that it will be able to implement a series of reforms on which there is a consensus. Core steps of a typical policy cycle existing in OECD and EU countries are presented in Table 4 below.

**Table 4: Core Steps of the Policy Cycle**:[[25]](#footnote-25)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Political Agenda Setting** | 1. defining the government’s priorities;
2. annual policy and legislative planning;
 |
| **Policy Development** | 1. preparation of policy proposals (including policy analysis, impact assessment, consultations with civil society);
2. preparation of legal drafts[[26]](#footnote-26);
3. inter-ministerial consultations;
4. submission of items to the government office;
5. review by the government office;
6. review by ministerial committees;
 |
| **Legitimation** | 1. decision by the government (Council of Ministers);
2. parliamentary process and passage;
 |
| **Implementation and evaluation** | 1. implementation; and

12. monitoring and evaluation |

To support the institutionalization of the policy cycle or at least its key elements consistent with OECD and EU models, UNDP may focus on two areas of support:

1. Provide technical support and help the Government in establishing a policy cycle consistent with the best international practices. Strengthen capacity of the Cabinet of Ministers’ staff to maintain standards of effective policy cycle. The Government can be supported in developing internal administrative regulations on key steps and requirements of the policy cycle. Supporting training materials and templates can be developed and widely disseminated among central agencies and line ministries. Technical support can be provided in developing of guides and protocols to ensure consistency in policy products and processes. Regular Government-wide training on how to prepare policy submissions could be delivered as well. The central Government agencies such as the Cabinet of Ministers’ staff and staff of the President’s Administration can be also supported in promoting practices of horizontal inter-ministerial coordination.Horizontal coordination should be enhanced because many issues, particularly in strategic policy or complex policies, do not fall within the mandate of one ministry and requires integration of diverse expertise and perspectives.

2. Support a few line ministries with implementation of specific strategies on which a consensus among stakeholders and experts has been reached.Practical and hands-on support could be provided on how to assess policy alternatives relying on solid evidence (e.g., distributional effects of policy reforms on the well-being or welfare of the targeted groups or poverty), identify policy instrument(s) to be used, and outline sequence of steps. Training could focus on such key elements of developing effective Cabinet of Ministers’ submissions as how to present decision sought**,** describe context for action, present recommended course of action, identify results to be achieved, including performance measures, outline fiscal implications, present economic and business impact analysis, risks assessment and mitigation strategies to address these risks, and present other options considered. Support can be provided also in the areas of policy implementation. For example, line ministries may be supported in developing policy implementation plans that include specific targets, performance measures and indicators measuring policy success. Particular attention could be paid to promoting participatory approaches to policymaking. Civil servants should be properly trained to engage into constructive dialogue with the public and NGOs and be capable to proceed beyond the policy formulation stage to encompass policy approval, implementation and the ongoing evaluation of change initiatives.

**Provide targeted policy support in the area of agricultural policy.** UNDP through its BRAAC project established very good working relations with the Ministry of Agrarian Policy and positioned itself as a reliable provider of high quality advice and support in the field of agricultural policies. BRAAC’s experts participated in internal meetings at the level of deputy minister and always promptly responded to Ministry’s requests. BRAAC project clients in the Ministry highly valued the support provided by the project, especially in the area of WTO accession.

The Government plans to introduce a number of reforms in this sector, including creation of a transparent market for agricultural land based on a unified land cadastre system and harmonize the system of standards and technical regulation of agricultural products according to EU standards. As UNDP is well positioned in the field of agricultural policy, it should continue providing policy and technical support in this area. As the market of agricultural land will be introduced in 2013, rural residents will be significantly affected. UNDP’s involvement in this sector is critical to ensure that the interests of rural vulnerable groups are taken into consideration in the process of reforms. As UNDP is a neutral organization, free of lobbying of any specific country interests, it is very well positioned to expand its supports in the area of agricultural policies.

## 5.2 Programme Design, Implementation and Management, including Coordination and Monitoring of Outcomes

The evaluation team suggests a number of strategies and changes that can further enhance UNDP positions and improve projects’ effectiveness, impact and sustainability. Core recommendations are provided below, while specific project-level analysis and suggestions can be found in respective individual evaluation reports and summaries (see Annexes 6.1-6.6).

**As a number of strategies were adopted and commitments made, the Government needs extensive support in practical implementation of reform measures**. More practical interventions helping the Government to achieve its goals can be considered. The Government may benefit from technical assistance on how to prioritize, sequence policies, interventions, and other measures, produce budget estimates, adopt transparent and effective management processes to implement the existing and forthcoming policies as they relate to human development and social inclusion.

**Enhance strategic long-term focus of interventions and remain flexible.** It is beneficial for UNDP to become more strategic in developing interventions to achieve CP outcomes. Sustainable change requires a long-term, multi-faceted approach that seeks to strengthen institutional, policy, capacity and other foundations in respective CP areas. While the importance of UNDP maintaining a strategic, long-term focus is fundamental to achieving CP outcomes, equal need exists for its interventions to have greater flexibility and enhanced capacity for rapid response to better address emerging issues and changing circumstances especially in upstream interventions where political and economic circumstances may rapidly change.

**Combine downstream and upstream interventions in projects, where appropriate.** The application of upstream and downstream approaches can be an effective mechanism to build and/or strengthen horizontal and vertical networks and links and achieve sustainable impact at the national and local levels. For example, UNDP projects targeting local development have developed significant expertise and knowledge about local human development needs, and their success should be supported by strong policy dialogue and knowledge sharing work at the national level. If these lessons are not translated into a policy area, there is always a risk that downstream interventions can become narrowly oriented at regions and municipalities with limited impact on national level CP outcomes. UNDP has strong capacities and good relations with the Government to pick up knowledge and learning from its downstream interventions and translate them to good policies and replicable programmes. It could also use the knowledge acquired through downstream interventions to encourage policy dialogue between the central and local governments, government and civil society and private sector. The knowledge acquired through upstream interventions can be used to inform local government actions and promote dialogue of CSOs and decision makers.

I**ncrease external visibility and actively promote UNDP achievements and capacities**. UNDP should continue promoting itself as a strong partner who can be trusted with implementation of a wide range of initiatives. Public relations campaigns and targeted dissemination of information can be implemented. UNDP projects’ results and achievements should be more widely disseminated, including amongst the direct beneficiaries, so as to increase the level of national and local ownership and the sustainability of the projects’ results.[[27]](#footnote-27) These activities will further enhance partners’ trust and credibility of UNDP and will help in attracting funding.

**Enhance results management practices.** UNDP has to demonstrate how and where the organization is making a measurable contribution to human development. Strengthening of results-based management (RBM) practices would help managers to achieve these goals by learning from results and empirical evidence and use that evidence to adjust either the projects under their control or the composition of the portfolio of projects to maximize the contribution of UNDP to CP outcomes. In addition to improved management and more strategic allocation of resources, strengthening of focus on results would allow to better demonstrate the effectiveness, impact and sustainability of UNDP’s interventions on development outcomes to all relevant stakeholders that is critically important in promoting UNDP among its partners. RBM in UNDP is based on four main pillars:

* the definition of strategic goals which provides a focus for action;
* the specification of expected results which contribute to these goals and align programmes, processes and resources behind them;
* on-going monitoring and assessment of performance, integrating lessons learnt into future planning; and
* improved accountability, continuous feedback performance.[[28]](#footnote-28)

The focus on results in project design, approval, implementation, and reporting processes should be strengthened.

**Align monitoring and evaluation processes and practices with the RBM**. Quantifiable baseline data along with indicators should be identified in measurable terms and by date. Effective monitoring and evaluation cannot be provided without this data and are not only important for monitoring and evaluation requirements but also for providing data for programme guidance and determining the contributions of partners. Additionally, they are valuable in building internal morale through measurable evidence of UNDP’s performance and achievements.

UNDP Ukraine has to capitalize on what has been achieved and promote a stronger culture of results. The Country Office can develop an internal system of outcome monitoring through results-based performance measures on the basis of a new CP. The performance measures would help the projects to stay focused on CP outcomes and monitor their performance from the beginning of the projects. These measures should reflect the contribution of UNDP’s interventions to the achievement of CP outcomes; measure the projects’ effectiveness and avoid excessive focus on outputs and activities; provide, in combination with other measures, a complete picture of a cluster contribution to outcomes; be practical and provide information needed to make decisions about the project; and provide an accurate and timely information about the projects. For example, the measures for upstream policy interventions can include a number of specific policy recommendations adopted by the Government, satisfaction of clients with the quality and timeliness of analytical work provided by UNDP project as well as independent experts’ reviews of projects’ analytical products. In addition to meeting UNDP accountability requirements, ongoing project monitoring is an effective measurement mechanism to assess projects’ performance that reduces the need in independent evaluation.

As this evaluation demonstrates, rapidly changing circumstances, emerging challenges and opportunities require an RBM framework to be flexible enough to review and adjust measures and expectations over time. This process is often evolutionary and advances through a trial and error through all stages of the project cycle.

**One of the practical and effective tools of the RBM is logic models** that help the management and staff to stay focused better on outcomes, connect outputs to long-term outcomes and link activities and processes to desired outcomes. It is advisable for the projects to develop a project’s logic model that will provide a roadmap of UNDP project, highlighting how its elements will work, what activities will come before others, and how desired outcomes will be achieved. As the project is being implemented, logic models help to measure each set of events in the model to see what happens, what works, what doesn’t work, and for whom.

**Introduce a Knowledge Management system.** There is no clearinghouse mechanism for the UNDP existing or closed project portfolio. It is beneficial for the Country Office to develop a knowledge management system that is able to collect, synthesize, and disseminate knowledge and make it more readily accessible to staff and partners. One of the common knowledge gaps in most organizations is the lack of capturing experiential learning for key processes within the organization. Thus, the staff often expresses the frustration of “reinventing the wheel”. Knowledge management tools can capture institutional memory and promote effectiveness, sustainability and synergy of UNDP projects. The Country Office can establish a document database for UNDP Ukraine projects portfolio, which would codify and capture all materials produced by the projects.

