

Evaluation of the UNDP parliamentary support project in Zimbabwe & recommendations

Final Evaluation Report

17-10-2012

Franklin De Vrieze & Rukudzo Murapa

-

Table of Content

Acronyms	3.
Acknowledgments	4.
I. Executive Summary	5.
II. The Parliament of Zimbabwe and the parliamentary support project	7.
1. Introduction to parliamentary reform in Zimbabwe	
2. The Global Political Agreement (GPA)	
3. Evaluation of the second phase of the Parliamentary Support Program	
4. The evaluation team	
5. Objectives of the evaluation	
6. Structure of the evaluation report	
7. Methodology for evaluation	
8. Attribution and context	
III. Project Design	11.
IV. Project Implementation	16.
▪ Outcome 1: Improved legislative and policy analysis	
▪ Outcome 2: Strengthened institutional knowledge & analytical capacity on government issues	
▪ Outcome 3: Strengthened Institutional knowledge base and analytical capacity in economics and development issues	
▪ Outcome 4: Improved Transparency, Accountability of MPs	
▪ Outcome 5: Improved Support Services to Parliament	
V. Project Management	33.
VI. Recommendations	45.
VII. Annexes:	51.
1. List of interlocutors and persons interviewed, June 2012	
2. Documents consulted on the Zimbabwe parliament project	

DISCLAIMER

The report ***“Evaluation of the UNDP Parliamentary Support Project in Zimbabwe and Recommendations”*** has been drafted by Franklin De Vrieze and Prof. Rukudzo Murapa. It was developed in the framework of the multi-donor parliamentary support program in Zimbabwe, funded by the European Commission and co-funded and implemented by UNDP. The views expressed in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of these institutions.

Acronyms

AU	African Union
CD	Country Director
CSOs	Civil Society Organizations
CTA	Chief Technical Advisor
EU	European Union
GPA	Global Political Agreement
ICT	Information Communication Technology
LCC	Liaison and Coordination Committee
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MDC-M	Movement for Democratic Change-Mutambara
MDC-N	Movement for Democratic Change-Ncube.
MDC-T	Movement for Democratic Change-Tsvangirai
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
MP	Member of Parliament
PAPST	Public Affairs and Parliamentary Support Trust
PCIC	Parliamentary Constituency Information Centre
PCU	Programme Coordination Unit
PLC	Parliamentary Legal Committee
PMC	Programme Management Committee
PoZ	Parliament of Zimbabwe
PR	Public Relations
PSP	Parliamentary Support Programme
RR	Resident Representative
SADC	Southern African Development Community
SAPST	Southern African Parliamentary Support Trust
SC	Steering Committee
SIDA	Swedish International Development Agency
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNICEF	United Nations Children’s Fund
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WIPSU	Women in Politics Support Unit
ZANU-PF	Zimbabwe African National Union-Patriotic Front
ZEC	Zimbabwe Electoral Commission
ZUNDAF	Zimbabwe United Nations Development Assistance Framework

Acknowledgments

The evaluation team would like to express its appreciation for the unhindered access to and for the frank and kind discussions held with members of parliament and staff of the Parliament of Zimbabwe, the various experts, representatives of CSOs, the media, development partners and other stakeholders during the time of the project evaluation mission.

The evaluation team is very grateful to the UNDP Resident Representative, Assistant Resident Representative, Country Director, Deputy Country Director, Program Analyst, Project Coordinator and all UNDP and project staff for the information and documentation provided, and for their insights and perspectives on the parliamentary support project.

The evaluation team also appreciates the practical and logistical support provided by UNDP and the parliament in support of the evaluation mission during the three week evaluation period in June 2012.

Finally, the evaluation team is particularly grateful for the warmth and hospitality extended to it in parliament, at UNDP and with other interlocutors.

Franklin De Vrieze
Prof. Rukudzo Murapa

October 2012

I. Executive Summary

In 2009-2010 the Parliament of Zimbabwe implemented the second phase of the Parliamentary Support Project, financed by the European Commission and managed and co-funded by UNDP. As the project has come to an end, UNDP Zimbabwe engaged two experts to work as an independent evaluation team for this assignment: one international lead evaluator and one national evaluator.

Franklin De Vrieze from Belgium is an experienced international parliamentary development expert, former Program Manager of UNDP's Global Program for Parliamentary Strengthening (GPPS) and author on parliamentary development and public affairs. Prof. Rukudzo Murapa is a leading national governance expert, former UN-official, an accomplished academic professional and former vice-chancellor of Africa University in Zimbabwe.

The main objective of the evaluation was to:

- Evaluate the results and impact achieved by the program;
- Assess the effectiveness of UNDP support to the program;
- Identify and critically analyze the relevance of the program activities;
- Critically analyze the effectiveness of the implementation modalities;
- Make recommendations on the way forward.

During its three weeks assignment in June 2012, the evaluation team conducted a wide range of interviews with stakeholders and interlocutors both within and outside parliament. The evaluation team also analyzed the project-documentation, observed a number of meetings at parliament and visited a selected number of Parliamentary Constituency Information Centers (PCICs).

Based upon the analysis deriving from the assessment, the evaluation team has structured the final evaluation report under three headings: (i) project design, (ii) project implementation and (iii) project management. Under the section "Project design" the evaluation team analyzed the extent to which the project document provided a solid and workable basis for successful project implementation. The section "Project implementation" evaluated the activities against the stated outputs. The evaluation was based on four criteria: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and impact/sustainability. The section "Project management" reviewed how the implementation and evaluation mechanisms were structured and managed.

The evaluation team identified a number of successes achieved by the program during the two years of its implementation. These included:

- Training of MPs in legislative and policy analysis strengthened their knowledge and skills and contributed to stronger facts-based parliamentary debates, and the review and amendments to legislation. The project-support for public hearings provided enhanced opportunities for public input into parliament's work.
- Technical support to a number of portfolio committees increased the policy oversight role of these committees.
- The workshops on ratification and domestication of international human rights instruments and the workshops on parliamentary diplomacy and representation abroad functioned as an eye opener to MPs in terms of their role in oversight over the government and helped in conflict resolution in the post-GPA area and facilitated an improvement in relationships between MPs of the three parties in the GPA .

- The training of MPs on economic literacy and the pre-budget and post-budget workshops contributed to a better informed budget debate in parliament, including amendments to the proposed budget. The baseline surveys on economic literacy and Committee- specific capacity needs are of high quality.
- In a structural way, the project's support to the ISO certification process addressed the need for improved management in the Parliament of Zimbabwe and has strengthened the capacity of both MPs and staff to better manage and communicate the business of parliament.
- The training of Hansard reporters, researchers, committee clerks, executive assistants, registry clerks and front office staff addressed some of the real needs of parliament for improved staff performance.

The evaluation team also found a number of shortcomings:

- Baseline studies were not distributed to MPs, trainers and experts.
- From a sustainability point of view, the project did not sufficiently address structures and procedures which remain in place beyond the activities and workshops, such as guidelines for legislative drafting, a legislative tracking mechanism, a calendar of reporting obligations and review mechanisms on human rights and other international/regional instruments, a detailed roadmap for the Budget Office, agreed procedures on interaction with the Office of the Comptroller and Auditor General.
- Following the signing of the cost-sharing agreement with the EC, there was an extensive delay before project implementation could begin as the agreement between the UNDP and Parliament on the Project Document took some time before it was signed.
- The Steering Committee did not play its role as systematically as envisaged in the Project Document in terms of providing leadership and overall policy guidance to the project.

One of the main chapters of this report is the section dealing with recommendations. The evaluation team has listed its 30 recommendations under the same three headings structuring the report. The report includes 10 recommendations on project design, including the recommendation for the early involvement of development partners, based on regular consultations, for the next phase of the parliamentary support project. There are 10 recommendations on project implementation, including (i) the need to provide support to a Budget Office within parliament, (ii) technical advice to strengthen the Research Department and (iii) follow-up on ratification of international treaties. Finally the report makes 10 recommendations on project management, including on the role of the Steering Committee and the recruitment of a Chief Technical Advisor (CTA).

In short, the evaluation team is of the opinion that the project has played an important and strategic role in providing support to parliament during 2009-2010, but that a number of issues could have been addressed more effectively and more efficiently. Due to the short time of implementation (20 months) and the considerable impact of the socio-economic and political context, transformative change development results on MPs and staff may be difficult to precisely measure. The evaluation team hopes that the report will provide both broad and more focused guidance to the Parliament of Zimbabwe and the UNDP as they reflect on how best to design the successor project.

In sharing this report with the Parliament of Zimbabwe, the evaluation team suggests that a special meeting of the Project's Steering Committee be convened to discuss the report, with a particular focus on its recommendations.

II. The Parliament of Zimbabwe and parliamentary reform

This chapter will provide information on previous initiatives in parliamentary reform in Zimbabwe and the context and preparations for the evaluation of the second phase of the UNDP Parliamentary Support Project.

1. Introduction to parliamentary reform in Zimbabwe

Since 1997, the Parliament of Zimbabwe has embarked on a reform program aimed at strengthening its legislative, oversight and representation functions as well as its administration. The reforms were inspired by developments in parliaments elsewhere and were in response to public pressure for a parliament which is effective in the discharge of its constitutional mandate. The Parliamentary Reform Committee (PRC), whose role has now been taken over by the Liaison and Coordination Committee (LCC), a forum of party whips and chairpersons of portfolio, thematic and other committees, recommended a number of reforms intended to strengthen the legislative branch which had been perceived as a weak partner of the executive branch. Since the 1990s UNDP has been instrumental in providing both technical and financial support to Parliament to achieve its reform objectives.

In June 2002, Parliament, with technical and financial assistance from the UNDP, appointed a Capacity Assessment Team (CAT) to make proposals for the reform process. The CAT submitted its report in May 2003 and identified the following critical success factors for the reforms: continued political and administrative leadership and commitment; firm ownership of the reforms by parliament, with the LCC - successor to the PRC - acting as the main custodian; the ability to retain professional staff; effective collaboration with development partners and other key stakeholders; efficient program management arrangements.

A strategic review of 72 recommendations of CAT were rationalized to 32 by the LCC. The LCC grouped the 32 recommendations into 5 strategic categories that were incorporated into the Administration of Parliament's Strategic Plan, 2005-2010. In 2005 the first "Three-Year Rolling Multi Donor Parliamentary Support Program" was rolled out. At the end of 2008, an independent evaluation of the Parliamentary Support Program (PSP) was carried out. This evaluation acknowledged the program's achievements in capacity building of parliamentarians in a number of issues and subjects: a fully entrenched portfolio committee system, legislative and policy analysis, an upgraded ICT system, and professionalization in the administration of Parliament. However, the report concluded that the results from the program had been "mixed and modest because the inputs had been mixed and modest", and noted a number of areas in need of improvement.

Drawing on the report's recommendations and given the new political dispensation of an Inclusive Government the second "Three-Year Rolling Multi-Donor Parliamentary Support Program" was launched. It was designed with cognizance of the parliament's revised Strategic Plan, and it emerged at an opportune and challenging time when the Global Political Agreement (GPA) came into force.

2. The Global Political Agreement (GPA)

The Global Political Agreement (2008) signed by all three main political parties, namely MDC-T, ZANU-PF and MDC-M, the imperatives of the Inclusive Government and the pending agenda of Parliament provided the framework that guided the second phase of the program. The GPA itself came into existence as a

result of protracted negotiations necessitated by contested elections, contested legislation, excessively high inflation and the consequent high unemployment and other socio-economic challenges.

According to the Project Document (p. 6), *"the second phase of the Rolling Programme needs to be cognizant of the processes which have allowed for the over centralised concentration of decision-making in the Presidency away from ministries and Parliament and which may present obstacles to the transition towards a democratic developmental state based on a rule-based system of government. The renewal of Parliament must be part of a more ambitious and comprehensive programme of institutional reforms and political, economic and social change taking place in Zimbabwe."* A key responsibility for parliament under the GPA is to oversee the constitution- making process through a special Parliamentary Select Committee (COPAC) set up for that purpose. It is noted that the constitution making process is supported by a separate UNDP project. Parliament is also seized with identifying and recommending suitable candidates for appointment to independent commissions which include the Zimbabwe Media Commission (ZMC), Zimbabwe Electoral Commission (ZEC) and the Human Rights Commission.

A major development in the parliamentary structures and procedures of Zimbabwe was the re-introduction of a bi-cameral system in 2005, with major implications on how parliament does its business and the capacities and competences required.

In addition, the Parliament of Zimbabwe operates within an environment in which it must respond to global and regional developments and imperatives. It is expected, for example, to review and ratify major international protocols and conventions, such as the Southern African Development Community (SADC) Protocol on Gender and Development and the U.N. Convention on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW).

3. Evaluation of the second phase of the Parliamentary Support Program (PSP)

The main objective of the PSP, as informed by the Zimbabwe United Nations Development Assistance Framework (ZUNDAF) 2007-2011 and the UNDP Zimbabwe Country Program for the same period, was to strengthen parliament as a key governance institution that, inter alia, promotes democratic dialogue, human rights, rule of law and gender equality. In this regard, the project's key focus was on strengthening parliamentary democracy, in the context of the doctrine of separation of powers, through capacity building, enabling parliament to effectively perform its legislative, representational and oversight roles. The Project Document, therefore, identified 5 key output areas for the project:

- Output 1: Improved legislative and policy analysis capacity by reinforcing the committee system, greater stakeholder involvement through inclusion of civil society actors and public outreach strategy;
- Output 2: Strengthened institutional knowledge base and analytical capacity on rule of law issues including constitutional reform, electoral management reform, anti-corruption, human rights, gender mainstreaming and gender budgeting;
- Output 3: Strengthened institutional knowledge base and analytical capacity on economic and development issues, in particular economic literacy, budget analysis, the international aid architecture, poverty assessments and MDGs, gender and sector-specific areas such as agriculture, mining, and other economic areas;
- Output 4: Improved knowledge and practice of good conduct by MPs on the basis of principles, ethics, public service, national interest, consensus building and reconciliation, and prevention of conflict of interest;
- Output 5: Improved administration of Parliament in support of legislative analysis and oversight functions including coordination of capacity building initiatives.