**Utilise effective partnerships strategies developed through the 2006-2011 CP cycle.** As UNDP has developed extensive partnership networks through its projects, it should continue to explore innovative approaches to partnerships through joint programming, cost sharing and other arrangements, where possible. This evaluation found that multi-stakeholder partnerships currently play important roles both at the operational and policy level. A number of strategies that made partnerships effective and efficient was identified. They can be used by UNDP through the next programme cycle:

* Continue utilising Project Boards that comprise multiple stakeholders. Their involvement helped to adjust the projects to changing political and socio-economic circumstances to benefit from opening windows of opportunity.
* Maintain continuous dialogues with key stakeholders to gather their feedback on projects’ performance, identify areas for improvement, explore potential partnership arrangements and sustainability measures as well as build their ownership of projects’ outcomes.
* Encourage experimentation with various partnerships arrangements.
* Continue exploring innovative strategies of building partnerships with the private sector.
* Keep partnerships goals oriented and focused on delivering practical results. Without tangible results, many partnerships would not be sustainable.
* Be flexible and accommodating as partners come with different sets of priorities, views, resources and practices.
* Review all partnership strategies used by UNDP projects. As this evaluation demonstrates, six projects reveal some lessons and effective practice, but a more systematic analysis and evaluation of partnership experiences across programmes can be conducted.
* Strengthen collaboration among UNDP projects. There is a clear room for improvement in creating better synergies among relevant UNDP projects.

**Enhance focus on sustainability and employ a range of instruments that proved to be successful in ensuring sustainability of programme results.** This evaluation identified a number of successful strategies that helped UNDP to ensure sustainability of programme results. It is recommended to utilize these strategies through the next CP cycle:

* Pay more attention to the question of exit or possible follow-on project at the early stages of the project cycle.
* Build strong relations with the national partners to ensure their ownership of the project and its outcomes. It increases their commitment to ensuring project’s sustainability.
* Address the goals of ensuring project sustainability through all stages of the project cycle.
* Design local level interventions with the goal of ensuring that they can be upscaled in support of broader policy and programmatic development results.
* Support CSOs by strengthening their sustainability through such interventions as capacity building in fundraising.
* Ensure that upstream interventions have a significant capacity building element with such beneficiary-focused measures as hands-on practical training opportunities for civil servants on how to conduct analysis, draft policy documents, and develop results-based budgets. Regular training needs assessments can be conducted to accurately define gaps between existing staff competencies and the required competency levels.
* Use resources of National Project Directors more proactively and seek their input into identifying the areas of potential follow-on projects and sustainability-building measures that are relevant to their ministries/agencies.

# 6. ANNEXES

## 6.1 Equal Opportunities and Women’s Rights in Ukraine Programme (EOWR). Outcome Evaluation Report. Executive Summary

The aim of the evaluation is to measure the contribution of Equal Opportunities and Women’s Rights Programme to the UNDP Ukraine Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) 2006-2010 outcomes. The findings and recommendations drawn out of this evaluation exercise will contribute to the formulation of CPAP for 2012-2016.

The evaluation was conducted in December 2010 – February 2011 and should be considered as mid-term evaluation as it covers the Project’s activities held during 2009-2010. It utilized a variety of methods to assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the Programme. In particular, the following approaches were employed:

* Document review (wide variety of project-specific documents as well as general literature related to the gender equality and domestic violence problems in Ukraine);
* Key informant interviews (with representatives of the Women and Children’s Rights in Ukraine Action projects (funded by EU); representatives of partner governmental agencies; relevant NGOs and experts on gender issues).
* Telephone interviews with a sample of regional partners of the Programme (advisers to the heads of regional state administrations on gender issues; representatives of regional gender resource and education centers; representatives of regional “Men against Violence” centers and NGOs) and participants of cascade trainings for teachers, district police inspectors and civil servants.
* Nationally representative opinion poll to measure gender awareness and awareness and effectiveness of “Stop violence!” campaign (representative for the Ukrainian population older than 16 years; sample size is 1000 respondents; survey method – face-to-face interview at respondent’s home).

**1. Project overview**

Equal Opportunities and Women's Rights in Ukraine Programme is a UNDP-led project co-financed by the European Union, Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA) and UNDP. The current Programme is the combination of two projects: Equal Opportunities Programme (funded by SIDA) and Women’s Rights in Ukraine (funded by EU). While the SIDA-funded project has been implemented by the UNDP since 2003, the EU-funded project was launched in September 2008. The budget of the Programme integrated the unspent funds under the Equal Opportunities Programme (Phase II) as of September 2008 and the entire amount of UNDP/EC funding for Women’s Rights in Ukraine. The Programme is the part of the larger Women’s and Children’s Rights in Ukraine Action (funded by EU) which includes also the following components: Gender Equality in the World of Work project (implemented by ILO), Project on Strengthening and Protecting Women’s and Children’s Rights (implemented by the Council of Europe), Children in Difficult Life Circumstances (implemented by UNICEF) and Communication Component (implemented by Safege). The national implementing partner is the Ministry of Ukraine for Family, Youth and Sports. The Programme started on 15 September 2008 and is scheduled to operate until September 2011.

The Programme has to ensure implementation of the outcomes and outputs as assigned in the UNDP Ukraine CPAP 2006–2010, namely in areas of:

1. Access to justice and human rights.
2. Civil society organizations protect and advocate for human rights and justice.

The Programme is aimed at achieving the five outputs (as formulated in the Project Document):

1. National gender machinery is equipped with legal and financial resources, political commitments revised to legally enforce gender equality laws and regulations.
2. The system of education is free of gender biases and stereotypes, gender balance in programmes, textbooks and education curricula is ensured.
3. System of response to gender based violence is improved.
4. Capacity enhanced of national and regional authorities to elaborate, monitor, implement and report on gender-sensitive strategies/programmes/plans.
5. Policy advice to harmonize legislative framework with Ukraine’s basic law and international obligations to ensure gender equality.

The outputs 1-3 were introduced with the EU-funded Women’s Rights in Ukraine project and activities to achieve these outputs have started since 2009 (during September-December 2008 the inception phase was implemented). The outputs 4-5 were transferred from the previous SIDA-funded Equal Opportunities Programme and activities to achieve these outputs were planned to be implemented until September 2009; in reality, they ended in February 2010.

**2. Trend in outcomes and factors affecting it**

**Outcome 1** Access to justice and human rights

According to Freedom House Ukraine is has the status of «free» country and rather high score of civil liberties 2 of 7 (where 1 is the best score and 7 – the worst). This score is stable through 2008-2010. However,af**ter the first 6 months of the new President’s governance since February 2010**external and internal sources report on **about increase of human rights violations by law machinery**.

As for the women’s rights the score of Gender Gap Index was stable within the evaluated period (0,686 in 2008, 0,69 in 2009 and 0,687 in 2010 on the scale from 0 to 1, where 1 is the maximum level of gender equality). In 2008, Ukraine was ranked 62 of 134 countries and in 2010 – 63. High levels of employment and educational and professional training of women are accompanied by insignificant representation of them in decision-making, high level of professional gender segregation and significant gender gap in wage level. Women are underrepresented in political life, higher levels of public administration and management of private sector organizations. While there appears to be no implicit or explicit male bias in the process of formulation and enforcement of various laws and regulations.

The change of the government negatively influenced national gender machinery established by the Programme. The national gender machinery mechanism has lost its functionality after the large-scale change of personnel in the ministries and regional state administrations. Moreover, with the launch of the administrative reform in December 2010, the main governmental partner of the Programme – Ministry of Family, Youth and Sports is planned to be integrated to the Ministry of Education and Science, and by the time of the evaluation it is still unclear what institution will be in charge of gender-related issues. The new government mostly neglects gender issues, the new Prime Minister recently made scandalous public statement that reforms are not female business.

The only large-scale measurable progress within the outcome refers to victims of domestic violence – the number of domestic violence perpetrators registered by the Ministry of Interior increased from 66 119 in 2008 to 91 000 in January-May 2010, the annual number of domestic violence cases registered by the Ministry of Family Youth and Sport increased from 71 000 in 2008 to 82 560 in January-September2010. As GfK Ukraine research showed stable level of prevalence of the domestic violence in 2007-2009 the growing number of registered cases of violence should be interpreted as improving the system’s response.

**Outcome 2** Civil society organizations protect and advocate for human rights and justice.

According to Freedom House the score of civil society development remained stable throughout 2008-2010 – 2,5 of 7 (where 1 is the best score and 7 – the worst). No progress of civil society development can be partially explained by financial crisis, which resulted in cutting financing of civil society organizations and related governmental programs. The new Law «On Civic Organizations» which has to improve the status of civil organizations in Ukraine hasn’t been adopted yet.

**3. Evaluation of UNDP contribution to the outcomes**

Generally, the UNDP is the only donor providing long-term integrated and systematic approach to gender mainstreaming in the broad context of state policy. Major positive changes facilitated by the UNDP are the following:

**Output 1** National gender machinery is equipped with legal and financial resources, political commitments revised to legally enforce gender equality laws and regulations.

**Output 4.** Capacity enhanced of national and regional authorities to elaborate, monitor, implement and report on gender-sensitive strategies/programmes/plans.

**Output 5.** Policy advice to harmonize legislative framework with Ukraine’s basic law and international obligations to ensure gender equality.

Gender programmes were adopted by all the regional state administrations. Coordination councils in charge of gender issues were established in all regions of Ukraine. Gender advisors in 10 regional state administrations were appointed. Gender resource centers were established in 11 regions. Capacity building events were organized in 10 ministries, other governmental agencies and regional state administrations.

With the Ministry of Justice the methodological recommendations on gender assessment of legislation were elaborated and the manual was prepared and distributed. The cooperation with the Ministry of Justice was particularly close: consultations on the amendments needed to the current legislation; training and workshop on implementing of gender approaches and methodology of gender assessment of legislation.

Functionality of the national gender machinery, which is still developing and is quite amorphous, has been endangered with the change of government and start of the implementation of administrative reform. However, according to many respondents, without the pressure and support from the Programme the national gender machinery would not be operational at all.

Support in developing the State Programme to Ensure Gender Equality in the Ukrainian Society (2011-2015) was provided.

**Output 2** The system of education is free of gender biases and stereotypes, gender balance in programmes, textbooks and education curricula is ensured.

Recommendations on gender-oriented standards in education, gender analysis of curricula; overcoming gender stereotypes were provided to the Ministry of Education and Science. The institutionalization of gender education in Ukraine was supported with equipment, informational and methodological assistance. Gender educational centers and departments of gender studies at the universities were established. Cascade trainings for teachers were conducted.

**Output 3** System of response to gender based violence is improved.

A large-scale awareness raising campaign «Stop violence!» was conducted – 33% of the Ukrainian population have seen at least some component of it. As a result, 27% of the population know about the hotline for combating domestic violence and protecting children’s rights. Capacity of relevant governmental agencies and police district inspectors has been strengthened. The draft law on domestic violence prevention was elaborated.

The Programme’s design is relevant**[[29]](#footnote-29)** to the CPAP Outcome “Access to justice and human rights” as Ukraine has low Gender Gap rank comparing to Central and Eastern Europe countries and prevalent problem of domestic violence; and somewhat relevant to CPAP Outcome “Civil society organizations protect and advocate for human rights and justice” as the Programme is primarily focused on working not with NGOs, but with state authorities.

The Programme was **somewhat cost-effective** – the activities in the areas of educational and domestic violence prevention systems (Output 2 and 3) were significantly more effective and had more visible results than in the area of developing national gender machinery and legislative framework (Output 1, 4, 5) while the budget between these two directions was distributed approximately 50/50.

The Programme was **somewhat sustainable** as the efforts in the areas of educational and domestic violence prevention systems proved to be sustainable, but sustainability of efforts in the area of developing national gender machinery and legislative framework are questionable and will be clearer after the full implementation of the administrative reform and the role of an institution in charge of gender issues in the future structure of the government.

**4. Recommendations**

It is recommended to continue involvement to the gender issues as it is widely acknowledged within the government and civil society that UNDP possess relevant reputation and capacity to work in this direction, and that long-term interventions are needed to ensure shift of gender stereotypes and widespread gender sensitivity – within both the government and the Ukrainian society. The recommended niches for UNDP interventions are the following:

* Gender mainstreaming into public policy and legislation;
* Gender mainstreaming into educational system;
* Improving the system of prevention of domestic violence;
* Public awareness campaigns on gender equality.

Recommendation concerning **gender mainstreaming into public policy and legislation:**

* Using the reputation and established connections to focus more on the strategic decision-making level of the state institutions to ensure adoption, implementation and institutionalization of future State Programme for ensuring
gender equality in Ukrainian society;
* To expand cascade trainings of civil services for lower district levels of the government and to focus on practical aspects of their work;
* To work towards incorporation of gender-related issues into the edtucationalprogrammes for civil servants;
* To bolster cooperation with the Ministry of Justice, which can review bylaws of other governmental agencies and recommend amendments;
* To facilitate cooperation of related NGOs with governmental authorities.

Recommendation concerning **gender mainstreaming into educational system:**

* To continue cascade training of teachers;
* To work towards incorporation of gender-related issues into the educational programmes for teachers as well as wider representation of gender issues in the programmes of primary, secondary and higher education.

Recommendation concerning **improving the system of prevention of domestic violence:**

* To promote legislation and infrastructure improvements in the areas of punishment of perpetrators and protection of victims;
* To continue cascade training of police officers;
* To work towards incorporation of gender-related issues into the educational programmes for police officers;
* To communicate success stories on police help to the victims of domestic violence to general public;
* To facilitate coordination and integrated response to domestic violence of different governmental agencies (law enforcement institutions, social and medical services institutions, educational establishments);

Recommendation concerning **public awareness campaigns on gender equality:**

* To focus on the most prevalent gender stereotypes (man as a breadwinner/ woman as a housewife, primary mother’s responsibility for upbringing children, female and male professions etc.);
* To cooperate with communication specialists to translate gender issues into common language;
* To implement awareness-raising campaigns more consistently, in closer cooperation with other stakeholders.

The general design and implementation of similar future projects can be improved in the following ways:

* The include gender issues into the broader human rights context – as they are often perceived separately in Ukraine; this might be done through better coordination and support in gender mainstreaming with the numerous international and civil society organizations (including UNDP projects and UN agencies) working in the field of human rights;
* To ensure closer cooperation among donors and distribution the areas of intervention between them;
* To conduct gender audit of other UNDP Projects and ensure gender mainstreaming in their activities.

## 6.2 Youth Social Inclusion for Civic Engagement in Ukraine. Outcome Evaluation Report. Executive Summary

The aim of the evaluation is to measure the Youth Social Inclusion for Civic Engagement in Ukraine Project (hereinafter referred as the Project) contribution to the UNDP Ukraine Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) 2006-2010 outcomes. The findings and recommendations drawn out of this evaluation exercise will contribute to the formulation of CPAP for 2012-2016.

The evaluation was conducted in December 2010 – February 2011 and should be considered as mid-term evaluation as it covers the Project’s activities held during 2009-2010. It utilized a variety of methods to assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the Project – in particular, document review; key informant interviews with Project partners and experts in youth issues; telephone interviews with a sample of representatives of United Nations Volunteers who directly work with youth centers, representatives of the youth centers and Skills for Success Programme facilitators.

**1. Project overview**

The Project was planned to be launched in September 2008, though in reality its implementation has started in December 2008. It was preceded by Human Security for Ukrainian Youth Project implemented by UNDP during 2005-2007. The Project is funded by the Intel Ukraine Microelectronics Ltd., United Nations Volunteers and UNDP. It covers 12 regions of Ukraine (Cherkasy, Chernihiv, Zhytomyr, Mykolaiv, Dnipropetrovsk, Zaporizhya, Kharkiv, Lugansk, Sumy, Rivne, Kyiv regions and the Autonomous Republic of Crimea). Project’s implementing partner is Ministry for Family, Youth and Sport.

The Project has to ensure implementation of the following CPAP outcome: Sustainable economic development through pro-poor policy reform.

The Project aimed at achieving the three outputs:

**Output 1. Increased organizational management and gender capacity of Youth Centres and volunteer involving organizations;**

**Output 2. Developed social competencies and skills of youth;**

**Output 3. Strengthened social solidarity among generations.**

Since early 2010 the Output 3 was suspended because of lack of funding. Only preparation for the implementation and pilot project were undertaken in 2009.

**2. Trend in outcome and factors affecting it**

The indicators of the Millennium Development Goal 1 “Reduce poverty” for 2009 and 2010 were not yet published by the time of the evaluation. According to GfK Ukraine’s data, the share of the population of lower financial stratum[[30]](#footnote-30) increased from 28% in 2008 to 37% in 2009 due to financial crisis. In 2010, some recovery is observed: the share of lower stratum decreased to 33%.

Currently youth has the lowest share of people of lower financial stratum among all age categories, pensioners has the highest one – however, the future level of economic development and poverty depends on youth. The significant gap remains in access to resources between dwellers of rural and urban areas (in villages 30% of youth belong to lower financial stratum while in cities with population more than 500 000 – 24% in 2010).

**3. Evaluation of UNDP contribution to the outcome**

**It’s hard to get measurable results of the Project’s contribution to the Outcome first of all because its interventions are focused on development of the skills of youth, the results of which can be felt only in remote future.** Major positive changes facilitated by the UNDP are the following:

***Output 1 Increased organizational management and gender capacity of youth centres and volunteer involving organizations***

6000 persons participants of the youth centers activities completed training program for capacity building (versus 1000 planned). With the Project’s support youth centers were able to implement a number of successful volunteering projects for their communities involving local youth and authorities. 115 projects of high complexity social projects (more than one group of youth working together, fundraising or use of external resources) were implemented against planned 100. Close to 2000 volunteers were mobilized in 2010, double the amount in 2009 (945)

Also 36 peer-to-peer networks (versus 30 planned) - networks of youth from different communities - were created with join efforts of the Project, youth centers and university organizations.

***Output 2 Developed social competencies and skills of youth***

6800 pupils were trained within the Project (versus 3000 planned), there were children with disabilities among them.

The partnership strategy with Intel Foundation, youth centers, UNV and All-Ukrainian Association of Youth Cooperation “Alternative-V” was largely successful. In fact, the partnership with the governmental agencies was weak. Also almost no cooperation with Peace Corps in Ukraine (which is the only donor operating in the similar areas with the Project) was established.

**The Project design is somewhat relevant[[31]](#footnote-31) to the CPAP Outcome (**Sustainable economic development through pro-poor policy reform) - it’s relevant to the aim of sustainable economic development, but it has no relation to policy-making. It is totally relevant to the CPAP Output «Social, economic and cultural development for the multi-ethnic Crimean society, Chornobyl-affected communities and rural settlements enhanced through area-based approaches». In fact, the regional focus of the Project is not justified and some activities took part in big cities which is not relevant to the Output and where there are much more development opportunities than in rural areas.

**As far as there are no considerable interventions in the area of promotion educational and social opportunities for youth in rural area,** the niche for UNDP intervention was chosen adequately. The Project effectively uses the experience and resources of interventions on the community level in the framework of the Local Development and Human Security Programme.

The Project is **cost-effective** – most of the targets were overfulfilled, the Project improved skills of 6800 pupils, 6000 participants of the youth centers activities, supported many social projects and mobilized 2000 volunteers. However, the costs for Output 3 seemed to be spent in vain. Besides there is a gap in the visibility of the Project – the communication officer was employed in July 2010 (for this reason there are even no Annual Progress Reports by the time of the evaluation).

The skills gained by the youth and youth centers within both components of the Project **proved to be sustainable –** the youth centers showed rather high level of sustainability and the skills gained within Skills for Success Programme are sustainable according to the results of teachers and parents survey.

**4. Recommendations**

It is recommended **to continue using existing and creating the new youth centers, establishing partnership with schools for promotion educational and social opportunities for youth in rural area** as a good niche for the UNDP intervention.

The design and implementation of similar future projects could be improved in the following ways:

* To continue partnership with Intel and other IT corporations as gaining IT skills by youth facilitates economical development.
* To conduct trainings for youth on the basis of youth centers and schools within Skills for Success Programme and to work out other trainings on educational, professional, employment, savings and investment and entrepreneurship possibilities in order to decrease the gap in access to resources between rural and urban youth.
* To expand the experience of the Project to the rural areas in all the regions of Ukraine – possibly in the cooperation with the CBA project.
* To facilitate higher degree of communication and cooperation among youth centers and volunteer groups from different regions and international volunteer organizations.
* To provide trainings for youth centers about the ways of cooperation with local authorities.
* To promote the Project more actively and ensure wider visibility to facilitate promoting volunteerism and motivating youth.
* To invest more efforts in building partnerships with governmental agencies (Ministry of Education, Science, Youth and Sport, State Service for Youth and Sports, Academy of Pedagogical Sciences, youth work placement centers) in charge of the youth policy;
* To share the experience and build partnership with Peace Corps Ukraine, the Delegation of the European Union and other organizations working in promoting educational and professional possibilities for youth.
* To use the experience of the previous projects in the area, to ensure the linkage between them.