4. The evaluation team

In order to conduct the evaluation of the Parliamentary Support Program, UNDP Zimbabwe engaged two experts to work as an independent and professional evaluation team for this assignment: one international lead evaluator and one national evaluator.

Franklin De Vrieze from Belgium is an experienced international parliamentary development expert and former Program Manager of UNDP's Global Program for Parliamentary Strengthening (GPPS). He is an author on parliamentary development and public affairs.

Prof. Rukudzo Murapa is a leading national governance expert, a former UN official, an accomplished academic who has published extensively and former vice-chancellor of Africa University in Zimbabwe.

In June 2012, the team conducted a three weeks evaluation mission.

5. Objectives of the evaluation

As stated in the terms of reference (ToR) the main objective of the evaluation was to:

- Evaluate the results and impact achieved by the program;
- Assess the effectiveness of UNDP support to the program;
- Identify and critically analyze the relevance of the program activities;
- Critically analyze the effectiveness of the implementation modalities;
- Make recommendations on the way forward.

6. Structure of evaluation report

As indicated earlier, the evaluation team has structured the final evaluation report under three headings: project design, project implementation and project management.

Under the section "Project design" the Project Document and the implementation framework as established at the start of the Project were reviewed. The evaluation team analyzed the extent to which the project document provided a solid and workable basis for successful project implementation. The section "Project implementation" evaluated the activities against the stated five outputs. The evaluation team analyzed how the five outputs were achieved through the stated activities. The evaluation was based on four criteria: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and impact/sustainability.

At the end of each output section, a rating for each of these criteria between "low" and "very high", was given, for all activities within the specific output.

The section "Project management" reviewed how the implementation and evaluation mechanisms have functioned. In this regard, the evaluation team looked at the cost-sharing agreement with the European Commission, project's human resources, Project Steering Committee and Project Management Board, project's human resources and parliamentary mainstreaming.

7. Methodology for evaluation

The evaluation team followed an inclusive approach to the evaluation of the PSP, which ensured its completeness, ownership, acceptability and transparency.¹ Therefore, the evaluation team identified a

¹ Further information on the evaluation methodology can be found in the document "Standards for Evaluation in the UN System", as prepared by the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG).

five-step methodology: (i) Desk review of relevant documents; (ii) structured interviews with key stakeholders; (iii) Data collection and analysis; (iv) observing a limited number of meetings at parliament and (v) visit to a selected number of Parliamentary Constituency Information Centers.

In terms of the structured interviews, the evaluation team met a wide range of interlocutors of the project, first and foremost the beneficiaries in parliament: members of parliament including the Speaker of the House, the President of the Senate, heads of party caucuses, chairpersons of Committees and other members of parliament, Clerk and deputy Clerk, heads of Departments in the Secretariat as well as trainers / experts who conducted workshops & training for MPs and staff. A second group of interlocutors were civil society, academics and media, and the Electoral Commission. Finally, the team also interviewed donors and relevant personnel at the UN and UNDP.

The evaluation has been conducted through five phases:

- *THE INCEPTION PHASE*: preliminary meetings with the leadership of parliament and of UNDP, to identify key issues, methodology of the evaluation and planning of the mission.
- *THE DESK PHASE*: review of all relevant documents on the project, on parliament and on the country context.
- *THE FIELD PHASE*: visit to a limited number of Parliamentary Constituency Information Centers.
- *THE INTERVIEW PHASE*: structured interviews with key stakeholders inside and outside parliament.
- *THE SYNTHESIS PHASE*: consultations on initial findings and draft recommendations; and finalization of the report.

8. Attribution and context

The evaluation team was well aware of the challenges in assessing the direct impact of the project activities. In particular the question of attribution was reviewed: to what extent could changes in the functioning of MPs and in the parliament as a whole be attributed to the input and intervention of the project, as opposed to the degree to which performance improvement could also be attributed to other factors including the growing experience and knowledge of MPs and staff.

As this evaluation demonstrated, the implementation of the project took place in a politically sensitive environment. The inclusive government under the GPA constituted the context in which the project was operating. This highly dynamic and, in many cases, tense context turned out to be partially conducive to the achievement of specific improvements in the functioning of the parliament, to which the project contributed. The project implementation took full advantage of the opportunities which the political context offered. At the same time, the evaluation team was aware that some of the project gaps or the inability to achieve certain project results were also related to some adverse effects of the political context in which MPs were expected to participate in other key policy debates (e.g. constitution making). Despite all these challenges, the evaluation team noted parliament's commitment to reforms and the considerable progress and achievements made which provide a good foundation for a more focused future program.

See: http://www.uneval.org/papersandpubs/documentdetail.jsp?doc_id=22

III. Project Design

The section on project design reviews the degree to which the Project Document provided a solid and workable basis for successful project implementation.

1. Situation analysis

The “situation analysis” within the Project Document provides a good overview of the context in which this project document was drafted. The context described includes the reform program which the parliament has embarked upon since 1997, the role of the Liaison and Coordination Committee to spearhead the reforms, the 2008 evaluation of the first phase of the multi-donor parliamentary support program and the new political dispensation of an Inclusive Government.

The “situation analysis” clearly articulates how the election results of March 2008 affected changes to key positions in parliament, as it saw the two major political parties, ZANU-PF and MDC-T, securing election of their candidates to the two important positions of President of the Senate and Speaker of the House respectively, even before the formation of the Inclusive Government. The text rightly notes that the composition and configuration of an enlarged and truly multi-party parliament resulting from the March 2008 general elections has put the spotlight on the institution which is an important forum for governance issues. The text then explains the constitutional amendments which increased the number of seats from 66 to 99 for the Senate and from 150 to 215 for the House. Given the relatively large number of new and, therefore, inexperienced MPs in 2008, the need for capacity building to enable MPs to effectively execute their mandate is central to the Project Document. Another important dimension that has been addressed is the representation of women in Parliament, as 30 out of 210 MPs and 20 out of 60 Senators are women.

The “situation analysis would have been more complete if reference had been made to the interaction of the Zimbabwe parliament with SADC Parliamentary Forum, the African Union’s Pan-African Parliament and other international organizations and inter-parliamentary forums. This is relevant as one set of project activities is related to international treaty obligations and parliamentary diplomacy, including above mentioned organizations.

2. Strategy and outputs

The strategy chapter of the Project Document is comprehensive and well written. It outlines the major areas in which the project was expected to support capacity development in terms of the legislative, oversight and representative functions of parliament. It mentions that the project will undertake activities that improve the quality of the laws, through legislative drafting, analysis, monitoring and capacity development in areas aimed at building consensus and resolving disputes. The strategy chapter emphasizes the need to undertake activities that strengthen the capacity of MPs to constructively oversee ministries and hold them accountable in terms of policy development, implementation and monitoring. And finally, the strategy chapter mentions activities that support the representational functions of parliament and the development of capacity in the administration of parliament.

The project derives from 11 priority areas earlier identified by the Liaison and Coordination Committee, and based on those priorities five outputs were developed for inclusion in the Project Document:

- I. Improved legislative and policy analysis capacity by reinforcing the committee system, greater stakeholder involvement through the inclusion of civil society actors and public outreach strategy

- II. Strengthened institutional knowledge base and analytical capacity relating to rule of law issues including constitutional reform, electoral management reform, anti-corruption, human rights, gender mainstreaming and gender budgeting
- III. Strengthened institutional knowledge base and analytical capacity on economic and development issues, in particular economic literacy, budget analysis, the international aid architecture, poverty assessments and MDGs, gender and sector-specific areas such as agriculture, mining, and other economic areas
- IV. Improved knowledge and practice of good conduct by MPs on the basis of principles, ethics, public service, national interest, consensus building and reconciliation, and prevention of conflict of interest
- V. Improved administration of Parliament in support of legislative analysis and oversight functions including coordination of capacity building initiatives

Although valuable in themselves, the evaluation team considers these five outputs broad and perhaps too ambitious for the time-frame of a two year project. Outputs defined in a more targeted way, in view of the time available in 2010 and 2011, might have been more realistic. This is particularly the case in view of the fact that the actual implementation period was only about 20 months.

The strategy chapter also outlines the specific strategy for capacity-building which the project would employ. It is said that the project will re-examine the workshop approach and adopt new methods such as training modules and courses that take place on a regularly scheduled basis to ensure knowledge is transferred and applied in the daily business of MPs. It was envisaged that in-house training capacity would be built through the 'training of trainers' approach as prepared by the administration of parliament.

The review of the actual implementation of the project as described in this report indicates that a more traditional workshop approach was used. In a politically charged context and without having all project human resources on board, developing and implementing new methodologies is all the more challenging yet equally necessary. Nevertheless, with concerted effort it might have been possible to schedule proper validation processes for the baseline surveys, followed by the development of training modules based on the findings of the surveys.

3. Project baselines

In order to be able to deliver quality project implementation which corresponds to the project outputs, a project needs a good understanding of the baseline of the strengths and weaknesses of the beneficiaries . The project baselines are mentioned within the Project Document's Results and Resources Framework:

- Perceived asymmetry between Parliament and the Executive [*could have been much clearer and measurable baseline*]
- An enlarged parliament after the March 2008 General Elections that needs capacity [*quantification could have been done*]
- Increased women MPs in both the Senate and House of Assembly that need capacity [*this is rather general*]
- Increased number of portfolio committees that need capacity
- Administration of parliament that needs capacity and equipment

In the view of the evaluation team, the baseline analysis is inadequate. Baselines could have been put in a more specific manner which would help in measuring progress during project implementation review. Some of the challenges faced by the evaluators were due to the absence of specific baselines and

indicators against which measurable and results oriented progress could be reviewed. Future project design should use specific percentages or numbers in the baselines.

In the absence of a proper baseline assessment of the functioning of parliament, the project included 5 baseline surveys to be conducted at the beginning of the project with the intention of having the survey results inform the main training activities. As described further in this report, the delays in the printing and distribution of the baseline surveys undermined that approach. The analysis on the functioning of parliament in the 2008 evaluation report of the first phase of the multi-donor support program has become the baseline analysis for the second phase of the project.

4. Indicators and annual targets

The Results and Resources Framework (RRF) is a comprehensive overview matrix, outlining the intended outputs, targets for the two project years, indicative activities and responsible parties – as per the UNDP standard format.

Each of the five outputs has a set of indicators and annual targets. Although most indicators are clear, not all of them are easily measurable. For instance, one of the indicators reads “improved quality of reports” (output 5) and “functional national healing strategy” (output 4). [the latter one does not fit well into this project, since there is in the country a healing process driven by the Executive, under the Office of the President and the Cabinet.] Other indicators do not look very realistic, such as “reduction of the number of corruption cases brought to the House” (after one planned training in anti-corruption principles and practices). However, the overall indicators and annual targets are quantitative and clear, indicating e.g. the number of staff persons trained. Although the Project Document did not provide information on the mechanisms for collecting the quantitative data from the activities, the reports indicate that the project did succeed in providing the number of participants in various trainings, as outlined in the Project Document.

The evaluation team noted that although the indicators were quantitative as they related to participation in project activities (e.g. the number of MPs trained or sensitized, the number of Committees and trainers capacitated), they were silent on issues relating to parliamentary performance (e.g. the number of public hearings, number of timely responses made by cabinet ministers to MPs inquiries, number of portfolio committee meetings held). Even with such data, it remains difficult to precisely measure the impact of the activities on the performance of parliament.

5. Project activity description

A narrative paragraph describing each of the project activities is a part of most UNDP parliamentary project documents. The current Project Document only has a Results and Resources Framework, which provides some information, but not sufficient to enable the reader to have a correct and full understanding of the different activities under each of the five outcomes. Most UNDP parliamentary project documents also have an implementation plan annexed to the Project Document. This needs to probably be taken on board for the next project phase.

6. Assumptions and risks

Assumptions and risks are well described in the Project Document. Four assumptions are mentioned explicitly:

- That the stable political environment prevails until the end of the project

- That the constitutional outreach program is concluded by July 30, 2010
- That funding is made available throughout the duration of the project
- That the currency stability prevails throughout the project period

Of these four assumptions, the first and the last have worked out in favor of the project. The second and the third assumption reveal the weaknesses of the project: lack of availability of MPs on specific occasions since the constitutional drafting process had not been concluded; and difficulties encountered in the timely availability and predictability of funding.

The risk log in the annex to the Project Document gives an overview of some of the anticipated risks and counter measures, as well as the marks (between very low and very high, or between 1 and 5) for the likelihood and the impact of each of the risks, as considered at the time of the start of the project. One of the risks mentioned, i.e. “resistance by the executive and government ministries to parliamentary oversight”, seemed to have been an issue during project implementation. The Committee chairpersons managed to overcome this challenge to a considerable extent (e.g. on the budget review process or on accuracy of secondary legislation) and thus diminished this risk, [rather than the stated “owner” of this risk, which is the Steering Committee.]

7. Cross-cutting issues

The Project Document’s Strategy section recognizes the importance of cross-cutting issues, especially gender mainstreaming and empowerment. Building on the experience of gender budgeting training and other capacity building of the Women’s Caucus in the first phase of the project, the Project Document for the second phase mentioned the importance of all MPs’ understanding of gender issues, as well as commitments arising from Zimbabwe’s signature to the SADC gender protocol.

Other cross-cutting issues often mentioned in UNDP parliamentary projects are promoting parliament interaction with civil society and good governance policy (e.g. interface between electoral cycle and parliamentary cycle). Interaction with civil society was present throughout the project implementation, but the role of the CSOs in the project implementation was not explicitly spelled out. This requires attention in the narrative of the Project Document for the next phase.

8. Management arrangements

The management arrangements in the Project Document are built on the effective functioning of the Steering Committee, Project Board and the recruitment of a Chief Technical Advisor (CTA) and project coordinator. The chapter on “Project Management” in this evaluation report will discuss in more detail how these provisions have worked out in practice during the project implementation period.