The other niche for the UNDP intervention in the area of developing economical capacities of youth is **discrepancy between labour market demand and educational system supply**.

The long-term trends of demand and supply will lead to an increase in tensions in the labour market in the future. In the period of 1990-2009 the number of graduates in jurisprudence increased 14,5 times, the number of graduates in economy and finances – 5 times, while the number of engineers – only by 15% which does not correspond to the market demand[[32]](#footnote-32).

UNDP through National Implementing Partner (probably the newly created Ministry of Education, Science, Youth and Sport) could facilitate the research on correspondence of market demand and educational system supply and promote corresponding changes to the educational system, awareness campaign and training programs at schools (as Skills for Success), сonnections between educational organizations and employers etc. This intervention would be in line with MDG 1 “Reduce poverty” and also the recommendations concerning MDG 2 “Ensure quality lifelong education” stated in the recent National Report[[33]](#footnote-33).

The last but not the least recommendation is **to advocate effective youth policy in Ukraine**. **This period is critical for preservation and development of the achievements of former Ministry of Family, Youth and Sports in the area of youth policy. The new National Youth Support Program for the nearest years in necessary to ensure consistency of state youth policy.**

## 6.3 Millenium Development Goals (MDG) Project. Outcome Evaluation Report. Executive Summary.

The aim of the evaluation is to measure the contribution of Millenium Development Goals Project to the UNDP Ukraine Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) 2006-2010 outcomes. The findings and recommendations drawn out of this evaluation exercise will contribute to the formulation of CPAP for 2012-2016. The evaluation was conducted in December 2010-February 2011 by GfK Ukraine team. It covered project activities in 2006-2010.

**1. Project overview**

According to CPAP Results and Resources Framework Ukraine, one of expected program outcomes within the overall UNDAF outcome of reducing poverty in Ukraine is defined as sustainable economic development through pro-poor policy reform. Particularly, this outcome is expected to be achieved with strengthening national capacities to improve strategic planning systems, develop economic and social policies and programmes, and monitor the achievement of UMDGs. The project was developed on the intersection of strategic planning as the tool of economic growth oriented policy and MDG framework that helps to streamline economic policies to achieve better quality of life.

The project defines its mission as contributing to the achievement of MDGs in Ukraine by supporting Ukrainian government in elaborating, implementing, and monitoring economic and social policies. The project objectives fall into four groups:

* Strengthening capacity building for economic and social policy development,
* Improving strategic planning and forecast system,
* Providing MDGs policy analysis, monitoring and advocacy,
* Support to social inclusion (added in 2009).

In Ukraine, the key government agency responsible for economic policy development and strategic planning is the Ministry of Economy. The project design was developed in close cooperation with the Ministry of Economy.

**2. Evaluation of UNDP contribution to outcome**

The project interventions were relevant to the expected outcome of sustainable economic development through pro-poor policy. Strategic objectives of sustainable economic growth, poverty reduction, improvement of people’s life quality, people’s safe vital activity have been frequently mentioned in strategic planning documents in 2000-2008. However, declaring these priorities was not always supported with deep understanding of the problems and their roots behind these priorities as well as clear action plans with measurable indicators for policy implementation results.

The project intervened by both substantive policy advice and establishing new practices and formats in strategic planning. First, the project attracted best experts to prepare policy research on MDG and Social Inclusion issues, including MDG Ukraine-2010 National Report. The policy research papers contained deep analysis of MDG related issues and provided measurable indicators to monitor Ukraine’s progress on achieving MDGs. They were utilized by government officials in drafting government programs.

Second, applying MDG framework gave example of how strategic planning should be organized. The MDG framework implies definition of goals, formulation of a set of targets and indicators, identification of problems and options to resolve them, developing recommendations to improve situation. Moreover, MDG framework requires involvement and cooperation of experts of different government and non-government institutions. The project used these principles in its work on promoting and monitoring MDGs in Ukraine as well as in providing assistance to Ministry of Economy in drafting and elaborating government programs.

The following key project outputs contributed to the achievement of the outcome:

* **MDG framework was advocated in Ukraine and awareness about MDGs was raised among government, experts, and wider public.** The project prepared and disseminated MDG Ukraine-2010 National Report. The Report was presented by the President of Ukraine at UN summit on MDG in September 2010. First, it was the first time when the highest Ukrainian official accepted the problem of HIV/AIDS in Ukraine at the international level. Second, the President declared the commitment that his program of reforms will be closely connected to MDGs.
* **MDG framework was utilized by government employees in preparing strategic planning documents.** Although MDGs were not integrated to full extent into the government documents and not mainstreamed into government policy, MDGs issues and indicators can be traced in recent government documents. For example, President Yanukovych Program for Economic Reforms in 2010-2014 declares reforms in healthcare and education. The Program defines that the success of reforms in healthcare will be particularly measured by the indicator of infant and mother mortality, that corresponds to indicators for Goal 4 and 5 according to MDG Ukraine-2010 National Report. Similarly, the success in education reform is to be measured by share of schools connected to Internet, that corresponds to indicator to Goal 2 in MDG Ukraine-2010 National Report.
* **Inter-ministerial and expert consultations were established as the practice in the elaboration of government programmes.** Due to practice inherited from Soviet planning system, the drafting of strategic planning documents was done in the following way. Line ministries were preparing their sections of the document according to their area of responsibility. The task of the Ministry of Economy was to put these separate sections into one document. It resulted in long documents about everything without any focus on priorities. Contradictions among different sections were quite often. The project contributed into breaking up this practice by installing the practice of discussion sessions among experts involved in government document drafting. In the course of elaboration of annual State Social and Economic Programmes, discussion sessions are run each devoted for the separate section of the Program. Participants to these sessions are Ministry of Economy experts, experts from line ministries, invited non-government experts. The project provided methodological and organizational support. As of 2010, this approach has become the usual practice of government action plan drafting and the Ministry of Economy is committed to continue doing it if the project is terminated.
* **Forecasting capacity strengthened by establishing practice of regular Consensus Forecast round-tables.** Government agencies, NGOs and private business forecast expert participate in regular consensus forecast meetings. Meetings are moderated by the Head of Macroeconomic Department of the Ministry of Economy. Ministry of Economy forecasting experts are very satisfied with Consensus Forecast seminars and consider them to be a critical tool in forecasting process. With the aid of these seminars, they can access views of other experts, widen information on which forecasts are based, validate their own forecasts by outside experts’ opinions. For example, with the project aid, the Ministry of Economy launched the expert survey to measure external risks affecting forecasts. The results of this survey are used to validate forecasts. Based on forecasts collected from participants of consensus forecast meetings, consensus forecast is calculated and press-release on it is disseminated. Consensus forecast results are frequently used by Ministry of Economy forecasting experts to justify their forecasts for politicians and withstand the political pressure to make unrealistic forecasts. In this way, UNDP contributed to the higher quality of government forecasts and ensuring that they are realistic.
* **Professionalism of central and oblast level government officials in strategic planning was raised.** The project has been organizing numerous training sessions on strategic planning. These sessions were particularly valued at oblast level, that was revealed in high participation rates.

The project results are sustainable. The Ministry of Economy is committed to continue consensus forecast meetings and internal consultations in government programmes elaboration, if the project is terminated. Meantime, more work is still to be done in the following areas:

* Achieving full-scale integration of MDGs into government policy. To reach this result, additional work should be done to make recommendations on MDGs achieving more practical and develop action plans for each of MDGs. Currently, the government strategic planning documents include sections on education, healthcare, targeted social assistance. However, issues related to HIV/AIDS, gender equality, sustainable environmental development are not in the strategic planning agenda,
* Raising awareness and advocating Social Inclusion framework in Ukraine. Currently, there is a lack of awareness of Social Inclusion framework and aligning of Ukraine social policy with the policy of inclusion in EU has not been discussed at the government level. Therefore, raising awareness effort is needed in this area similarly to what has been already done for MDGs.

The project was cost-effective. The project staff includes 3 people. The project is located in the premises of the Ministry of Economy.

**3. Recommendations**

Options for project expansion are as follows:

**1. Finding new ways to integrate MDGs and social inclusion framework into government policies.**

The lesson learned is that it is quite difficult to integrate MDGs into government policies under the current situation due to short-term span of government programs and their main focus on economic reforms with less attention to social and humanitarian issues. Meantime, there are signs of interest on government sign on MDGs framework:

* The President declared at UN summit that his reforms will be connected to MDGs,
* The President’s program on economic reforms contains indicators similarly to MDGs indicators,
* At recent Cabinet of Ministers meeting, the Prime-Minister has stated the importance of monitoring of quality of life indicators.

The recommendation is to consider different ways of integrating MDGs and social inclusion framework into government policies. The possible ways are as follows:

* Increase involvement in activities of Committee of Economic Reforms to integrate MDGs into the Presidential Program of Economic Reforms. The key Committee’s task is to monitor the reform process. MDG framework may be used to analyse and to monitor how economic reforms affected the quality of life in Ukraine.
* Initiate elaboration of separate long-term strategy document focused on social and humanitarian issues. Currently, there is the lack of such document in Ukraine presenting strategy of increasing quality of life in Ukraine. The option of having separate document on social and humanitarian issues may be included as the proposal to the new draft law on strategic planning.

The key risk for the task of integrating MDGs into government policies is the gap between economic and financial planning in Ukraine. That is, there is no link between government economic programs and budget financing programs in mid-term and long-term time span due to lack of mid-term and long-term budget planning. Under these circumstances, actions to achieve MDGs may lack relevant budget financing.

**2. Apply project best practice in organizing in-service training, knowledge sharing and consultative process**

The project clients are very positive about project activities in organizing trainings, knowledge sharing events and consultations with wider experts. The key success factor for this positive evaluation was the strong correspondence of trainings and consultations to Ministry’s needs. One of example for this is the project success in conducting training seminars on strategic planning for heads of economic departments at oblast administrations. Heads of economic departments at oblast level were trained about approaches to making economic and financial plans that were fit into their job needs. The participation rate was very high and the response was very good.

Consultative process is very important in reforms implementation. Unfortunately, current Ukrainian reforms are done without any consultative process. The President declares that the reforms should be done very fast. Consequently, time for consultations is sacrificed. However, consultative process is needed to ensure quality of reform actions and to minimize obstacles to reform implementation. UNDP may offer to the Committee of Economic Reforms or Ministry of Economy to organize consultations on reform directions at inter-agency and expert levels using the best practice of MDG project. The consultations should be focused on activity planning.

**3. Strengthen capacity for elaborating and delivering practical recommendations and action plans to implement government policies**

There is a lack of high quality and practical action plans in implementing government policies in Ukraine. MDG National Report 2010, unfortunately, also suffers from the deficiency of practical recommendations. UNDP may offer expertise on how to develop high quality action plans, provide templates for action plans and organize consultations to elaborate action plans with the involvement of key stakeholders. Strengthening capacity for the development of action plans is referred to both integrating MDGs into government policies and to implementing government policies in general. For this purpose, tools of policy analysis and activity planning together with templates and examples from other countries may be used. Activity planning implies analysis of stakeholders views, analyzing problems and their roots, defining actions to remove roots of problems, detecting possible obstacles and risks to implement actions, conditions necessary for successful implementation, as well as setting targets to monitor activity implementation.

**4. Strengthen capacity of the Ministry of Economy to communicate economic and policy analysis to politicians and wider public**

The Ministry of Economy experts lack skills of communicating economic analysis results to top decision-makers and wider public. Economic analysis publications posted at the web-site of the Ministry of Economy tend to be rather academic and lack executive summaries. They are more targeted at expert audience, but will not be useful for decision makers or politicians. The Ministry of Economy officials are aware of this deficiency and need advice on how to improve communication to non-expert public, including members of the Parliament. UNDP can offer trainings and templates on communicating and presenting economic analysis to top decision makers and wide public.

**5. Raise awareness and advocate EU Social Inclusion framework.**

The objective of the support to social inclusion network has been recently added to the project objectives. While the project has done much to advocate MDGs. National report “MDGs. Ukraine-2010” was widely disseminated and presented by the President during MDGs summit. With regard to Social Inclusion framework, only the first steps have been made including dissemination of the research “Social Inclusion in Ukraine: European Choice and Social Sector Institutions”. More work is to be done in the future to raise awareness and advocate EU Social Inclusion framework in Ukraine.

**6. Expand MDG and social inclusion analysis and monitoring to regional level.**

In 2006-2007, the project worked on localization of MDG to local level at three pilot oblasts, Luhansk, Lviv, Donetzk. The project also helped to develop the template for monitoring social indicators at oblast level. However, since MDGs were not directly incorporated into government policy documents, it was difficult to expand MDG localization beyond three pilot oblasts.

The establishment of the Presidential Committee on Economic Reforms opens new opportunities to expanding MDG and social inclusion analysis and monitoring to regional level. The regional committees for economic reforms have been organized at oblast level. Within regional committees, working groups for different direction of reforms are organized. The structure of working groups is typical for all oblast and includes the working group on social sphere reform and improving quality of life[[34]](#footnote-34). UNDP can establish cooperation with these working groups, analyze their needs, offer trainings for them and help to establish monitoring of quality of life indicators within MDG framework.

Another opportunity comes from adding MDG and Social Inclusion frameworks into the Civil Society Development Project. The civil society organizations can be trained on using MDGs and Social Inclusion framework to monitor results of government policies at local level.

## 6.4 Support to Economic Reforms in Ukraine through the Blue Ribbon Advisory and Analytical Centre Project. Outcome Evaluation Report. Executive Summary.

The aim of the evaluation is to measure the contribution of the Blue Ribbon Advisory and Analytical Centre (BRAAC) Project to the UNDP Ukraine Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) 2006-2010 outcomes. The findings and recommendations drawn out of this evaluation exercise will contribute to the formulation of CPAP for 2012-2016. The evaluation was conducted in December 2010-June 2011 by GfK Ukraine team. It covered project activities in 2005-2010.

**Project overview**

In July 2004, at the initiative of UNDP, a group of international and Ukrainian experts established a team to prepare proposals on a second wave of reforms in Ukraine. The team’s Blue Commission Report (BRC) “Proposals to the President - A New Wave of Reforms” was publicly released in January 2005 after the Orange revolution. The proposals were positively received by the President and the Government.

The consultations of the Government of Ukraine, international development community, civil society and private sector identified the need for UNDP to provide high quality policy advice and capacity building supports to assist Ukraine in implementing reform measures outlined in the BRC. UNDP responded to this Government demand by establishing the Blue Ribbon Advisory and Analytical Centre (BRAAC). The project document was signed by UNDP and the Government in 2008. The European Union (EU) provided financial support to the project.

The Centre’s Mission was to promote the next stage of social and economic transformation in Ukraine by mobilising and joining efforts of a wide range of experts and reformer officials in order to support market-oriented reforms and stronger economic growth in Ukraine. The BRAAC was set as a team of long term advisors working in close tandem with government officials and ministers to identify problems and issues, provide analysis and policy recommendations, and establish monitoring and feedback mechanisms to determine the effectiveness of the government policies.

More specific objectives of the Centre included:

* supporting policy formulation and implementation processes through the provision of high-quality analytical and advisory services;
* building capacity of executive authorities, local governments, nongovernmental organisations in the area of practical implementation of reforms; and
* expanding public dialogue on the realisation of reforms initiated by the President, the Verkhovna Rada, and the Government.

To achieve these objectives, the Centre has undertaken a number of various activities which comprised in-house expertise of the draft laws or other legal instruments in response to requests of the Government, President’s staff or Verkhovna Rada; holding training seminars to strengthen capacity of the Ukrainian authorities; preparation of publications, working and advisory papers for top government officials, civil servants, as well as the general public.

The project identified the critical weaknesses and bottlenecks in economic and social systems and provided recommendations how they can be addressed to sustain economic growth and social development. The priority areas of support were selected taking into consideration the Government Action Programme, other national strategic documents in the field of social and economic development, national poverty reduction strategies and EU-Ukraine documents, including the National Indicative Programmes and EU-Ukraine Association Agenda Priorities. The areas of focus included:

* International integration,
* Macroeconomic and regulatory policies,
* Monetary and fiscal policies,
* Agricultural policy and rural development,
* Private sector development.

To achieve the objectives in five broad areas outlined above, the project implemented the following interventions:

* Assistance in policy formulation and implementation,
* Capacity development, and
* Expanding public dialogue and advocating reforms.

**Evaluation of UNDP contribution to outcome**

The project was expected to contribute to the CPAP outcome of **sustainable economic development through pro-poor policy reform**. Overall, the actual project outputs were somewhat relevant to this outcome.

BRAAC activities in areas of international integration, monetary and fiscal policies, agricultural policy and rural development were relevant to the achievement of sustainable economic development through pro-poor policies:

* In the area of international integration, BRAAC activities were focused on issues of WTO accession of Ukraine. Foreign trade stimulates competition, increases society welfare and contributes to poverty reduction.
* Within monetary and fiscal policies area, BRAAC activities were focused in particular on advocating pension reform. First, pension reform is a critical measure to ensure fiscal stability in Ukraine. Second, pension reform is an opportunity to improve the welfare of the elderly by making the pension system more diverse, effective and better targeted.
* Within the area of agricultural and rural development, BRAAC has established good working cooperation with the Ministry of Agriculture and provided support in elaborating agricultural policies on a day-to-day basis. Promoting sustainable agricultural development contributes to increased human development opportunities for the rural residents.

BRAAC activities in the area of macroeconomic and regulatory policies and in the area of private sector development were somewhat relevant to CPAP outcome of pro-poor policies elaboration and implementation. They were in line with EU-Ukraine Association Agenda priorities for 2010. Within the area of macroeconomic and regulatory policies, BRAAC contributed to the development of regulatory framework for financial markets and supervision. Within the area of private sector development, BRAAC activities were mainly focused on company law development. This was in line with EU-Ukraine Association Agenda that prioritised the importance of functioning company law. BRAAC contributed significantly to the drafting of the law on joint stock companies and the law on companies with limited liabilities. However, less attention was given to policy support in the area of small businesses promotion (except for activities conducted in 2006-2008).

Main BRAAC project contributions to the achievement of the outcome of sustainable economic development through pro-poor policy reform are:

* **Ukraine joined WTO in 2008**. The project experts worked closely with the Trade Department of the Ministry of Economy preparing reports to WTO, providing recommendations for negotiations, revising and drafting changes to legislation to ensure compliance with WTO and EU requirements. Key project expert on WTO issues also advocated Ukraine’s joining WTO by disseminating results of the impact study of WTO accession in media. After Ukraine joined WTO, the project staff continued to monitor new policy initiatives with regard to their compliance with WTO requirements. For those policy initiatives that contradicted Ukraine’s obligations to WTO, the project experts advocated their abolishment. For instance, in February 2009, the Parliament passed the law on establishing additional 13% custom duty on a list of imported goods. The project advocated the need for abolishment of this additional custom duty as having negative impact on Ukraine’s international reputation. After 6 months since adoption, the law was revoked.
* **Consensus on the need of pension reform and its specific measures was built among policy makers and experts.** Pension reform was extensively advocated by the BRAAC. The project made significant contribution to pension reform debate in Ukraine by providing high-quality analytical papers, conducting round-tables, organizing consultations between Ukrainian professionals and international experts. In 2008, BRAAC published and disseminated the analytical report on pension system reform. The report was presented at the joint meeting of the Committee of the Parliament, the Ministry of Labor and Social Policy, and the Pension Fund. At the initiative of the Ministry for Labor and Social Policy, a series of round-table events were conducted in different cities of Ukraine, including Odesa, Donetzk, Lviv, Sumy. The value of the report was that it provided a systematic approach to pension reform. Its key message was the need to revise the foundations of the current pension system and establish a completely new pension system. The report was widely used by the Ministry of Labor and Social Policy, Pension Fund, and other relevant agencies. As a result, pension reform has been included into the Presidential Program for Economic Reforms for 2010-2014.
* **Consensus on the necessity of agricultural land market infrastructure development and reforms was built among policy makers at the national and local levels and expert community**. The need for agricultural land market development was effectively advocated by the project. In 2007, BRAAC experts prepared the analytical report “Problems of establishing and functioning of agricultural land market in Ukraine”. The publication of the report was followed by the series of regional round-tables discussing the issues of agricultural land market development in 2007–2010. Key stakeholders and experts participated in these round-tables. BRAAC experts made high-quality presentations to stimulate discussion. As a result of these activities of the BRAAC, agricultural land market development was identified as a priority in the Presidential Program for Economic Reforms.
* **Numerous reform proposals developed by the project were accepted by the President and the Government.** Out of 21 key reform proposals provided by BRAAC in its 2009 report “Recommendations on economic and institutional reforms 2009”, 11 proposals were fully or partially reflected in the Presidential Program of Economic Reforms for 2010-2014. A recommendation on defining corruption as a key priority of the national policy was incorporated into the Presidential Address to the Parliament.