The project design for the management arrangements is in line with standard practice of UNDP parliamentary projects. In some countries, the Steering Committee includes members of parliament from different parties, often chairpersons of committees as direct beneficiaries of the project. This has not been the case in the management arrangements of the Project Document. However, in the Strategy Section of the Project Document, a “multi-party committee overseeing the program” was mentioned as a possibility. However, this possibility does not seem to have received further consideration.

The section on monitoring, evaluation and reporting is generally good. It outlines the quarterly progress reports, annual reports and risk log, which have all been implemented. However, the Project Document also mentions a semi-annual quality assessment on progress towards the completion of key results, a “Lessons Learned” log to be regularly updated to ensure on-going learning and adaptation within the

organization. The latter have not been achieved. The application of these instruments could have helped to facilitate internal project evaluation and quality review, beyond the annual review by the Steering Committee or an end-of-project external evaluation.

9. Budget

The Project Document mentions a total budget of 2,175,885 USD for the project. The EC and some bilateral donors are mentioned on the front page of the Project Document, but without specific amounts. This is an omission discussed in the chapter on 'Project Management'. Most UNDP Project Documents of parliamentary projects in other countries also indicate a specific monetized in-kind contribution by parliament, along-side providing working space for the project staff. This further demonstrates national ownership and enhances the possibilities for sustainability.

10. Sustainability

Best practice in project design requires a discussion on the issue of the project's exit-strategy, at the end of the project, and how the sustainability of project results will be assured. Although a sustainability policy is not explicitly discussed in the Project Document, the multi-donor rolling parliamentary program is a parliament-driven project and therefore has the potential to design a credible sustainability policy for a future phase of the project. A key factor to enhance sustainability is the establishment of proper structures and procedures covering the issues which are addressed through the project activities as based upon the baselines and needs assessment. As outlined in this evaluation report, the project could – according to the evaluation team – have focused more on structures and procedures to ensure the sustainability of the project achievements. We found this to be an unfortunate omission in the project design.

Conclusion on project design

In conclusion, the evaluation of the project design is generally positive. Despite gaps mentioned above, the Project Document is fairly comprehensive and it addresses the main project planning components in a professional way.

IV. Project Implementation

As mentioned above, the project has five main project outcomes: (1.) improved legislative and policy analysis; (2.) Strengthened institutional knowledge and analytical capacity on government issues; (3.) Strengthened institutional knowledge base and analytical capacity in economics and development issues; (4.) Improved transparency and accountability of MPs; and (5.) Improved support services to parliament. Under each outcome, we provide a description of the initiatives taken followed by an evaluation commentary and the evaluation chart.

In analyzing the information available on each of the project outcomes, the evaluation team noted that the parliament's progress reports mentioned project activities under different project outcomes as compared to those in the Project Document. The parliament's quarterly and annual project progress reports were of uneven quality, and not always consistent with the quarterly and annual work plans. The evaluation team nevertheless managed to have a fairly good understanding of what each project outcome had achieved, as outlined in the following pages. Suggestions for a future project design have been included as well.

The evaluation of the implementation of the project outcomes is based on four criteria: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and impact/sustainability:

- Relevance: Evaluating to what extent the project addressed the existing and changing needs of Parliament and how well the project displayed a coherent set of activities.
- Efficiency: Evaluating to what extent the project inputs delivered the desired outputs in an efficient way, with minimum waste of time, human, financial and other material resources.
- Effectiveness: Evaluating how much the project outputs influenced the institutional capacity of Parliament to become a more democratic, functional, accountable and inclusive institution.
- Impact/Sustainability: Evaluating to what extent the results of the project will last, in the short run (impact) and long run (sustainability), with focus on structures, strategies and national ownership.

At the end of each outcome section, a rating for each of these criteria between "low" and "very high" has been given, for all activities within the specific outcome.² A mark "low" means that the set of activities under that output did not meet the requirements in terms of one of the four criteria (relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and impact/sustainability). A mark "medium" means that the set of activities under that output only partially met the requirements in terms of the stated criteria. A mark "high" means that the set of activities under that output fully met the requirements in terms of the criteria reviewed. A mark "very high" means that the set of activities under that output exceeded the requirements for the stated criteria (relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and impact/sustainability).³

² Further explanation on the methodology of the rating can be found in the introduction chapter of this report. See also the document "Norms for Evaluation in the UN System", as prepared by the United Nations Evaluation Group: http://www.uneval.org/papersandpubs/documentdetail.jsp?doc_id=21

³ An example of the ratings given for each of the evaluation criteria to parliamentary evaluation projects, can be found at: MURPHY, Jonathan, *Strengthening Effectiveness and Transparency of the Parliament of Georgia - Project Evaluation and Formulation*, London / Tbilisi, August 2008, 32 pp.

Outcome 1: Improved legislative and policy analysis

1.1. List of main activities

- Baseline assessment on legislative capacity of MPs
- Trainings on legislative and policy analysis
- Capacity building for Mines and Energy Committee
- Capacity Building for Environment, Tourism and Natural Resources Committee

1.2. Evaluation Commentary

Following the signing of the GPA in 2008 and throughout the tenure of this parliament, committees have managed to thoroughly discuss proposed legislation and approve changes to the legislation. Because no political party has an absolute majority following the 2008 elections, it has become more difficult to fast-track legislation or to suspend parliamentary rules, as was the case before.

The evaluation team was informed that the legislative analysis capacity of the MPs has improved. It noted that parliamentary debates are increasingly based upon facts. A series of constructive debates on topic issues during the Prime Minister's Question Time have taken place. New legal provisions have been put in place to strengthen the role of the portfolio committees in monitoring budget implementation by scrutinizing monthly and quarterly reports submitted by ministers. These substantive improvements can, in part, be attributed to the capacity enhancement activities initiated by the project.

The enhancement of MPs' analytical skills, based upon the project's capacity building efforts, further informed the discussions and enactment of, for instance, the Reserve Bank Amendment Act in 2010. This Act regulates the central bank and draws parameters between the bank and the Ministry of Finance. Legislative and policy analytical skills underpinned the debate (May 2011) on the loan extended to Zimbabwe by the People's Republic of China to construct the Zimbabwe Army Staff College. Before passing the motion on the loan, Parliament demanded to know the terms of the loan and its effects. This was the first time that such scrutiny was applied to an international loan agreement.

Although most laws are proposed by the executive, a couple of laws have been introduced by MPs, through the so-called private member bills. The most significant one is the bill requiring the repeal of Public Order and Security Act (POSA), although this bill has not been passed into law yet. During the last years, the parliamentary Legal Committee scrutinized the secondary legislation issued by ministries. When a Minister issues secondary legislation which goes against the primary legislation adopted by the House, this Committee, as well as other Committees, has on occasions issued "adversary decisions". It is the general view of the evaluation team that the level of competence, effectiveness and efficiency of parliamentarians in debating and passing legislation as well as in exercising their oversight function has improved considerably over the period of the GPA.

Through a series of workshops and by supporting the organization of public hearings, the UNDP parliamentary support project has contributed to the enhanced role of parliamentarians in the legislative process. The workshops on policy and legislative analysis involved lectures, text analysis and simulations. They were greatly appreciated by all committee chairpersons whom the evaluation team interviewed. The evaluators were however cautioned that some of the workshops faced a lack of participation by MPs due to the MPs intensive participation in the constitution making process. Public hearings, supported by the project, were carried out by the portfolio Committee on Justice in relation to the Human Rights Commission Bill. It was expected that the workshops on legislative and policy analysis would be informed

by the baseline assessment on the legislative capacity of MPs. However, the baseline survey which was completed in March 2011 has not yet been published and its contents were not shared in advance with the experts conducting the workshops, as mentioned to the evaluation team by those experts. This means that the findings of the baseline surveys were not incorporated in the training materials used in the workshops. The evaluation team did not receive a clear-cut answer from the Project Coordinator as to why the results of the baseline surveys were not made available to the experts and participants and why there was a delay in their publication.

The report on the legislative capacity of MPs is of good quality. With a view to assess MPs' knowledge regarding issues such as constitutional interpretation and general legislative analysis, the study reviewed relevant legal documents, reports and other local and international regulatory frameworks, instruments, charters and protocols. The study analyzed data from a comprehensive questionnaire specifically developed to provide baseline information on MPs' knowledge of various aspects of their legislative function. The study benchmarked the findings against international best practices in the context of legislative analysis. Finally, the report detailed recommendations for further training on constitutional interpretation and analysis, legislative analysis processes, formulation of laws and on international agreements and protocols.

While a summary of the baseline studies was presented at the LCC meeting in February 2012, the project design clearly indicated that one of the main objectives of the baseline surveys was to inform the training workshops for MPs. The evaluation team also learned from the chairpersons of Committees that they had not yet received copies of the baseline surveys. In view of the fact that the current term of parliament is coming to an end soon, the protracted process in publishing the surveys also constitutes a missed opportunity for the committees to review and improve the quality of their own functioning based upon the findings of the baseline surveys. However, the baseline surveys could still be useful for the next term of parliament, particularly with regard to the induction programme for newly elected MPs.

The evaluation team recognized that, in the workshops for the Mines and Energy Committee and the Environment, Tourism and Natural Resources Committee, the project had managed to bring on board specialized technical expertise on the topics of mining, environmental management and public law. This was appreciated by the Committee chairpersons who indicated the need for further technical support to their committee.

Despite the above mentioned improvements, the legislative process in Zimbabwe is still characterized by various weaknesses and flaws. The evaluation team identified a number of structures and strategies which could strengthen the legislative and policy analysis capacity of parliament and which the project did not address. Following are six issues which the project might tackle in the next phase.

- (i) A "Legislative Tracking Mechanism" to identify the state of affairs of all pending legislation.
- (ii) A parliamentary mechanism for tracking the implementation of legislation.
- (iii) Systematic follow-up by parliamentary committees on legislation in their own policy areas.
- (iv) Parliament guidelines for legislative drafting.
- (v) Parliament has already issued guidelines for conducting public hearings (2004), although the document needs a review and requires more detailed guidance.
- (vi) While most draft laws are introduced by the government, the financial, economic or environmental impact assessments of draft laws are often incomplete or sometimes non-existent.

1.3. Evaluation Chart

- **Relevance:** The training on legislative and policy analysis addressed the needs of parliament, with particular reference to the post-GPA period. The training as well as the policy support provided to the two portfolio committees responded to the increased demands for parliament’s policy input. The relevance of the UNDP project activities in 2010 and 2011 under this outcome is thus considered “very high”.
- **Efficiency:** This project component has been run in an efficient way, except for the review of the baseline surveys on legislative capacity of MPs. The non-distribution of the surveys to MPs, trainers and experts who conducted the workshops is a substantial omission and gap in the implementation of the project. There would have been value addition if the surveys were also subjected to validation by e.g. a selected group of MPs, legal experts within and outside government, including academics. Validation of commissioned expert studies is a standard form of quality assurance for UNDP and many other organizations. It does not diminish the in-house expertise that exists. The efficiency under this output is considered “medium”.
- **Effectiveness:** The effectiveness of the project activities is considered “high”, taking into account the facts-based parliamentary debates, the review and amendments to legislation and the input generated through public hearings, organized with the support of the project. Such public hearings, were used by the portfolio Committee on Justice in relation to the Human Rights Commission Bill.
- **The impact and sustainability of project activities under this outcome is “medium”.** The sustainability would have been better secured if consideration was given to a number of structures and strategies to strengthen the legislative and policy analysis capacity of parliament, such as for instance guidelines for legislative drafting and a legislative tracking mechanism. The high demand for technical assistance and training indicates that the activities are built on national ownership.

EVALUATION OUTCOME 1	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	VERY HIGH
Relevance				X
Efficiency		X		
Effectiveness			X	
Impact / Sustainability		X		

Outcome 2: Strengthened institutional knowledge and analytical capacity on government issues

2.1. List of main activities

- Baseline assessment on MP capacity on human rights and rule of law
- Oversight capacity training of the thematic Committee on Human Rights and Rule of law
- Training of MPs on ratification and domestication of international human rights instruments
- Workshops on parliamentary diplomacy and representation abroad
- Sensitization on MDGs for MPs
- Development of public outreach strategy
- Media workshops on role and functions of parliament
- Outreach activities to schools

2.2. Evaluation Commentary

As basis for the project's activities in this area, a baseline survey on the capacity of MPs in human rights and rule of law was commissioned. A large number of the international human rights instruments ratified by Zimbabwe under the African Union and U.N. human rights systems were reviewed. A questionnaire among MPs, with a response rate of 39%, revealed that MPs face chronic challenges in appreciating domestication – a process that is utilized to make international treaties part of Zimbabwe law – and that knowledge of international law and human rights instruments on the part of the generality of MPs was either very rudimentary or non-existent.

While the questionnaire was to the point and the analysis useful, the consultant's recommendations are very general. The Baseline Survey report refers to the need for training, propose a joint committee on human rights and rule of law (from both Houses), and recommends the linking of the Parliament of Zimbabwe to regional parliaments such as the SADC Parliamentary Forum and the Pan-African Parliament (which is already the case). The Baseline Survey recommendations could have been more focused, for instance outlining a calendar of human rights reporting obligations and human rights review mechanisms which the Committee can follow-up in its interaction with the government. Recommendations could have further included information platforms and cooperation channels on human rights which the Committee could access, as well as proposals for cooperation with various UN agencies present in Zimbabwe which are working on human rights issues. A quality review by the project, by parliament leadership and/or UNDP could have substantially upgraded this baseline survey, a key project output. As noted earlier, validation of commissioned expert studies is a standard form of quality assurance for UNDP and many other organizations.

The project strengthened the capacities of over 80 MPs on the ratification and domestication of international human rights instruments and supported the workshops on parliamentary diplomacy and representation abroad. The evaluation team received many positive comments on these capacity building initiatives for the MPs.