The project performed successfully in a difficult political environment. The key success factors behind its success were project flexibility, readiness and willingness to provide timely support, project staff commitment and involvement, and effective partnership strategies. BRAAC was responsive to the needs of the Government and project partners.

Project cooperated with a wide range of agencies, including the Ministry of Economy, the Ministry of Agrarian Policy, the Parliamentary Committee on Industrial Policy, Regulatory Policy and Entrepreneurship, the State Commission on Securities and Stock Market Regulation, and the State Commission on Regulation of Financial Markets. Project staff provided analytical support to these agencies on a daily basis upon their request, including drafting of government documents and legislation, preparing analytical and policy notes, helping with information search and analysis. BRAAC also provided assistance to the EU Delegation in Ukraine and other donor and international organizations.

Project partners and clients in the government were highly satisfied with the project work and contribution. BRAAC established good reputation among independent experts. The project’s reports and policy notes are valued for their high analytical quality. Project’s clients highly appreciate the timeliness of BRAAC response to their requests and BRAAC staff involvement.

Project’s results are somewhat sustainable:

* **Reform agenda was set in Ukraine**. The Program of Economic Reforms for 2010-2014 announced by the President Yanukovych incorporates many of reform proposals advocated by BRAAC, including prudent fiscal policies, pension reform, deregulation, international integration, and establishing land market.
* **The Government committed to pass legislation on pension reform**. As a result of project’s extensive policy work and advocacy and due to effective partnership strategies, the Ukrainian government committed to pass legislation on pension reform in 2011.
* **Ukraine joined WTO and has been negotiating Free Trade Area with the EU**.

To strengthen capacity of the Government, the project utilized a wide range of tools. It provided access of Ukrainian civil servants and public to the best international expertise, supported Government policy making, conducted round-tables and widely disseminated project analytical papers and other products. The capacity building activities were somewhat sustainable. The Ukrainian experts were informed on the international experiences that supported their work and helped to develop more effective and better quality policy products. They also widely used numerous analytical products developed by the Centre.

**Key project’s limitations include:**

* **Insufficient focus on results.** The project overemphasized the importance of activities/inputs without proper focus on strategic priorities, outcomes and impacts. Often the linkages between inputs, outputs and CP outcomes were not fully clear in projects documentation. Project performance was tracked with the outputs achieved, including number of policy papers produced, draft laws prepared, media comments given, and round-tables conducted.
* **Capacity building objectives were not explicitly pursued that limited the project sustainability**. Capacity building activities of the project were limited to facilitating access of Ukrainian professionals to the best international expertise, and providing assistance and consultations in the process of policy making. As the project’s consultants did not work directly with civil servants to ensure effective knowledge transfer, this modality of capacity building had a risk that BRAAC experts performed the functions of civil servants.
* **The possibilities for collaboration between BRAAC and other UNDP projects were not fully explored and utilized.** The School for Senior Civil Service Officials, established in the course of implementation of UNDP Support to Civil Service Reform Project, for instance, may have served as good institutional mechanism for capacity building of government officials and networking on reform issues advocated by BRAAC. BRAAC experts’ participation in School activities would have strengthened project’s capacity building efforts by expanding their audience.

**Recommendations**

In 2010, President Yanukovych established the Committee for Economic Reforms to develop and implement the Presidential Program of Economic Reforms for 2010-2014 entitled “Rich society, competitive economy, effective state”. This program sets the reform agenda for the next five years. The public administration, however, does not have sufficient capacity to implement reforms, especially in policy planning and monitoring, analysis and working with stakeholders, and presenting policy analysis results to politicians and the public. Reforms do not often include an open consultative process.

Taking into consideration UNDP’s comparative advantages, the following areas can be targeted by UNDP in the next CP cycle in achieving the outcome of economic development through pro-poor policies:

* **International integration and foreign trade**. UNDP has long-lasting partnership relations with the Trade Department of the Ministry of Economy. International integration is on the current reform agenda as the Presidential Program of Economic Reforms declares the goal of establishing free trade area with EU. As a member of WTO, Ukraine participates in Doha round negotiations. As the Government still has limited capacities in these areas, UNDP can support the Government efforts in international integration.
* **Private sector development with the focus on small and medium business**. Growth of small and medium businesses provides employment and contributes to poverty reduction. Currently, there is a tendency in government regulations to benefit larger companies, while there is no clear policy towards individual entrepreneurs. UNDP can support the Government in developing sustainable policies and regulations of individual entrepreneurs’ activities.
* **Pension reform**. BRAAC strongly advocated the pension reforms and the law on pension reform has passed the first reading at the Parliament. However, much work has to be done to implement pension reform, including development of regulations, implementation plans, budget forecasting, and monitoring. As UNDP, due to the BRAAC project, developed significant expertise in the area of pension reforms and built strong relations with the relevant Government partners and donors, it may be beneficial to continue to be involved in this area to ensure that the reforms and their implementation promote the interests of the most vulnerable groups.
* **Agricultural policy development and implementation**. The Presidential Program for Economic Reforms sets the objective of establishing the infrastructure of agricultural land market, aligning methodology of agriculture subsidization with WTO norms, and developing financial services market for agriculture producers. These issues have been effectively supported by BRAAC and the Government has identified the need in further assistance that UNDP is well positioned to provide.

As there is a consensus on what reforms should be implemented in these four areas that was built to a large extent through the BRAAC project’s activities, UNDP intervention in the next CP cycle should focus on supporting reforms implementation. To implement reforms in these areas and achieve positive human development outcomes, effectiveness of policymaking institutions and processes and capacity of public administration should be enhanced. One of the first priorities identified by stakeholders through the interviews, is a need to enhance state’s capacity in effective policymaking and coordination so that it will be able to implement a series of reform measures on which consensus among stakeholders and experts have been reached.

Reforms of policymaking and coordination are complex and could be long-lasting with potential setbacks. In **supporting the Government in establishing an effective policy lifecycle that includes twelve essential steps UNDP may focus on two areas**:[[35]](#footnote-35)

**Table 1: Core Steps of the Policy Cycle**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Political Agenda Setting** | 1. defining the government’s priorities;
2. annual policy and legislative planning;
 |
| **Policy Development** | 1. preparation of policy proposals (including policy analysis, impact assessment, consultations with civil society);
2. preparation of legal drafts[[36]](#footnote-36);
3. inter-ministerial consultations;
4. submission of items to the government office;
5. review by the government office;
6. review by ministerial committees;
 |
| **Legitimation** | 1. decision by the government (Council of Ministers);
2. parliamentary process and passage;
 |
| **Implementation and evaluation** | 1. implementation; and

12. monitoring and evaluation |

To support the institutionalization of the policy cycle or at least its key elements consistent with EU models, UNDP may focus on two areas of support:

1. **Provide technical support and help the Government in establishing a policy cycle consistent with the best international practices. Strengthen capacity of the Cabinet of Ministers’ staff to maintain standards of effective policy cycle**. The Government can be supported in developing internal administrative regulations on key steps and requirements of the policy cycle. Supporting training materials and templates can be developed and widely disseminated among central agencies and line ministries. Technical support can be provided in developing of guides and protocols to ensure consistency in policy products and processes. Regular Government-wide training on how to prepare policy submissions could be delivered as well.

The central Government agencies such as the Cabinet of Ministers’ staff and staff of the President’s Administration can be supported in **promoting practices of horizontal inter-ministerial coordination.** Horizontal coordination should be enhanced because many issues, particularly in strategic policy or complex policies, do not fall within the mandate of one ministry and requires integration of diverse expertise and perspectives. To improve horizontal coordination, the capacity of central agencies should be strengthened in overseeing development and implementation of cross ministerial policies and initiatives. Technical support can include hands-on guidance on effective practices of supporting horizontal collaboration that may include clarifying the mandate and responsibilities of the lead ministry; establishing and maintaining cross-ministry steering committees and/or project teams; and support of cross-ministerial communities of practice.

1. **Support a few line ministries with implementation of specific strategies on which a consensus among stakeholders and experts has been reached.** Practical and hands-on support could be provided on how to assess policy alternatives relying on solid evidence (e.g., distributional effects of policy reforms on the well-being or welfare of the targeted groups or poverty), identify policy instrument(s) to be used, outline sequence of steps, including development of Cabinet Submission. Training could focus on such key elements of developing effective Cabinet of Ministers’ submissions as how to present decision sought**,** describe context for action(e.g.,previous Cabinet of Ministers’ direction, other government commitments), present recommended course of action (e.g., the recommended strategy and immediate actions), identify results to be achieved (e.g., a link to the key government priority supported by the recommendation, performance measures), outline fiscal implications, present economic and business impact analysis, risks assessment and mitigation strategies to address these risks (e.g., fiscal risks that could result in higher than anticipated costs, legal or constitutional risks); and present other options considered (e.g., alternative courses of action considered but not recommended that include a summary of results, fiscal impacts and other relevant considerations). Support can be provided also in the areas of policy implementation. For example, the ministries may be supported in developing policy implementation plans that include specific targets, performance measures and indicators measuring policy success. Particular attention could be paid to promoting participatory approaches to policymaking. The public administration should be properly trained to engage into constructive dialogue with the public and NGOs and be capable to proceed beyond the policy formulation stage to encompass policy approval, implementation and the ongoing evaluation of change initiatives. Stakeholder involvement into policy making is critical for buy-in and ongoing cooperation and ensuring that all relevant factors and views are considered.