Prior to 2008, parliament passed international instruments and protocols with very little informed debate. By contrast, at the close of the project, there were serious debates on a number of instruments, including on the non-ratification of key human rights instruments such as the International Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. This parliamentary debate in December 2011 was partly as a result of the training provided under the project to MPs on ratification and

domestication of human rights instruments, thus raising awareness amongst parliamentarians on human rights.

The project also organized three workshops on diplomatic skills. These proved to be very useful, in particular for MPs with no prior international experience. Following the agreement on inclusive governance, MPs from opposing parties were often faced with antagonistic positions and behavior. The UNDP-sponsored workshops helped to partly overcome these party-based antagonisms in an effort to develop a national approach in representation abroad. The workshops and the joint multi-party participation in conferences abroad helped in conflict resolution and facilitated an improvement in relationships between MPs.

The evaluation team interviewed some of the key resource persons and experts for these workshops and learned from them that, prior to the start of the workshops, the experts had no insight into the level of knowledge of their audience. Baseline studies, preliminary findings or any other information on the knowledge level of the MPs at the time were not shared with the experts. In most cases the project had not initiated any preliminary contact with the experts to discuss the design of the workshop. The experts mentioned that any information on the UNDP parliamentary project would have greatly enhanced their capacity to conceptualize better the workshops in advance.

In the view of the experts interviewed by the evaluation team, the workshops functioned as an eye opener for MPs on their oversight role over the government. The MPs were not aware of the powers they already had. However, the experts noted that the willingness of some of the Ministries to submit to parliamentary oversight “is close to zero”. It was thus recommended that a future parliamentary project should also work with the executive to sensitize ministers on their accountability to parliament.

The parliament administration’s External Relations Directorate provides briefings to MPs prior to their departure for international meetings. Resolutions adopted at international parliamentary conferences are sent to the relevant authorities. However, the evaluation team learned that the House Committee on Foreign Affairs had so far had few, if any, contact, with the External Relations Directorate. No briefing by the External Relations Directorate to the Foreign Affairs Committees on Zimbabwe’s inter-parliamentary activities has yet taken place. While the Committee on Foreign Affairs carries out oversight on the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, a basic working contact with the Directorate of External Relations would be useful, as is the case in many other parliaments.

One of the experts interviewed by the evaluation team cited the very diverse background of the MPs, some of whom struggled with basic writing skills. The expert stressed the need for extensive training and formation workshops, beyond an induction program at the start of the parliament mandate and throughout the whole tenure of parliament.

In 2012, the Senate thematic Committee on MDGs tabled a factual report on the attainment and status of MDGs in Zimbabwe and its recommendations were considered by government. This happened as a direct result of the project exposing MPs to the MDGs, their current status in Zimbabwe and the roles Parliament can play in keeping Government accountable for attaining the goals, as facilitated by the parliamentary project in collaboration with UNDP MDG program in 2011.

Under this Outcome, the project organized a number of activities to enhance parliament’s outreach and media relations. More than 50 parliament staff and media representatives participated in a workshop on the roles and functions of parliament. Upon inquiry by the evaluators, the media representatives stated that the workshop was very useful but that their knowledge of parliamentary procedures and activities still remains very weak. They mainly learned through peer-coaching and from information provided by colleagues. They expressed their interest to cover parliamentary events outside of the capital, but were

restrained from doing so due to transport difficulties. The media representatives mentioned that parliament staff did not allow them to join the bus organized for MPs, while the Secretariat stated that Parliament has always allowed journalists to travel in Parliament buses provided that journalists would have sought prior approval and have been indemnified. The evaluation team advises more flexibility to enable journalists to join the parliament's bus to events outside of the capital, or for parliament to organize alternative transport, since that would enhance media coverage of parliament's activities.

The media representatives interviewed by the evaluation team outlined a number of additional suggestions for a future project, such as the provision of a press room equipped with desk tops for journalists to use when reporting from parliament; public broadcaster and radio to cover sessions of parliament more regularly, use of social media by parliament, and publishing parliament updates in weekend newspapers. The evaluation team considers that these proposals can help to implement parliament's Public Outreach Strategy.

The evaluation team has received a copy of the new Public Outreach Strategy of parliament. The document, developed with the support of the project, gives an insight into the "Outreach Strategic Framework", the objectives and strategies of the outreach program and the outreach methodology. To become an operational document, additional information on the individuals who will be responsible for implementation of specific sections of the strategy and within which timeframe would be required.

Finally, under this outcome the project supported parliamentary staff and MPs to go out and meet the public. Visits were made to schools with the objective to raise awareness on the role of Parliament in Zimbabwe. These outreach efforts highlighted the fact that a majority of the people, especially in the rural areas, are not aware of the role of Parliament. Subsequently, the project initiated the process of taking parliament to the public, which is recommended to be further scaled up in future interventions.

The evaluation team noted that the Parliament "Open House" as envisaged in the Project Document, did not take place. The 2010 Work Plan also included the training of CSOs on how best to engage parliament in legislative processes; but the evaluation team did not find any evidence that this activity was implemented.

2.3. Evaluation Chart

- **Relevance:** The training of MPs on ratification and domestication of international human rights instruments and the workshops on parliamentary diplomacy and representation abroad addressed real needs of parliament, in particular in the post-GPA period. The media workshops and the development of a public outreach strategy responded to the need for parliament to become more visible and its activities known to the public. The relevance of the UNDP project activities in 2010 and 2011 under this outcome is "very high".
- **Efficiency:** This project component has been run in an efficient way, except for the baseline survey on MPs' capacity on human rights and rule of law. The non-distribution of baseline survey results to MPs, trainers and experts who conducted the workshops is a substantial omission and gap in the implementation of the project. Taking into account the other activities under this outcome, the overall efficiency is considered "high".
- **Effectiveness:** The effectiveness of the project activities is considered "medium". The debates on why certain conventions were not yet brought to parliament for ratification is a first but yet insufficient step towards actual ratification and domestication of the international human rights standards. Parliament's cooperation with media representatives and parliament's outreach can be further enhanced.

- The impact and sustainability of activities under this outcome is “medium”. The sustainability would be better secured if the baseline study and other project activities had considered structures and strategies on human rights, such as a calendar of human rights reporting obligations, human rights review mechanisms for the Committee to follow-up, information platforms and cooperation channels on human rights, etc. In order to become operational, the Public Outreach strategy needs information on implementation mechanisms and timelines.

<i>EVALUATION OUTCOME 2</i>	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	VERY HIGH
Relevance				X
Efficiency			X	
Effectiveness		X		
Impact / Sustainability		X		

Outcome 3: Strengthened Institutional knowledge base and analytical capacity in economics and development issues

3.1. List of main activities

- Baseline assessment on MP capacity in economic literacy
- Baseline assessment on sector specific Committees
- Capacity Building for the Budget, Finance and Investment Committee
- Pre-budget and post-budget seminars for MPs, staff and stakeholders
- Support fact finding and public hearing by Committee on Gender and Development
- Portfolio and thematic committees trained in gender mainstreaming
- Support to Women Caucus

3.2. Evaluation Commentary

As basis for project activities under this outcome, a baseline survey on economic literacy for the Zimbabwe Parliament was commissioned. The survey assessed the levels of appreciation of economic issues among MPs of both Houses. The study analyzed the MPs' level of knowledge of the following issues: the economic system; factors of production in the economy; role of government in the economy; concept of state budget and budget analysis; evaluating public expenditure and expenditure priorities; public debt; role of parliament in public finance management; gender budgeting; and the budgeting process.

The results from the survey indicate that Members of both Houses showed significant deficiencies in their knowledge and awareness of basic economic concepts. The survey also identified issues to be covered in subsequent training programs and recommended on-the-job training to take MPs through the budget analysis process. The survey recommended that basic economic training be conducted in collaboration with universities, and that parliament should expedite the establishment of a well-equipped Budget Office. The evaluation team considers the economic literacy survey as comprehensive and detailed, based on a sound methodology and with a comprehensive set of conclusions and recommendations. The team believes that this baseline survey will remain valuable and relevant to inform capacity building for MPs in future and, therefore, the survey results should be incorporated in the next project document.

Another baseline survey was conducted to establish sector-specific, capacity-building needs of the Parliamentary Committees. The Survey revealed that the operating economic environment adversely affected the work of Committees as Parliament could not provide adequate financial support required by Committees to effectively carry out their legislative, oversight and representative functions. As a result, some of the Committees could not fully execute their planned activities such as field visits, public hearings and capacity-building workshops. Many Committees were unable to go out and assess the progress of Government programs on the ground. Planning and management of Committee work and, in particular, parliamentary procedures that relate to the operations of committees are areas in which committees require heightened skills and capacity. The baseline survey indicated the need to develop focused committee work plans, to clarify the committees' Terms of Reference and to produce simplified manuals and guidelines on key subjects within the scope of responsibility of the committees.

The evaluation team interviewed the Zimbabwe Economic Policy Research Institute, which was the author of the baseline survey on economic literacy. The evaluation team learned that the draft report was submitted to parliament in January 2011 and was finalized shortly after having received feed-back from

parliament. The Zimbabwe Economic Policy Research Institute was not part of the capacity building workshops for MPs and did not have any contact with the experts providing those workshops as this was not part of the terms of reference. The committee chairpersons interviewed by the evaluation team informed the team that they had not yet received a copy of the survey report.

The project's workshops on economic literacy and budgeting were directed towards the Budget and Finance Committee and the Public Accounts Committee. As a result, there has been a noticeable shift in parliamentary practice. While in the past the draft budget was for the most part rubberstamped, now it is reviewed in depth by the Committee on Budget and Finance, through pre-budget meetings and public hearings. In 2010 there were hearings in five venues. In 2011 hearings took place nation-wide. The Committee on Budget and Finance is very assertive and did not allow ministers to get away with non-attendance or non-responsiveness. Parliament estimated that 80 % of this improvement was attributable to the project and 20 % to the growing experience and own knowledge of MPs. The project supported post-budget analysis, in which experts unpacked the budget and helped MPs prepare debates. In the end, the workshops have contributed to better informed debate in Parliament on budget matters, as well as a more competency and inclusive decision making process, which is the ultimate objective of the project under this outcome.

Committee chairpersons and the clerk of parliament confirmed that a Budget Office would be the most appropriate instrument to secure budget expertise for MPs. A concept note for an in-house parliamentary budget office is currently being considered. The Clerk of Parliament led a parliamentary delegation to the South African parliament to get some appreciation and ideas of how a Budget Office in Zimbabwe could be structured and made to function. It is suggested that the Budget Office would work primarily for the Budget and Finance Committee and the Public Accounts Committee but would also be open to requests from other committees. It would furnish the other committees with knowledge of financial and budgetary processes that could then be used when discussing the national budget with the ministries they oversee.

The Budget Office would be established in terms of section 48 of the Constitution, become the technically competent resource center within parliament and would provide an interface between Parliament, the Ministry of Finance and other ministries. The evaluation team took note of an alternative, though not necessarily better, idea that the Ministry of Finance would fund a parliamentary Budget Office outside of the parliament administration structures. The evaluation team does not support this idea. Best practices indicate that the parliamentary Budget Office should be part of the parliament administration, staffed with highly qualified and well-remunerated professionals and be allowed to set its own agenda on a non-partisan basis. When designing the next phase of the parliamentary support project, support for the creation of a parliamentary Budget Office should be given high consideration. The sustainability of the initiative needs to be analyzed carefully, to avoid the possibility of making it totally or overly donor-dependent.

While project activities with the Committee on Budget and Finance and the Committee on Public Accounts have been conducted very professionally, the evaluation team feels that there is need to continue the efforts at strengthening the structures and procedures that exist in order to ensure sustainable capacity and competence of parliament in the area of public finance.. In terms of structures, the project could have provided more technical advice on developing a road map and timeline to create a Budget Office, to accelerate consultations with the government on the needed resources for this Office, to develop a sustainability concept for the Budget Office and to support a more pro-active role for the parliament library and Research Department on current issues in economic and budgetary developments. In terms of procedures, the project could have provided technical advice on how parliament provides follow-up to the

findings and reports of the Office of the Comptroller & Auditor-General (OCAG), taking into account that the Auditor-General is an Ex-Officio Member of the Public Accounts Committee.

Under this outcome, the project provided limited support to the Committee on Gender and Development and the Women Caucus in parliament. Since those initiatives were not part of the project design, limited resources were drawn from the project's budget. The support to the Women Caucus and Gender Committee was mainly provided through the Gender Equality and Women Empowerment Project, implemented by the Ministry of Women Affairs, Gender and Community Development (2008-2011).

In 2010, five MPs of the Caucus drawn from different political parties, including the chair, were supported to participate at an International Forum on the Role of Leadership and Women's Economic Power in Rwanda. The MPs observed that the Rwanda Women's Parliamentary Caucus had its own office and a coordinator, with initial assistance from UNDP and UN Women. Although the MPs were attracted to this idea, upon their return to Zimbabwe they did not submit a written proposal for implementation. In 2011, three women MPs were invited by the Ministry of Women Affairs, Gender and Community Development to a study tour to Uganda, Rwanda and South Africa with a view to draw lessons on effective national gender machineries and learn about the concept and practice of a "Women's Council". The UNDP Country Director and program analyst gave technical guidance and assisted in securing meetings with high level people in Rwanda and Uganda. Also in 2010, the Caucus was able to meet a mission of eminent African women leaders, led by H.E. Mary Robinson, former President of Ireland and former UN Human Rights Commissioner. In 2011 UNDP and UN Women supported the Caucus and the Ministry of Women on a position paper on gender equality and the constitution, suggesting clauses to be incorporated in the draft constitution.

The head of the Women Caucus told the evaluation team that she considered the Women Caucus a pressure group inside parliament, but independent of parliament, and that the Caucus should, therefore, get direct funding instead of getting it through the parliament administration. The evaluation team was also informed that the head of the Women Caucus advocates for project funding for an office outside of parliament, preferably at the University of Zimbabwe.

The evaluation team recommends that gender and women empowerment be more clearly defined and be included in the design of the next project phase. Adequate resources can be allocated through a specific budget line, to be accessible in an accountable way. In order to do so, the Women Caucus and the Gender Committee will need to develop a five-year strategy and outcome-oriented project document. The next project design can consider if it is feasible to reinforce the parliamentary project team with a gender person who can directly work with the Women Caucus, the Gender Committee and be in charge for all gender main streaming activities and reporting. Such a person could also forge effective linkages between the Women's Caucus and the Gender Committee on the one hand, and the Ministry of Women's Affairs, Gender and Community Development on the other.

3.3. Evaluation Chart

- **Relevance:** The training of MPs on economic literacy and the pre-budget and post-budget workshops addressed real needs of parliament, in particular when no single party had absolute majority and chances for budget scrutiny had thus increased. The relevance of the UNDP project activities in 2010 and 2011 under this outcome is "very high".
- **Efficiency:** Activities under this outcome have been run efficiently. The studies on economic literacy and Committee specific capacity needs are of high quality, although their non-distribution is a

substantial source of weakness in the project, as mentioned before. The overall efficiency of activities is considered “high”.

- Effectiveness: The effectiveness of the project activities is considered “high”. The thorough review of the budget under the leadership of the Committee on Budget and Finance has ensured that budget approval is no longer a “rubberstamp”. Public hearings have moved from an initial pilot phase of 5 hearings in 2010 to nation-wide public hearings in 2011.
- The impact and sustainability of activities under this outcome is “medium”. The sustainability would be better secured if structures and strategies on parliament’s role in economic development and budget review were put in place, such as a road-map and timeline for the creation of a Budget Office, including an agreement with the government on its financing, and established practice of follow-up to the findings of the Office of the Comptroller & Auditor-General (OCAG).

EVALUATION OUTCOME 3	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	VERY HIGH
Relevance				X
Efficiency			X	
Effectiveness			X	
Impact / Sustainability		X		

Outcome 4: Improved Transparency, Accountability of MPs

4.1. List of main activities

- Draft Code of Conduct for MPs prepared
- Up-date Constituency Information Profile Database
- Conduct PCIC outreach – verification of assets
- Develop new concept for PCICs

4.2. Evaluation Commentary

Under this outcome, a draft Code of Conduct calling upon MPs to declare their assets was developed and approved by the standing Rules and Orders Committee. Earlier, in 1982 a Code of Conduct was adopted but was never effectively or systematically implemented. It seems clear that the lack of political will accounts for the absence of effective implementation of the code of conduct and other accountability issues.

One area of work under this outcome was the interaction between MPs and their respective Parliamentary Constituency Information Centers (PCICs). Although the design of the 2009 Project Document did not elaborate in great detail on the PCICs, the project had limited though still substantial interface with the PCICs, through four particular initiatives:

- Updating the Constituency Profiles database
- PCIC field visits and asset verification
- Concept paper on the future of PCICs
- Management decision on training for Office Assistants

In view of the project's limited but important engagement with the PCICs on these four issues, the evaluation team felt it necessary to address the PCICs in this report. It also helped to assess the infrastructure framework in place to facilitate the MPs' role in carrying out their representation mandate.

The project provided support to the parliament in updating the "Constituency Information Profile Database", a tool designed by the Research Department with information on the state of affairs of the constituencies in terms of health services, education, local governance, infrastructure, development projects, etc. The constituency profiles are aimed at providing a resource for the MPs in their interaction with their electorates. Most of the profiles include detailed information for each ward within the constituency on subjects such as numbers of population distribution, primary school distribution, primary school enrolment, health centers distribution, water points distribution, cattle distribution, etc. The evaluation team reviewed the information included in the updated constituency profiles, and considers them to be of high quality and detailed in content.

The project assisted parliament in outreach to the PCICs in terms of verification of assets, and organized a series of field visits. The project has worked with the clerk of parliament in developing a new concept for the PCICs, based upon lessons learned from the functioning of the PCICs during the last ten years. However, the Concept Paper is still in its draft form.

In view of the project's ongoing, though limited, engagement with the PCICs and since UNDP is still very much identified with the support given at the time of the creation of the PCICs, the evaluation team felt it necessary to analyze the PCICs more closely.

The objective was to get a better appreciation of the PCICs' character and functions as they seem to have been designed as an integral part of the MPs' machinery in the performance of their functions. They seem

to have been mandated to play a critical role in the legislative, oversight and representation functions of Parliament as they provide a focal meeting point for the MP and her or his constituents.

It was for these reasons that the evaluators visited six PCICs to get a first hand view of their infrastructures, meet and discuss with office personnel as well as review materials available. The six PCICs represented offices of 2 MPs of ZANU-PF, 2 MPs of MDC-T and 2 MPs of MDC-N.

Although the PCICs visited were at different levels of development, the overall picture that emerged was that they remained relatively underdeveloped and ill-equipped to fully execute their prescribed mandate. None of them had a working computer or an e-mail address. Printers and fax machines were not working. Some of the Office Assistants (OAs) who run the PCICs indicated that they use their own laptops and personal e-mail addresses. Others had neither personal laptops nor e-mail addresses. They stated that they had reported their ICT problems to the PR Office in Parliament without the issues being resolved. Contact between the PCICs and the PCIC Desk in the PR Office in Parliament is rare or non-existent.

Five of the Offices visited by the evaluators operated from rented space and they were all in arrears with their rent. In two cases the arrears run to more than 4 and 6 years respectively. The sixth Office operated from an office donated by the MP but was situated in the city centre and outside the MP's rural constituency. Landline telephones were disconnected due to non-payment. All of the PCICs visited are also in arrears in the payment of their electricity and water bills.

It seems clear that the issue of permanent PCIC offices requires urgent attention as it has serious implications for sustainability. It is the evaluators' understanding that the issue is already under consideration and that a Concept Paper on PCICs has been developed in which there is a proposal to have Parliament/Government build permanent structures in each constituency. How soon this can be done given the current economic and financial constraints is yet another issue.

The evaluators' findings reveal that the process of recruiting the OAs was not uniform for all the PCICs visited. In four cases, the OAs were identified and chosen by their MPs and then referred to Parliament to formalize the recruitment process. Only in two cases of the six PCICs visited by the evaluation team was the process competitive in that the posts were advertised and the candidates were interviewed. In the evaluators' view the current practice of MPs identifying and selecting prospective OAs needs to be revisited if the objective of making the PCICs non-partisan is to be achieved.

In carrying out their responsibilities, all the OAs visited indicated that they did not have budgets to meet the costs of their functions. Some indicated that they use about 10% of their salaries on transport to visit their MP's constituents or to attend meetings deemed important to the MP. In some cases, OAs use council transport when it is available. This is a serious constraint as OAs are expected to be in frequent contact with the MP's constituents in order to keep the MP briefed and up-to-date with developments in her/his area. The lack of some budget means most OAs only sit in their respective offices and wait for members of the constituency to come to the office. It is no wonder that in one PCIC the OA informed us that she sees only 2 or 3 visitors per week. Most of the OAs expressed the view that the vast majority of people in the MP's constituency do not know of the existence and functions of the PCICs, hence only very few visit those offices. The OAs have no means of making known the existence and functions of PCICs to the constituents at large. This is an area that requires attention if the involvement and effective engagement of voters in parliamentary issues/developments is to be realized. Not only should OAs be enabled to visit the MP's constituents, but other means of broadcasting the existence and functions of PCICs should be used, including the public media (Radio, TV and the print media), workshops, road-shows, etc. Such information serves not only to cultivate awareness but also to empower the constituents who must hold their MPs accountable.

The Constituency Development Fund (CDF) is administered from the Ministry of Parliamentary and Constitutional Affairs and it did not yet exist at the time of the creation of the PCIC's. While the Parliament Secretariat states that it has no role in administering the Fund, most of the PCICs visited by the evaluation team reported some role in the distribution of the CDF and in tracking and keeping records of how they are used.

All the PCICs that were visited seem to be aware of how the CDF had been used. In at least three constituencies visited, the funds were divided equally among the councilors for use in their respective wards. In one constituency the total amount was used to build a public library although the funds were not enough to complete the building. The MP of the area later informed the evaluators that he was busy raising supplementary funds from the business community in his constituency and was confident that he would be able to meet the target. The OA in one PCIC informed the evaluators that a decision had been taken to build two schools and work to do so went ahead. However, one school was demolished by the military because it was deemed to be too close to their barracks. As a consequence, money that had already been spent was lost. The OA concerned was not aware of the sites of these schools as she had never visited them, yet the schools were built during her tenure. Four of the PCICs visited had detailed records of how the CDFs were used. Two did not have records they could share with the evaluators.

Record keeping in the PCIC is critical to the work of the MP. However, the findings were that the PCICs visited were not at the same level as far as keeping records was concerned. In one PCIC, the OA simply did not have any records (e.g. minutes of meetings, issues raised by those constituents who visited the office, breakdowns of how the CDF were distributed, etc.) to share. That OA also mentioned that she never got a copy of her contract. On the other hand the evaluators also visited a PCIC where the record-keeping system was very sound. The OA shared with the evaluators files on just about everything asked for.

The non-partisan nature of the PCICs remains a big area of concern. Besides the recruitment process mentioned earlier, there remains the question of which constituents from which party feel comfortable to use the PCICs. In one PCIC which is located in a community centre, the evaluators were informed that members of various parties (particularly MDC-T and ZANU/PF) frequent the office following their respective meetings at the centre to collect the Hansard, COPAC documents, etc. On the other hand, the OA at another PCIC expressed the view that her office only served people of her MP's party.

The issue relating to the security of office property (i.e. computers, fax machines, printers, staplers, desks, chairs, dust bins, etc.) is of concern. Some of the OAs indicated that some equipment was taken by the MPs or OAs who were there before them when the previous MPs had lost elections. They claimed that there was no effective method of tracking those who had walked away with property paid for using taxpayers money. In some of the offices, there were no Asset Registers. However, the PR Office in Parliament argued that all property had been accounted for. There seems to be a need to put a more reliable system in place to ensure the security of property in the PCICs, particularly soon after elections when there is likely to be a high turn-over of personnel (both political and staff) occasioned by electoral results.

Related to the issue of high turn-over following parliamentary elections is the question of security of tenure for the OAs. Because the current practice requires that they leave office when their MP loses elections, their job security is at great risk. This can compromise commitment and quality performance. In addition the practice does not seem to enhance efforts towards sustainability as it leads to a waste of institutional memory. The likelihood of a departing officer making comprehensive and effective hand-over to an in-coming officer from a rival political party is very slim. Hence the incoming officer will have to start all over again.

OAs in the PCICs seem to function without effective supervision. The “Office Assistant’s Manual” which has not been revised since it was issued in 2007 states “... the officer shall serve under the direct supervision of Parliament and the Members of Parliament.” In practice, however, the MP is rarely present as she/he spends a large part of her/his time in Harare. This is particularly so if the MP is also a Minister in the Government. The PCIC Desk Officer in Parliament is too removed to exercise any supervision. In any event there are so many PCICs across the country, separated by great distances, making it difficult for effective supervision to take place. The only “supervision” that may be said to take place is through monthly reports that the OAs are supposed to send to the PCIC Desk Office in the PR Office in Parliament. However, the evaluators also noted that such reports are not regularly made. In fact, one PCIC had not made any such reports. In essence, OAs seem to be functioning as their own masters.

The issue of supervision can be further complicated should the serving MP die in office, resigns or be dismissed. Under the current GPA which has been in existence since 2009, no by-election has been held to fill parliamentary seats left vacant by MPs who have died in office or have been dismissed by their parties. According to the Office of the Clerk of Parliament, there are currently 29 such vacant seats. This effectively means the Office Assistants in the *affected* PCICs continue to operate without supervision from an MP.

Finally, almost all the OAs visited by the evaluation team complained of the lack of induction and capacity-building workshops. They further complained of working in isolation with no contact with their counterparts in other PCICs and, therefore, did not have opportunities of exchanging ideas and experiences with their peers. They are left in a position of constantly “re-inventing the wheel” in addressing problems that they face. We noted, however, that in the meeting of 15 June 2011, the Management Committee, upon the request of the Clerk of Parliament, took a decision to defer all training programs for OAs until all MPs had PCICs in their respective constituencies. This perhaps explains the absence of training activities for the OAs. But it also effectively means that existing PCIC staff will not receive any training for a very long time to come.

Overall, the evaluation team is of the opinion that PCICs have the potential to play a critical role in ensuring the effectiveness and accountability of MPs to their constituencies, thereby anchoring the principles of democracy and representation. The evaluators consider that the current PCICs are still in an experimental stage and that so far a number of “lessons learned”, both positive and negative, have emerged. What is now required is for Parliament to take those lessons on board and enact relevant legislation and put in place appropriate administrative structures and systems to ensure that measures are taken to correct the mistakes of the past and introduce relevant mechanisms to ensure the political neutrality (non-partisan) of the PCICs and their effective performance.

4.3. Evaluation Chart

During its second phase, the project supported the PCICs by updating the “Constituency Information Profile Database”, assisting parliament in outreach to the PCICs in terms of verification of assets, and working with the clerk of parliament in developing a new concept for the PCICs. The project’s management committee decided on training for Office Assistants. In view of the project’s ongoing engagement with the PCICs on these four issues, the evaluation team felt it necessary to address the PCICs in this report.

- Relevance: The PCICs have an important potential role in ensuring the accountability of MPs to their constituency. Any support provided through the project, even if it is limited to up-dating the

Constituency Information Profile Database, supporting the verification of assets and developing a new and realistic concept for the PCICs, is highly relevant.