In supporting the Government in establishing the effective policy lifecycle, UNDP could enhance its partnership with the Committee on Economic Reforms at the Presidential Administration. The Committee plays instrumental role in achieving strategic priorities identified by the President such as improving the life standards, building a dynamic modern economy and providing efficient and fair policy of the stable government.[[37]](#footnote-37) Partnership with the Committee will help in building the necessary political support for reforms of policymaking.

Partnership strategies should be also pursued with the implementing ministries and relevant donors with the necessary technical expertise in the area of reforms. During implementation of the BRAAC project, UNDP has established effective partnership relations with trade department of the Ministry of Economy and the Ministry of Agriculture. As establishing Free Trade Area with EU and land and agricultural reform are some of key President’s priorities, UNDP can work with these ministries to support them in implementing reforms. Additional line ministries that can benefit from UNDP’ support may be identified by the Committee on Economic Reforms, depending on country’s development priorities.

## 6.5 Civil Society Development Programme (CSDP) in Ukraine. Outcome Evaluation Report. Executive Summary.

The aim of the evaluation is to measure the Civil Society Development Programme in Ukraine (CSDP) contribution to the UNDP Ukraine Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) 2006-2010 outcomes. The findings and recommendations drawn out of this evaluation exercise will contribute to the formulation of CPAP for 2012-2016.

The evaluation was conducted in December 2010 – February 2011 and should be considered as mid-term evaluation as it covers the Project’s activities held during 2009-2010. It utilized a variety of methods to assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and sustainability of the CSDP – in particular, document review; key informant interviews with implementing partners and civil society experts; telephone interviews with a sample of small NGO grants recipients and potential grants recipients.

**1. Project overview**

The CSDP is funded by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark. It was preceded by the Civil Society Development Programme in Ukraine implemented by the OSCE Project Co-ordinator in Ukraine during 2006-2008 and financed by the same donor.

The CSDP has to contribute to the achievement of the outcomes as assigned in the UNDP Ukraine CPAP 2006–2010, namely in the following areas:

Outcome 1.2. Access to justice and human rights improved

Outcome 2.1. Civil society organizations protect and advocate for human rights and justice

CDSP aimed at achieving the two outputs:

Output 1. Selected Ukrainian civil society organizations (CSOs) in seven target regions (Kirovohrad, Lugansk, Lviv, Kherson, Khmelnytsky, Donetsk and Chernihiv regions) have strengthened their a) managerial, b) advocacy and c) monitoring capacity to promote 1) government transparency and accountability, 2) protect the rights of vulnerable groups, such as people with disabilities, detainees and prison inmates, women at risk, disadvantaged children and youth;

Output 2. National and international experts' support, facilitation and coordination of the dialogue between CSOs, parliament and government agencies for developing an enabling legal framework for civil society in Ukraine in accordance with international standards has been delivered.

Both components are currently being implemented with the support from the implementing partners: CCC Creative Center (since October 2009) and ISAR “Ednannia” (since July 2010) for the first component, and Ukrainian Center for Independent Political Research (since September 2010) for the second component.

**2. Trend in outcomes and factors affecting it**

**Outcome 1** Access to justice and human rights

According to Freedom House Ukraine is has the status of «free» country and rather high score of civil liberties 2 of 7 (where 1 is the best score and 7 – the worst). This score is stable through 2008-2010. However, аfter the first 6 months of the new President’s governance since February 2010 external and internal sources report on about increase of human rights violations by law machinery.

**Outcome 2** Civil society organizations protect and advocate for human rights and justice.

According to Freedom House the score of civil society development remained stable throughout 2008-2010 – 2,5 of 7 (where 1 is the best score and 7 – the worst). No progress of civil society development can be partially explained by financial crisis, which resulted in cutting financing of civil society organizations and related governmental programs.

Also, as a result of the change of the government, the draft Law “On Civic Organizations” ( # 3371) was withdrawn and the process of submitting a new draft took about 9 months. Аt the present time, there are two competing draft Laws “On Civic Organizations” registered in the parliament – #7262 and #7262-1. Draft #7262-1, which provides better legal framework for civil society, is being promoted by the leading Ukrainian CSOs coordinated by the UCIPR and supported by the Ministry of Justice. In fact, due to lack of political will and low public support (the awareness campaign is presumably limited with CSOs community and unknown to the wider public) the new legislation is still not adopted.

**3. Evaluation of UNDP contribution to the outcomes**

UNDP supports grassroot local CSOs which (according to the interviewed experts) especially need capacity building and external support. IRF is the only donor except UNDP which provides grants to local CSOs in the area of promoting and protecting human rights (without capacity building component). IRF is focused more on protecting the rights of the poor citizens and local communities, while CSDP is focused on the rights of such vulnerable groups as disabled people, convicts and former convicts, women and youth – so the area for UNDP intervention was chosen adequately.

The UNDP has good reputation and contacts with the local authorities, which can facilitate its involvement at the local level. At the same time, the UNDP is perceived as the new player in civil society development field and its capacity to manage small grants programmes is perceived as still underdeveloped.

Major positive changes facilitated by the UNDP are the following:

***Output 1 Selected Ukrainian civil society organizations (CSOs) in seven target regions have strengthened their capacity.***

22 small grant projects (versus 30 planned) have been successfully implemented by the CSO partners with support from the 1st round of the CSDP small grants scheme in two thematic areas (support to the vulnerable groups, and citizen participation). 14 projects have been indentified for grant support through the 1st round of the small grants scheme in the human rights area. 40 representatives of the 22 grantees received new knowledge and skills in CSO management and advocacy during four training and networking events.

***Output 2 National and international experts' support, facilitation and coordination of the dialogue between CSOs, parliament and government agencies for developing an enabling legal framework for civil society in Ukraine.***

Analytical, awareness-raising and advocacy work to promote enabling legal environment for the civil society has been started by the Ukrainian Center for Independent Political research (UCIPR) supported by a grant through the CSDP.

CSDP is **somewhat relevant** to the CPAP Outcomes of Access to justice and human rights and Civil society organizations protect and advocate for human rights and justice as one of the three thematic areas for small grants - enhancing citizens’ involvement in the process of decision-making - is not related to human rights and as the regional focus of the CSDP is not justified.

CSDP is **somewhat cost-effective** as 20% of Output 1 budget is assigned on capacity building of grantees and 46% on grants administering – it’s would be more effective to redistribute more on capacity building for both grants recipients and IPs, as the representatives of the IPs has mentioned during the interviews that capacity buiding for the IPs was neglected.

The results of small grants scheme and trainings of local CSOs are sustainable. While the legislation improvement component did not succeed in effective lobbying for the adoption of the new law on civic organizations, the efforts of the current implementing partner and concerned organizations may bring results in the near future.

**4. Recommendations**

It is recommended to continue using small grants scheme in the area of promoting and protecting human rights (particularly, in combating of ill-treatment by law enforcement officials, сorruption, illegal actions of the officials, promoting the rights of vulnerable groups) as a good niche for the UNDP intervention. The design and implementation of similar future projects could be improved in the following way:

* To use the experience of the previous projects in the area, to ensure the linkage between them and possibly with other related UNDP projects.
* To abandon regional focus, allowing organizations from all the regions of Ukraine to compete for small grants with innovative projects.
* To simplify and clearly define the procedures for provision of small grants particularly by leaving the function of provision of funds at the implementing partners that have sufficient number of experienced personnel to adhere to the UNDP procedures.
* To focus more on the need of capacity building of grantees (particularly, оn trainings on financial sustainability and working with the authorities) and local authorities (in the area of protecting human rights and responding the needs of vulnerable groups and related cooperation with CSOs).
* To facilitate proactively partnerships of grants recipients with local authorities and communities.
* To establish effective cooperation and communication among all the partners and grant recipients – building a network of experience sharing and educational infrastructure (resource centers) in the regions for civil society activists in human rights protection area.

There are still hopes that the work of the Programme and other organizations will result in the adoption of the new Law On Civic Organizations. If draft is not adopted in the nearest time, it is recommended to focus on large-scale public awareness campaign on the issue. Such campaign can also contribute to the understanding of the role of the third sector by general public and government officials.

## 6.6 Support to Civil Service Reform Project. Outcome Evaluation Report. Executive summary.

The aim of the evaluation is to measure the contribution of Support to Civil Service Reform Project to the UNDP Ukraine Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) 2006-2010 outcomes. The findings and recommendations drawn out of this evaluation exercise will contribute to the formulation of CPAP for 2012-2016. The evaluation was conducted in December 2010-April 2011 by GfK Ukraine team. It covered project activities in 2008-2010.

**1. Project overview**

Support to Civil Service Reform Project was designed to contribute into the CP outcome of accountable citizen-based government promoted. This corresponded to the UNDAF outcome of “Government institutions at national and local levels function on transparent, accountable and participatory basis that ensures the human rights of all people of Ukraine. Expected CP outputs for the CP outcome of accountable citizen-based government were public administration reform, parliamentary oversight and public access to government strengthened through institutional reforms and anti-corruption measures.

The project document was prepared in October 2007. The project lasted from 2008 to 2010. The project design was developed in close cooperation with the project implementing partner, Main Department of Civil Service (MDCS). MDCS identified list of needs for the potential UNDP project. This list was analyzed taking into account the available resources of UNDP and the possible overlapping with other donor projects. As the results, the following project components were defined:

* To build the MDCS capacity in designing and delivering relevant training modules to civil servants in order to support their role and function in the current Ukrainian civil service, on its way towards a more professional, modern and effective civil service. This component was the most important one and, consequently, 80% of total budget allocations were spend on this component,
* To sensitise selected Ukrainian civil servants and political decision-makers on the critical place of the new Law on Civil Service to facilitate its swift adoption,
* To provide the MDCS the necessary tools in terms of analysis, expert advice and monitoring function to successfully conduct its mandate in driving the Ukrainian civil service reform process. This component included the support to SIGMA reviews.

**2. Evaluation of UNDP contribution to outcome**

The project outputs were relevant to the outcome of accountable citizen-based government. The project activities were aligned with recommendations given in SIGMA Ukraine’s governance assessment report in March 2006. The project contributed to building political consensus on the civil service reform by its activities to sensitize high-level stakeholders on the need to pass new Law on Civil Service. The project helped MDCS to access best expertise of SIGMA experts on civil service reform issues.