- **Efficiency:** The decision of the project Management Committee to defer all training programs for Office Assistants until all MPs have PCICs in their respective constituencies effectively means that existing PCIC staff will not receive any training for a very long time to come; this maintains a sense of isolation among the OAs, lack of capacity-building and, in fact, endangers earlier investments made by the previous project phase. On the other hand, the project’s contribution to PCICs through updating the constituency profiles database and supporting the asset verification by parliament was important. The overall efficiency of the project under this outcome is considered “medium”.
- **Effectiveness:** While the PCICs are an integral part of the MPs’ set of instruments to perform their functions and provide a focal meeting point for the MPs and their constituents, the PCICs are underdeveloped and inadequately equipped to fully execute their prescribed mandate. The overall effectiveness of the project’s support is “low”.
- The impact of project’s activities under this outcome and the sustainability of the PCICs, as of today, are also “low”. While the PCICs belong to parliament’s full ownership, the “lessons learned” can feed into a new concept for the PCICs. Cross-party consensus for a politically neutral and non-partisan functioning of the PCICs and the ability to generate the needed resources, in a mid-term financial perspective, will determine the ultimate sustainability of the PCICs.

EVALUATION OUTCOME 4	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	VERY HIGH
Relevance				X
Efficiency		X		
Effectiveness	X			
Impact / Sustainability	X			

Outcome 5: Improved Support Services to Parliament

5.1. List of main activities

- ISO certification planning, sensitization, training of internal auditors, visibility activities
- Training of Hansard reporters on the use of upgraded equipment
- Training of researchers and committee clerks on research and report writing
- Training of executive assistants & registry clerks on records management and information systems
- Training of executive assistants in electronic data management
- Training of front office staff in public relations and customer care
- Internet connection on fiber optic link
- Purchase of heavy duty printers, desk top computers and computer software
- Purchase of project motor vehicles, minibus and project office equipment

5.2. Evaluation Commentary

One of the main activities of the project under this outcome was the support to improve management processes in the Parliament of Zimbabwe through the ISO certification process. In 2010, parliament adopted the ISO 9001 (2008) certification process, and as a result the quality management systems of the administration have significantly improved. The administration has developed a “Quality Policy Manual” and a “Quality Policy Statement”. Six “Mandatory Procedures” have been documented and operationalized, with each department documenting its own operational procedures. “Service Level Agreements” have been signed with internal as well as external clients. Furthermore, a “Balanced Scorecard Performance Management System” has been adopted and is now operational for individual performance management. The administration of parliament passed the Standards Association of Zimbabwe first stage audit and is set to be fully certified in 2012.

The project has embarked on a wide set of training activities for the staff, in particular for Hansard reporters, researchers, committee clerks, executive assistants, registry clerks and front office staff. This training was found to be very useful in upgrading the performance of parliament. The need for additional, structured series of activities was identified in order for the capacity building to have a real impact. There is not yet a pool of trainers and knowledgeable staff to give training. Further efforts will be required before a “training of trainers” concept can work.

The Research Department produces regular background papers for committee meetings and conferences. However, the quality of the research reports continues to fall below minimum standards for publication. The Research Department is in need of a research strategy, outlining its objectives, methodology, partnerships, and human and financial resources. There is also need for research guidelines and result commitments. Should the position of the CTA be included in the next phase of the project, he or she can provide valuable guidance and implementation support to the research strategy. The parliament’s library lacks many contemporary books, magazines and e-journals. Currently, there are no statistics on the usage of the library by MPs, staff, other officials, students and other citizens. A future project can support the Information Services Directorate in improving the library services and resources.

The current project has given its support to the annual Presiding Officers’ (Speaker of the House, Deputy Speaker of the House, President of the Senate, Deputy President of the Senate and the panel of four chairpersons) retreat to review the Annual Work Plans and annual reports from each Department.

The capacity to implement the parliamentary support project was further enhanced by the purchase of a mini bus and three project vehicles. The upgrading of internet to optic fiber, and the purchase of desktop

and laptop computer equipment has also improved parliament's Information and Communication systems. The service provider to update the parliament's web site has been identified. USAID has financed the new audio-visual equipment in parliament: screens and microphones in the plenary hall and a new server room. It is clear that MPs need capacity building in the use of ICT as the MPs' computer literacy is low. Parliament has introduced the recording of committee meetings and would like to introduce electronic voting. Further training on this will also be required in future.

5.3. Evaluation Chart

- **Relevance:** The project's support to the ISO certification process addressed in a structural way the need for improved management in the Parliament of Zimbabwe. The training of Hansard reporters, researchers, committee clerks, executive assistants, registry clerks and front office staff addressed some of the real needs of parliament. The UNDP project activities in 2010 and 2011 under this outcome reflect a coherent set of activities. Their relevance is thus "very high".
- **Efficiency:** Activities under this outcome have been run efficiently. Training materials are available at the parliament library as hard copies. The project contributed to improved ICT infrastructure though there is need for further ICT training. The overall efficiency of activities is considered "high".
- **Effectiveness:** The effectiveness of the project activities is considered "high". Hansards of parliament proceedings of the day are available the next morning. The report writing and support by Committee clerks has somehow improved. The ISO certification process has mobilized staff and parliament management to improve management style and communication.
- **The impact and sustainability** under this outcome is uneven taking into account different activities. The ISO certification process provides the potential for the most sustainable result. Once certification has been confirmed, a sustainable result for this part of the project will be achieved. The sustainability of past staff training would be better secured if a "training of trainers" concept would be operationalized, as was foreseen by the project. The sustainability of the support to the Research Department would require a research strategy, research resources and research guidelines. The overall sustainability of activities under this outcome is therefore "medium".

EVALUATION OUTCOME 5	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	VERY HIGH
Relevance				X
Efficiency			X	
Effectiveness			X	
Impact / Sustainability		X		

V. Project Management

In this chapter, the management of the project throughout the project period will be evaluated. Particular attention will be given to the relationship with the donor, financial management and human resources, the role played by the management structures as foreseen in the Project Document and the project reporting. Following this analytical chapter, a separate section with recommendations will outline the proposed way forward for the management of a future phase of the parliamentary support project.

1. Cost-sharing agreement with the European Commission (EC)

In December 2007, the EC Delegation in Harare signed a cost-sharing agreement with UNDP to contribute 1,000,000 Euro to the multi-donor parliamentary program with an anticipated budget of six million US dollars. The EC contribution was to be implemented within 24 months, i.e. by December 2009. A first no-cost extension was requested by UNDP and approved in October 2008, bringing the end-date for implementation to 21 September 2010. A second no-cost extension was requested by UNDP in August 2010, suggesting October 2011 as the new end-date for implementation. By the time of the second no-cost extension request, the content of the project had changed, as compared to the December 2007 cost-sharing agreement between the EC and UNDP, and the multi-donor program had not managed to bring on board a number of bilateral donors expected to contribute through the UNDP Trust Fund.

Although the political changes in the country substantially affected the context in which the parliamentary project was to be executed, from a project management point of view the main reason why the EC funds were not put to use was the delay of 2,5 years for reaching an agreement between UNDP and the parliament on the content and the wording of the Project Document. While the contract between the EU and UNDP was signed in December 2007, the Project Document was not signed by UNDP and the parliament until in May 2010. The evaluation team considers that best practice in project management require both documents to be negotiated and signed around the same time.

Reasons for the delay in starting the project had to do with the presidential, parliamentary and local authorities elections calendar of March 2008 and the June 2008 re-run of the presidential elections, the GPA signed in September 2008 leading to an inclusive government, the time required to constitute the Committees and to bring the new parliament up to speed, and the parliamentarians' focus on the constitutional amendments arising from the GPA. In addition to the national political context which substantially contributed to the delayed start of the project, the evaluation team identified at least three other reasons.

The first reason, beyond the national political context, for the delayed start of the project was the protracted negotiations between UNDP and the parliament on the content of the parliamentary support program. Apparently, 18 versions of the Project Document were reviewed before UNDP and the parliament could agree to sign the document in May 2010. The evaluation team noted that there were often extensive time gaps between various key decision making meetings. For instance, the LPAC meeting took place on 7 October 2009, followed by a meeting with development partners on 22 February 2010, followed by the signature by UNDP and the parliament on 5 May 2010. The evaluation team was not given any compelling reasons as to why, for instance, there was a gap of more than 7 months between the meeting of the LPAC and the signing of the Project Document.

The second reason, beyond the national political context, for the delayed start of the project was the consultations with the bilateral donors. It appears that bilateral donors which were interested in contributing to the program first wanted more clarity on the content of the project before committing any funds, while the Parliament of Zimbabwe (POZ) first wanted to have a better view on funds

committed before making a final determination on the scope of the project. The evaluation team conducted meetings with the bilateral donors and learned that one of the reasons why some of them did not come on board had to do with doubts on the human resources at UNDP to manage such parliamentary program: since no CTA was recruited in the first phase of the project (2005-2007) and the project then suffered considerably from gaps in management, vision and accountability (as identified by the 2008 project evaluation), some bilateral donors were not convinced that UNDP had successfully addressed the question of its capacity for this project. Still hoping that more donors would come on board afterwards, in May 2010 the parliament and UNDP finally signed off on a Project Document with a budget of 2 million USD. Given the fact that the 2007 cost-sharing agreement between UNDP and the EC envisaged a six million USD project and that ultimately only 2 million USD was available from the EC contribution and the UNDP Trac Fund, the scope of the final project had to be 'trimmed down' to fit within the available resources.

The third reason, beyond the national political context, for the late start of the project was the delay in recruitment of the project's human resources. While it was anticipated from the beginning to have a team of three persons, i.e. the Chief Technical Advisor, the project coordinator and the project assistant / accountant, nobody was hired during 2009. The current project coordinator came on board in January 2010, replacing another coordinator who left parliament in 2008. If human resources for the project had come on board earlier, some capacity building activities for staff could have been organized during 2009. Although it took time for the MPs and parliamentary caucuses to constitute the committees, the window of opportunity to start providing staff training was lost. In the absence of a comprehensive Project Document, a limited MoU between UNDP and the parliament could have been agreed upon to kick-start a series of workshops for committee secretaries, researchers and other parliamentary staff, to be covered by the funds available from UNDP and the EC. This window of opportunity could have been used if a project coordinator was fully on board during 2009 and it might have triggered the expected commitment from bilateral donors, which had by now taken a "wait- and- see" approach.

As soon as the Project Document between UNDP and the parliament was signed in May 2010 and with the project coordinator on board, the first quarterly work plans were signed off and implementation of activities started. However, it appears that, although the 1 million Euro from the EC were the only secured funds, the program description attached to these funds in the December 2007 cost-sharing agreement between the EC and UNDP was not considered binding when drafting the second phase of the multi-donor rolling parliamentary program. The evaluation team has identified that the May 2010 Project Document differed from the December 2007 cost-sharing agreement and its 2008 Addendum (for the first no-cost extension) in a number of areas.

Firstly, the expected outputs and activities of the project were restructured. While the December 2007 cost-sharing agreement was structured around 4 main areas of activities (legislative process, representative role, executive oversight, parliament administration), the Project Document had a different design: legislative analysis; rule of law; economic literacy; code of conduct and conflict prevention; administration of parliament. The change in structure and also content of the program was a result of the long negotiations with the parliament and reflected the project logic considered most relevant in view of the changed political context.

Secondly, the project indicators were rewritten. While the Logical Framework Matrix of the initial EC documents mentioned mainly quantitative indicators on parliamentary performance (such as number of public hearings, number of timely responses made by cabinet ministers to MPs inquiries, number of portfolio committee meetings held), the Results and Resources Framework of the 2010 Project Document

included mainly indicators related to participation in project activities (such as the number of MPs trained or sensitized, the number of Committees and trainers capacitated). Although, in this way, the output of project activities is easier to measure, the impact on the parliament's performance becomes more difficult to assess.

Thirdly, the human resources to implement the project were adjusted as well. The position of a Chief Technical Advisor (CTA), as mentioned in the Addendum 1 of October 2010, was no longer included in the final version of the revised EC project description (revised annex I C) in 2011. For the EC the absence of a CTA was a major flow in the management of the project. [On the CTA, see section on project's human resources]

The 2011 revised EC project description document was drafted by UNDP, upon the request of the EC, to harmonize the EC documents with the 2009 Project Document, prior to the approval of the second no-cost extension in August 2011. When approving the second no-cost extension request, the EC thus incorporated the May 2010 Project Document into the contractual document binding the EC and UNDP.

The above information led the evaluation team to conclude that the two no-cost extensions for the EC funding implied more than a mere extension of the timeline for project implementation, but also included substantial adjustments to the project outputs, activities, indicators and project human resources; and thus go beyond the rules regulating no-cost extensions.

The evaluation team is aware that the approval of the second no-cost extension request and harmonization of documents were not a foregone conclusion. No-cost extensions are not approved by the Head of the EC Delegation but by the EC in Brussels. Despite reservations because of the above mentioned alterations in the content of the cost-sharing agreement and the extensive delays in starting the project implementation, the Head of the EC Delegation decided to recommend to Brussels the approval of the second no-cost extension request, as the EC wanted to demonstrate its support to the GPA and to the increased role for the parliament under the GPA.

UNDP requested the second no-cost extension on 4 August 2010. Following extensive consultations with Brussels and the provision of needed explanations, the EC Delegation in Harare was only in a position to reply positively on 18 May 2011. In retrospect, the EC took 9 months for the second extension request to be approved. However, the evaluation team believes that more regular communication between UNDP and the EC Delegation on the project and issuing invitations to the EC to participate in the Steering Committee meetings would have enabled the EC Delegation to provide explanations and justifications to Brussels more swiftly. The lack of such regular communication between UNDP and the EC on the parliamentary project contributed to the perception that the Project Document which UNDP and the parliament had signed in May 2010 was a 'fait accompli' for the EC, and that the EC Delegation may have financed a program which it had not entirely signed up to in the cost-sharing agreement.

2. Financial management of the project

The budget design and the financial management of the project were faced with a number of challenges. The evaluation team identified at least five.

The first challenge was the size of the project budget. As indicated earlier, the EC-UNDP cost-sharing agreement had been designed with a budget of 6 million USD. Since only the EC and UNDP provided funding, only 2 million USD were available; and the scope of the subsequent 2009 Project Document had to be 'trimmed down'. UNDP leadership explained that it is standard UNDP policy to develop an overall project based upon national priorities and all needs of the beneficiary, and then raise funds as the project

is being implemented. The alternative road of developing a project based upon the resources actually available, and then upgrade the project budget and the set of activities as new funds become available was not taken into consideration when signing the cost-sharing agreement. This alternative road would probably have been more realistic in terms of harmonizing the beneficiary expectations with the reality of limited resources.