Finally, the project addressed SIGMA recommendation on institutionalization of in-service training with its most substantial Activity 3. Training capacity within the MDCS. By the completion of the project, 78% of its budget was allocated to this Activity. When the project document was prepared, there was a lack of practical ad hoc in-service training to civil servants. The National Academy of Public Administration, the institution under the auspices of the President in Ukraine, had a strong bias to academic education and Masters of Public Administration training. Meantime, there was a need for short-term training in practical skills of democratic governance, such as communication, negotiations, dealing with stakeholders, change management, particularly targeted at senior civil servants who faced significant lack of time. The project outputs within its Activity 3 were relevant to this need.

The following project accomplishments contributed to the achievement of the outcome:

* **The School for Senior Civil Service Officials was established and well-institutionalized**. The School is accountable to MDCS with the mandate to develop and implement training policy for high corps of the civil service. The School management highly evaluated UNDP assistance and support. UNDP support was in (1) assisting in development of the School statute documents, (2) conducting the study of the demand for the School, (3) providing recommendations for the training programs, (4) helping in hiring School trainers, (5) assistance in networking and establishing partnership with peer institutions in the EU countries, (6) helping to develop the School web-site, (7) support to the implementation of training modules. The School offers short-term ad hoc trainings targeted at civil servants of 1st and 2nd categories. Besides offering training programs, the School serves as the tool for informal networking among high level civil servants. The School was an innovation into the Ukrainian system of civil servants training. First, the School training program is focused on practical leadership skills such as change management, communication, general management, HR management, strategic management, leadership. Second, training courses are designed to be short-term, flexible and be delivered in small groups to ensure involvement of trainees. The suspension of academic content and flexibility to meet the demand of the targeted group in practical management skills are factors that distinguish the School from traditional Ukrainian system of civil servants trainings (more on the School see Section 10.1 Sustainability of interventions).
* **The procedures for training need assessment were developed and transferred to the School.** With support from ROI Dutch Institute for Public Administration the assessment of training needs was conducted. With support of the Institute, the School developed and implemented Management Development Program. When the contract with the Institute was over, the School modified the program into Leadership Development Program with the focus on strategy and leadership skills.
* **Professionalism of higher civil servants was raised and their leadership skills were developed. The culture of life-long learning for senior civil servants was introduced in Ukraine**. Over 200 high civil servants from wide range of central government agencies participated in School trainings and master classes. However, more work is to be yet done to link training with appraisal and promotion process within the civil service.
* **Awareness about the necessity of the new Law on Civil Service was raised and the Law was promoted**. The project conducted round-tables, organized study tours and prepared materials that were used by MDCS in promoting the new *Law On the Civil Service* among members of the Parliament, Presidential Administration, other stakeholders. Finally, in March 2011 the Law was submitted to the Parliament and passed its first reading in April 2011.
* **Analytical and organizational support** was provided in performing functional reviews, updating databases of state functions and services, preparing analytical materials to promote legislation changes. Unfortunately, SIGMA postponed cooperation with Ukrainian government on governance reviews in response to the lack of progress in public administration reform. As the result, the project component on Support to SIGMA reviews was not fully implemented and SIGMA cooperation with MDCS was limited to ad hoc basis, while governance reviews were not conducted.

The School for Senior Civil Service Officials is the most tangible and vivid output of the project. It is also the best proof of the project sustainability. According to our interview with the School director Oleksandr Sayenko, School’s positions are strong after the exit of UNDP:

* School has been successfully raising funds from other donors including CIDA, Danish government, USAID,
* School activities are backed with government documents including the Decree of Cabinet of Ministers on Training Programs and on Concept of the Development of High Corps of Civil Service,
* Despite the difficult situation in government finance, the budget financing for the School was increased for 2011.

The project is an example of sound organization and management[[38]](#footnote-38). The project document was thoroughly prepared. Project outputs were successfully completed. Project partners and training participants are satisfied. The operations of the project were based on cost-efficiency principles.

However, UNDP should be informed about the inherent risks of overlapping with projects implemented by the National Academy of Public Administration (NAPA) in the in-service civil service training area. These risks originate from the lack of clearly defined scope of responsibilities and lines of accountability of MDCS and NAPA. As the result, the working relationship between these two institutions has not been established. When planning future UNDP interventions, effort should be devoted to the analysis of NAPA Road Map to Modernization developed in 2006 and Twinning project Support to the Development and Improvement of the Civil Servants Training System in Ukraine[[39]](#footnote-39) started by NAPA in October 2009 and funded by EU. Particularly, the component 2 of the project is aimed at strengthening organization and management of NAPA and Regional Institutes with a focus on the in-service training institute’s ability to train high-level civil servants.

**3. Recommendations**

The adoption of the Law on Civil Service in the first reading is the proof that civil service reform has been returned to the reform agenda. The complete adoption of the Law will be an important milestone in civil service reform. However, as SIGMA experts put it in 2007 report, adopting legislation is not sufficient. Deeper institutional change will be needed to overcome the legacy of command administrative system. Particularly, it requires establishing right institutions with right division of functions and lines of accountability. The daily routine work will be also needed to increase professionalism of civil service by introducing culture of long-life education and incorporating it into the appraisal and promotion system.

There are the following options for UNDP intervention in response to these changes in the environment.

**1. Revive component on support to SIGMA reviews.**

The last update of SIGMA governance assessment was conducted in 2007. Since that time the governance situation has changed. First, the Constitution was revised and the powers of the President were increased. Second, the optimization of the structure of government executive bodies has been conducted according to the Presidential Decree issued in December 2010. Third, the new Law on Civil Service was submitted to the Parliament.

There is a need for the independent evaluation of these changes with the practical recommendations on what should be done further. SIGMA expertise may be of high use in helping to streamline the further governance reform in Ukraine and to monitor its progress.

**2. Utilize the model of the School for Senior Civil Servants to institutionalize in-service training center with pilot Ministries**

The model developed for the training of senior civil servants during the project implementation is a good example of flexible in-service training in response to job and self-development needs of civil servants. The project applied this model to establish training center for senior civil servants. This model can be also applied to establishing in-service training center for selected pilot ministry. In this way, UNDP will contribute to decentralization of civil servants training.

One possibility is to develop in-service training center for the Ministry of Economy in alignment with Millenium Development Goals (MDG) Project. MDG project has been successful in conducting seminars on strategic planning for Ministry and oblast administration staff. These activities can be deeper institutionalized by establishing in-service training for the Ministry of Economy.

Another opportunity for UNDP intervention emerges from the Blue Ribbon Analytical and Advisory Center (BRAAC) project. The project has established the close working cooperation with Trade Department of the Ministry of Economy that is responsible for Ukraine’s cooperation with WTO. The BRAAC project was designed to provide analytical support to the Trade Department at the Ministry of Economy on WTO negotiations, but it did not contain any training component. In fact, project staff was performing job instead of Ministry staff (see **BRAAC project outcome evaluation report**). To correct for this deficiency, UNDP can offer training on negotiations with international organizations within the in-service training center at the Ministry of Economy.

The benefit of this approach for UNDP will be the opportunity to penetrate deeper and get access to civil servants of 3rd and 4th categories as well as employees at local level, while the School for Senior Civil Servants at MDCS will preserve focus on top level civil servants of the 1st and 2nd categories. The training needs of servants of lower categories, particularly, at the local level, will differ significantly from the needs of top level servants at central ministries. It is expected, that there will be more demand for technical and analytical skills, including policy analysis and policy implementation planning, and less demand for leadership skills. Therefore, training needs assessment will be needed to design training programs.

**3. Address the demand for policy implementation skills**

In 2010, President Yanukovych announced the Presidential Program of Economic Reforms for 2010-2014 named “Rich society, competitive economy, effective state”. The President established the Committee for Economic Reforms to implement the Presidential Program of Economic Reforms for 2010-2014. For each direction of reforms, the President appointed the government official, who bears the personal responsibility for reform progress. The program of economic reforms is to be supported with annual National action plans, which define activities and set targets for reform implementation for one year period.

However, there is a lack of capacity for policy activity planning and implementation in Ukraine. UNDP can address this lack by providing trainings targeted at what needed for reform implementation. This may include training on tools of activity planning and monitoring, preparing policy notes to communicate about reform issues and progress, dealing with stakeholders. These trainings can be organized within the in-service training center for a pilot ministry.

**4. Address the demand for establishing human resources management system within the civil service**.

Human resources management was named as one of eight key recommendations by SIGMA experts in February 2006. Human resources management in civil service is the domain of Ukraine Civil Service Human Resources Management Reform Project funded by the Canadian Government. Despite this, the expertise of UNDP Project will be valuable in the area of human resources management installment in civil service, particularly in the following directions:

* Building MDCS capacity in training policy development,
* Incorporating training into performance appraisal system and promotion system,
* Support to conducting training needs assessment at different levels of civil service,
* Support to forming the President’s “gold reserve” of civil service. The design for “gold reserve” has been currently under discussion. The School for Senior Civil Servants is involved in the development of the design for “gold reserve”. Currently, the key issue is how to ensure transparent and effective selection to “gold reserve”. UNDP can provide its support in designing procedures for selection to “gold reserve”, as well as in developing training program for its members.

**5. Negotiate possible cooperation with the National Academy of Public Administration to target wider audience of public servants and to avoid overlapping of efforts**

There is still a need in modernization of the National Academy of Public Administration. The modernization road map was developed in September 2006, but it has not been implemented. Therefore, the task of re-positioning and re-focusing the Academy from being academic institution to providing effective practical skills training of civil servants is still on the agenda and increase share of in-service training.

Cooperation with the National Academy of Public Administration potentially brings the following benefits for UNDP:

* Expand the target audience of civil servants to lower categories at central agencies. In this way, UNDP will contribute to the development of the professional layer of civil servants at middle-level of civil service. Special training courses should be developed with the focus on professionalism, including what it is to be professional in civil service, how to communicate with political positions, how to deal with stakeholders, how to conduct and present policy analysis.
* Expand the target audience of civil servants to local levels. The Academy can provide access to civil servants at regional and local levels via its regional institutes. To develop training programs for the civil servants at local level, their training needs assessment will be needed.

Meantime, there are following risks that can prevent successful cooperation with the NAPA:

* There is a strong academic bias among NAPA permanent staff that may result in opposition to UNDP interventions to implement flexible, short-term in-service training program,
* NAPA staff may oppose to inviting external trainers and offer themselves as trainers, that can limit the project flexibility,
* There is a risk of overlapping with Twinning project at NAPA funded by EU.
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