The second challenge was the reluctance of bilateral donors to join the UNDP basket fund at the start of the second phase of the rolling multi-donor parliamentary program. During 2008, 2009 and 2010 there were consultations with representatives of UK, the Netherlands and Sweden. However none of them contributed to the funding of the second phase of the program. The evaluation team learned about the reasons why some bilateral donors did not want to contribute to a basket fund. One reason was related to prevailing international relations towards the Government of Zimbabwe to wait and see how the GPA implementation would unfold. Another reason was that some bilateral donors preferred to work through CSOs such as the SAPST, PAPST, WIPSU and the Zimbabwe Institute. And some bilateral donors doubted the political will to recruit a Chief Technical Advisor as the quality guarantor for the project [next section].

A third financial challenge to project implementation was the uncertainty regarding the timely disbursement of funds by the EC. While a first tranche of 400,000 Euro was received upon signature of the initial contract in early 2008, the payment request for the second tranche of 500,000 Euro could only be made when up to 70% of the first tranche were spent, as stipulated in the rules under the Contribution Agreement with Implementing Organizations. The evaluators were informed by the EC Delegation that the reason why the second payment request was not honored was because funds given in the first tranche had not been exhausted. When UNDP received the equivalent of 780,000 USD in August 2011, only two months were left for disbursement of the contribution.

A fourth challenge for project implementation relates to the availability of UNDP Trac Funds. The UNDP financial contribution to the project was never pinned down to a fixed amount, as was the case with the EC contribution. The amounts available for 2010 and 2011 changed during the course of the year, for different reasons. UNDP reduced its contribution for 2010 from 550,000 USD to 400,000 USD due to the low implementation rate of the project by mid-year (even though the project only started in May). UNDP reduced its contribution for 2011 from an initial 500,000 USD to 300,000 USD due to reduced resources received from UNDP HQ. In addition, SIDA had asked for a refund of 110,000 USD which the project had already allocated to SIDA budget code after the expiry of the first cost-sharing agreement with SIDA while waiting for a second cost-sharing agreement, which in the end did not materialize. Subsequently, a reversal of funds spent from SIDA to UNDP budget codes had to be done, reducing further the available UNDP funds for 2011 by 110,000 USD. As a result, only 190,000 USD from UNDP Trac Resources were available for spending in 2011. Salaries of the project coordinator and project accountant are always from UNDP Trac Resources.

Changes in the UNDP contribution to the project budget raised questions with the beneficiary and some donors on how UNDP is managing the basket fund and on the predictability of funds. It was noted that the exact amount of the UNDP contribution had not been mentioned on the cover page of the Project Document. The exact amount of the parliament's financial contribution to the project is also not clear. The evaluators asked for a "monetized assessment" of the parliament contribution to the project but did not receive it.

The fifth challenge was the actual administrative and financial management of the project. The evaluation team recognizes that UNDP staff demonstrated great flexibility in managing the available funds in often difficult and changing circumstances. Advance payments were facilitated regularly, to be followed by

adequate reversals in ATLAS once the new funds came in. However, the complex financial management system also led to delays in payments.

All payments were direct payments by UNDP. The system of advance payments was changed after the 2007 Deloitte audit of the previous project phase because of the hyperinflation which had resulted in considerable financial losses for the project. Payments of daily allowances for workshop participants were also faced with some challenges. Firstly, the payments happened at a local bank in the city where the workshop took place. MPs then had to queue to receive their money, sometimes delaying the opening session of the workshop. On the occasion of the workshop on MDGs, though under a different program specialist and unit in UNDP, the money had not arrived at the local bank office in time, partly because parliament's request to transfer the money was made at the last minute, and the UNDP faced criticism from the MPs. There was no system in place to ensure accountability for cases when workshop participants would come to the first day of, say, a three-day workshop, picked up the three-day allowance and disappeared soon afterwards. As the evaluation team is aware, UNDP rules do not allow to give additional fees to MPs and civil servants for chairing a workshop. However, the evaluation team was informed that these rules were sometimes difficult to explain, when external people did manage to get a fee for doing the same work. A group of CSOs informed the evaluation team about how they were struggling to secure the needed resources to pay the daily allowances to MPs, sometimes creating competition between various organizations working with parliament. As UNDP applies the UN daily rates agreed by the Government, CSOs sometimes try to accommodate MPs by pushing the payment of DSA to the UNDP project, as MPs insist on getting the UN rates. The issue of DSA rates needs to be resolved between CSOs and parliament.

As a result of the complex financial management system and the scarcity of available resources at particular points in time, the project fell victim to a "trim down" management. Activities which were already well prepared and ready for implementation had to be scaled down, postponed or cancelled since insufficient funds were available at the time of implementation. Lack of available funding forced the project management to defer activities from 2010 to 2011 and from 2011 to 2012. As activities were reduced, delayed or cancelled, adjustments were made to the quarterly work plans. While waiting for funds to arrive, the work plans were trimmed further down.

The Project team and Management Committee over a total of 8 meetings in 2010 and 2011 discussed 157 accumulated project activities [If a project's implementation & timing is changed twice, it is counted twice]. Due to lack of available funds 24 activities were reduced or downscaled, 13 activities were delayed and 12 were cancelled.

Meeting	Date	Activity budget reduced or downscaled	Activity budget increased	Activity delayed or postponed	Activity cancelled or removed	Total number of activities reviewed
Project Team	10 Jan. 2011	1	1	0	0	18
Project Team	16 Feb. 2011	9	0	2	9	26
Mngt comt	28 March 2011	2	0	3	0	30
Mngt comt	15 June 2011	5	3	3	1	25
Project team	10 Aug. 2011	5	2	1	0	28
Project Team	1 Nov. 2011	1	1	0	1	17
Project Team	9 Nov. 2011	1	0	4	1	13
TOTALS		24	7	13	12	157

3. Steering Committee and Management Board

The implementation of the project was guided by four layers of management structures: Steering Committee, Project Management Board, project technical team and the Project Coordination Unit (PCU), as indicated in the Project Document.

The Project Document stipulated that the Steering Committee, comprising the Presiding Officers of Parliament, UNDP Resident Representative and Heads of Missions of Cooperating Partners, would provide leadership and overall policy guidance to the project. This Committee would meet semi-annually, or more frequently as the situation may require. The Project Document foresaw that the Project Management Board, comprising the Clerk of Parliament or his designated representative, Head of Governance and Gender Mainstreaming at UNDP, the Chief Technical Advisor, a representative of other development partners and the Project Coordinator, would oversee the management of the project. The Project Board would meet at least quarterly. In addition, there were monthly technical meetings of the project team, including UNDP staff and the project coordinator at parliament. The PCU included the project coordinator, project accountant and project assistant.

Challenges of the Steering Committee were related to the frequency of its meetings and the availability of the members of the Steering Committee. This was also the case in the first phase of the multi-donor rolling project. The 2008 evaluation noted that the proposed schedule of quarterly meetings was not adhered to and that the schedules of the Speaker of the Assembly as well as the UNDP's Resident Representative (RR) apparently did not permit frequent formal meetings. The second phase of the project tried to address this by stipulating semi-annual meetings of the Steering Committee instead. However, these meetings also did not take place as foreseen. The evaluation team found evidence of one meeting in 2010, one meeting in 2011 and one meeting in 2012. The current RR has not yet joined a meeting of the Steering Committee. Apparently, the previous, acting RR delegated the Steering Committee to the UNDP Country Director, and it has remained that way since. The Speaker and the RR have not yet met and they informed the evaluation team of their desire to do so.

Management meetings during project implementation				
	Steering Committee	Management board	Project team (UNDP – project coordinator)	Project Coordination Unit (PCU)
2010	8 February 2010	29 September 2010	25 March 2010 5 August 2010	26 January 2010 9 February 2010 16 March 2010 4 April 2010 11 August 2010 20 September 2010 19 November 2010
2011	20 September 2011	28 March 2011 15 June 2011	10 January 2011 16 February 2011 10 August 2011 1 November 2011 9 November 2011	17 March 2011 4 April 2011 10 May 2011 18 July 2011 18 August 2011 24 October 2011 1 December 2011
2012	25 January 2012			

The evaluation team is of the view that the Steering Committee did not play its role as systematically as envisaged in the Project Document, and that the challenges in the availability and coordination of agendas were due to the lack of high level attention or planning from the UNDP side for this project and the priority given to meetings of the constitution making process. Nevertheless, an effort could have been made to schedule the meetings of the Steering Committee in advance and with regular intervals.

In addition to the representatives of parliament and UNDP, the European Commission Delegation should have been invited to the meetings of the Steering Committee, as foreseen in the cost-sharing agreement and the Project Document. However, the EC Delegation informed the evaluation team that they had not been invited. Instead, in its meeting on 20 September 2011, the Steering Committee decided to invite development partners to the Steering Committee meeting *“in the event that a new program was launched”*. As far as the evaluation team could determine, there was no invitation to the EC for the January 2012 meeting of the Steering Committee, which dealt with the implementation of the current project.

In the absence of meetings of the Steering Committee, the management board and project team became the forum which oversaw the activities of the project. The minutes from the management board and project team give a detailed insight into the way financial expenditures were allocated to UNDP track resources or EU funds; as well as how activities were sometimes deleted or postponed, due to delayed disbursement of funds. The nature of these decisions impacted the direction of the project and the key choices of the project. This was often beyond the implementation of the project, rather it was re-shaping the project in the process of implementation

Some of these decisions taken by the Management Board were not just implementation decisions, but substantially altered the way the project was proceeding. Some of the decisions had policy implications which should have been discussed by the Steering Committee. One example is the decision reflected in the minutes of the Management Board on 15 June 2011 to defer all training programs for PCIC office assistants until all MPs had constituency offices and office assistants. Since parliament has not opened new PCICs, this policy decision effectively meant that existing PCIC staff would not receive any training in the foreseeable future. In our view, that was a decision which should have been taken by the Steering Committee.

4. Project’s human resources

The project has been faced with two major human resources questions: the Chief Technical Advisor (CTA) and the UNDP program officer / specialist for parliamentary development.

The CTA question is perhaps the most discussed and arguably most challenging issue. The CTA position was foreseen in the first phase of the multi-donor parliamentary project, but was not filled. Also during the second phase, the CTA position was included in the Project Document but was not filled.

In 2011, a ToR was developed, which mentioned the following key-functions to be performed by the CTA:

- Delivering technical and advisory services on the roll-out of the program to senior management both at Parliament of Zimbabwe and UNDP, in matrix manner;
- Conducting regular evaluation processes of components and activities covered in the support of the program;
- Support in creation of strategic partnerships and implementation of the resource mobilization strategy.
- Share knowledge, codify information and experience and contribute to UNDP practice areas on the support to Parliamentary Reforms in Zimbabwe.

The evaluation team inquired with a wide group of interlocutors in parliament and at UNDP and donors on the reasons why the position had not been filled. In summary: four reasons were given to the evaluation team. The first reason was that insufficient financial resources were available to justify the costs related to such a position. While parliament interlocutors stated their openness to consider hiring a CTA if more financial resources came on board, bilateral donors became reluctant to do so as the first phase of the project did not recruit a CTA and donors were not convinced of the political will on the part of parliament to do so during the second phase. In addition to the financial argument, the evaluation team heard a second reason for not hiring a CTA: the apparent conviction that there is no need for an external advisor since the functioning of the parliament of Zimbabwe is at an acceptable level and there is sufficient human resources capacity in-country to provide short-term expertise to parliament when needed. The third reason given to the evaluation team for not hiring a CTA was the fear that the CTA might be perceived to be favorable to one political party or another and might not be able to function in an independent and politically neutral way. And fourthly, in a much broader sense, because Zimbabwe has many experienced people providing assistance abroad, in surrounding countries and a few in-country, the institutions in-country find it hard to accept that they need quality technical assistance themselves.

The evaluation team carefully listened to its interlocutors inside and outside of parliament for the reasons given in favor of a CTA. The Speaker of the House, all Committee chairpersons interviewed as well as senior Department Staff in the Secretariat expressed the need for a CTA. In summary, seven reasons were given:

1. A person with parliamentary experience or experience in parliamentary development will be able to provide a comparative perspective on the parliament's functioning and bring best practices to upgrade the functioning of the Zimbabwe parliament;
2. A CTA will be able to respond to the request for technical support to Committees and advise Committee chairpersons;
3. The Zimbabwe parliament is in need of upgrading its research department and a CTA would be able to assist in the development of a parliamentary research strategy, facilitate the needed research and engage expertise from universities, parliamentary research centers and on-line knowledge networks as well as produce for the parliament a series of research papers and policy briefs;
4. The CTA would be able to provide advice, if requested to do so, to the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate on institutional leadership issues;
5. A UNDP parliamentary project would benefit from a CTA who provides quality control on the activities and output delivery of the project;
6. A CTA would become a resource person for the donor community on developments in parliament, be able to mobilize additional financial resources for the project and facilitate the interface between UNDP and the donor community in terms of parliamentary development;
7. A CTA would thus raise the profile of the UNDP parliamentary project internally and externally.

In view of the four reasons why the CTA did not materialize and the seven reasons why a CTA is deemed desirable, the evaluation team considers it important that a CTA be included in the next project design, provided that the following 7 pre-conditions are observed.

1. There is a written request from the leadership of parliament to include the CTA in the project design and a commitment to work with the person once in place;
2. The ToR of the CTA have been validated by the Speaker and the Clerk and they are based on a realistic scope of work, outlining the primary interlocutors within parliament with whom the CTA will interact

(e.g. Committee Chairpersons, Research Department, Office of Speaker National Assembly and President of Senate);

3. Parliament and UNDP jointly decide on whether an international or national CTA should be recruited;
4. The recruitment process has been scheduled within a clear and accountable timeline and foresees the participation within UNDP rules and regulations of the leadership of parliament in the selection process;
5. The CTA has a UNDP-issued contract;
6. The reporting lines within UNDP (e.g. to the Country Director or Deputy Country Director)) and within parliament (to the Speaker and/or Clerk) have been agreed upon in advance;
7. The CTA will be in place within the first two weeks of the start of the next phase of the project.

Based upon the ToR drafted in 2011 and taking into account the above 7 preconditions, the evaluation team attaches great importance to the creation of the position of CTA for the Parliament of Zimbabwe, and has received preliminary indications that donors will generate the needed financial resources for such a person throughout the life-cycle of the project. Such CTA would be expected to bring the relevant parliamentary development experience to the parliament of Zimbabwe from a non-partisan perspective in full respect of the national ownership of parliament.

The current project coordinator has been in place since January 2011. Compared to the previous project period, the project outputs have increased substantially. The project coordinator implemented a series of activities, facilitated basic reporting and improved project planning. The role of a CTA, as outlined above, is at a more technical and substantial level than that of the project coordinator. The evaluation team considers that the void in project management, mentioned in the 2008 evaluation report, has to a certain extent been addressed with the arrival of the current project coordinator. The project's Finance Manager has done a good job in regular liaising with UNDP and in keeping track of all administrative and financial implementation tasks. However, the comparative parliamentary advice and quality control remain key areas of responsibility for a future CTA.

The second human resources challenge of the project was the high turnover in the position of the UNDP program officer for parliamentary development. Within its 20-month life span, the project witnessed four different people managing the program from UNDP side. The evaluation team noted that critical institutional memory was lost as a result of the frequent changes of project officers. This was exacerbated by the absence of hand-over notes. As was already observed in the 2008 evaluation, the UNDP program officers/program specialists see their role merely as 'back stopping' since they have a wide portfolio, overseeing other I projects at the same time. Compounding this problem is the fact that the UNDP parliamentary development program officers were not always included in the implementation of the activities as this was seen as the purview of parliament, nor were they involved by parliament to contribute to the review of training materials, baseline surveys, selection of experts, etc.

In this context, unnecessary delays occurred. In April 2010, six months before the cost-sharing agreement was to expire (after the first no-cost extension), the EC alerted UNDP on the approaching deadline and suggested that UNDP send a request for a second no-cost extension by May 2010. For no compelling reasons except lack of proper follow-up between different program officers, it took four months, until August 2010, to submit the request to the EC. This delay considerably reduced the time available in 2011 for the disbursement of the last installment of the EC funding.

Further to the question of the project's and UNDP human resources is the issue of quality control. The evaluation team is of the opinion that there is need for a more considerate approach on quality review / quality control by UNDP. Currently, there is an almost exclusive focus on UNDP administering the

payments and parliament implementing project activities, without much further collaboration on content-based follow-up. One of the baseline surveys, on MP capacity on human rights and rule of law, could have been of higher quality if UNDP had been asked to review the content of the draft text. The UNDP Economic Advisor could have been asked to comment on the “economic literacy” baseline survey. While UNDP took a rather hands-off approach, in order not to give any impression of being intrusive, the parliament could have created more opportunities for UNDP engagement and technical input, thus reinforcing the quality of the project delivery. Quality control is critical and is an issue that both project staff and the UNDP must address jointly.

5. Project reporting

During 2010 and 2011 the Project Coordinator delivered quarterly and annual activity reports.

The quarterly reports follow - to a certain extent - the structure of outcomes and activities as outlined in the Project Document and in the quarterly work plans. The quarterly reports give a self-rating on achieving each of the program components. The quarterly reports have a similar structure and heading, which ensures consistency. The quarterly reports enable the reader to follow project implementation in detail.

The 2010 and 2011 annual reports summarize the highlights from the quarterly reports. While the 2010 annual report was rather short, the reported activities in the 2011 annual report did not entirely match the structure and content of the 2011 annual work plan. The project coordinator did not report some of the challenges as observed during the project evaluation, such as delays in publication of the baseline studies, the lack of distribution of the results of baseline studies to experts, workshop participants, chairpersons of committees and other stakeholders; lack of parliament capacity to design training modules or challenges to create the structures and strategies to ensure sustainability.

The evaluation team noted that the quarterly and annual reports focused almost entirely on activity reporting and very rarely included reporting on results and their impact on the improved functioning of Parliament. The project coordinator could be expected to deliver more quality outputs in reporting.

The final narrative report May 2008 – October 2011 submitted to the EC, and which the evaluation team understands was written with the substantial involvement of the UNDP Country Office, is of excellent quality. It has a clear and comprehensive structure, referring to the five project outcomes and the outputs under each outcome. It has chapters on continuation and sustainability, monitoring and evaluation, links with other projects, challenges and lessons learned, partners and collaboration, visibility and the financial report. The document is well written and has a realistic approach on lessons learned and challenges. The final report is more analytical in nature, and is more critical towards the ability of the project to deliver change compared to the annual and quarterly reports. Although comprehensive, the final report could have been more straightforward on internal-UNDP challenges to project implementation, such as staff turn-over and reduced Trac funds. Overall, the authors of the report at UNDP are to be commended for the approach taken in this final report to the EC.

The project coordinator also wrote the reports from the Steering Committee, management board, project team and PCU. Reporting of meetings was mostly on time; although the report of a previous steering committee (20 September 2011) and of a previous management committee (28 March 2011) were not timely available.

The 2008 evaluation made a number of critical observations on the availability of files and files management. The current evaluation team did receive most of the requested documents, sometimes in

soft copy, sometimes in hard copy. However, it was noted that the documents had no filing codes. The extent to which there is a clear and comprehensive filing system in place remains an area of concern which needs to receive more attention by the UNDP and Parliament management.

The Project conducted a series of activities in the area of economic literacy of MPs, ISO certification for the Secretariat, parliamentary diplomacy, public hearings in the legislative process, etc. Each of these series of activities could have resulted in a more comprehensive thematic report, bringing together the findings and lessons learned in a particular area. Such thematic reports by the project coordinator would have helped the project team in its communication of results beyond individual activities and enhance visibility. It would have encouraged the projects team's reflection on how to secure sustainability of what had been achieved.

6. Parliamentary mainstreaming at UNDP

The United Nations Country Team in Zimbabwe includes a number of organizations and programs which deal with policy areas relevant to the work of the members of parliament. These include FAO, ILO, OHCHR, UNAIDS, UNICEF, UN Women, UNFPA, WHO, etc.

So far, the UNDP parliamentary project has worked together with UNIFEM / UN Women in terms of gender mainstreaming and support to the Women Caucus in the parliament; this cooperation is regular and extensive . However, for a number of other policy areas, the UNDP parliamentary project hardly liaised with other UN agencies in Zimbabwe. The evaluation team considers that parliament committees can receive substantial policy support through the UN in-house expertise. This can become a potential growth area for the next phase of the project.

UNDP parliamentary project can function as a “resource center” for other UNDP programs and other UN agencies which need to engage with the political leadership and with parliament in order to make progress in their area of work. The UNDP and UN work on climate change and ecological matters, MDGs, gender or on human rights, for instance, will be well served when liaising with the UNDP parliamentary project. Investment in a parliamentary project can benefit programs outside of the UNDP Democratic Governance cluster. The investment in a parliamentary program would be well spent if it involved the UN work as a whole.

Likewise, the evaluation team considers that the UNDP parliamentary support program should not be a stand-alone set of activities and needs to be integrated with other UNDP program units and UN agencies in-country. They should contribute to the project design of a parliamentary program (e.g. if there are components related to Human Rights, Climate Change, MDGs, anti-corruption, elections), and ensure parliamentary mainstreaming in their programming.

Parliamentary mainstreaming means that all Agencies and projects of a UN Country Team consider and include possibilities and requirements for engagement with parliament, thus enhancing the instruments to achieve program objectives. The budget of the UNDP parliamentary program can then include contributions from other UN agencies in relation to the project outputs relevant to their respective work, and to support the role of the parliamentary project as “resource center” for other UNDP programs and UN agencies.

7. Project communication at parliament

The parliamentary project is more than a collection of single activities to which either MPs or staff are invited. The parliamentary project has overall objectives to strengthen the functioning of parliament and

to mobilize the requisite resources to realize those objectives. Good project management should provide opportunities for MPs and staff to call upon the support of the project for the capacity needs they would like to see addressed. In order to do so, comprehensive information on the objectives, timeline, human resources and areas of expertise need to be available to all stakeholders and beneficiaries.

The evaluation team is of the view that more could have been done to inform MPs on the UNDP project and what it had to offer. UNDP Senior officials could have been invited in a timely manner to attend the opening of some high level activities. Neither at the start of the project nor throughout the life cycle of the project was a circular on the overall UNDP project distributed within parliament. No comprehensive information on the project was made available to all MPs; an issue which could have been addressed early on through the Project Coordinator. The platform to inform chairpersons of Committees and party whips on the project is the Liaison and Coordination Committee (LCC), which is supposed to meet twice per year. However, in 2011 the LCC did not meet. In addition, one cannot assume that LCC members share the information from LCC meetings with their party colleagues. In summary, the information on the project available to MPs was extremely limited.

Donors and development partners as well as MPs expressed a strong desire for the key stakeholders in parliament (Speaker, the President of the Senate, Clerk, Committee chairpersons) to subscribe to a common/joint vision of the project as this would ensure optimum benefits and the effective use of the resources made available.

VI. Recommendations

Based upon the evaluation of the second phase of the multi-donor parliamentary program in support of the Parliament of Zimbabwe, the evaluation team puts forward the following 30 recommendations for the next phase of the project as well as for project action in 2012. The recommendations are divided into three sections, each of which includes 10 recommendations: design of the new project phase, implementation of the new project phase and management of the new project phase.

A . Recommendations on Project Design

The parliamentary project has been a parliament-driven and UNDP-supported capacity building program, with financial support from the European Commission and UNDP. Despite some weaknesses that have already been cited, the program has contributed in a substantial way to the enhancement of the professional functioning of parliament. A new project phase will continue to play an important role for parliament at a time when Zimbabwe is at a new juncture in its transition as the GPA comes to a close and new parliamentary elections are on the horizon. The following are recommendations for the design of the new Project Document.

1. The project design needs to be informed as broadly and as practical as possible. Flexibility is important especially for a key governance and political institution like parliament. The evaluators are delighted to note that the parliament is preparing a new Strategic Plan. This document, together with the ZUNDAF and UNDP CPAP 2012-2015, needs to be the basis for the future project design, alongside the baseline surveys written during the current project, the progress achieved under the current project and the observations from this evaluation report.
2. The timing of the new project design needs to be determined soon. The evaluation team recommends that the drafting of a new Project Document takes place in autumn 2012, with the objective to have a new project ready to start when the new parliament takes office. The evaluation team recommends that the project human resources be on board at the start of the project. To this end, a detailed timeline for project start-up needs to be agreed on between parliament and UNDP.
3. The evaluation team recommends early involvement and consultations with development partners on the project design. Instead of a fund raising exercise done ex-post, the design of the new project should be done in an inclusive process and in full transparency with the donors and development partners. This will facilitate additional quality input from best practices in parliamentary development projects elsewhere.
4. The evaluation team recommends that the budget of the new Project Document be designed on the basis of available and committed resources as much as is possible. The Project Document and budget can propose a number of optional program modules to be activated if and when additional resources are generated during the lifespan of the project. However, the starting budget of the project should be built upon available and committed resources. In this way, project management might include upgrading the project, rather than trimming it down as a result of the lack of resources. The evaluation team recommends that parliament financial contribution and UNDP Trac Resources be included in the budget summary of the Project Document. The evaluation team recommends that the Project Document and the cost sharing agreement are signed around the same time and before the commencement of the project implementation.
5. The evaluation team recommends that the drafting of the new Project Document takes into account the observations from the review of the current Project Document: to articulate baselines, outcomes

and outputs in a more targeted realistic and result oriented way, to prepare an appropriately detailed and rigorous Results Framework, to foresee measurable indicators which cover both participation in project activities and improvements in parliamentary performance including process indicators as these are permissible governance indicators, to prepare project activity descriptions and to annex an implementation plan to the Project Document. UNDP, as part of its technical inputs, can share some of the best practices governance indicators, which can then be repackaged to the country /project specific situation.

6. The evaluation team advocates that the new project includes the prospect of a successfully accomplished exit. An exit strategy needs to be founded on a progressive transfer of skills and roles whereby the capacity receiver gradually assumes the role of the capacity provider and undertakes (or participates in) the development of a cadre of members and officials. The new project needs to direct its activities to the exit process in a much more explicit and purpose-driven manner than was done in the present project. This is not to say that the PoZ will no longer need external support. However, it should be possible to formulate a project design which enables the reduction of the level of support significantly but naturally over time without adversely effecting the operation of the PoZ.
7. To enhance sustainability of parliamentary capacity building, the project design needs to put more emphasis on structures and procedures beyond a series of activities and workshops. The current project evaluation has already made suggestions for such structures and procedures, such as guidelines for legislative drafting, a legislative tracking mechanism, a calendar of reporting obligations and review mechanisms on human rights and other international/regional instruments, an outreach strategy with timelines and responsibilities, a roadmap for a Budget office, agreed procedures on interaction with the Office of the Comptroller and Auditor General. The project design can probably identify in greater detail the structures and procedures which can further enhance sustainability of the project's support.
8. One of the cross cutting issues in UNDP project design is gender mainstreaming. The gender activities noted in this evaluation have laid a firm foundation for further work. Discussions with a number of women MPs indicated a full awareness of the need for further progress. The emphasis now needs to be on organizing the proper operational and administrative procedures to ensure that throughout the core business of Parliament (legislation and oversight), gender mainstreaming is fully established. The goal is that consideration of gender in all aspects of parliamentary life (e.g. budgeting, policy consideration, proposals for laws, all aspects of the parliament's own administration) should take place as a key aspect of the natural, default operational frame of the institution. In this way, Parliament can become an exemplar for gender equity throughout the country and in the region. The next project can allocate resources to the Women Caucus and Gender Committee and other gender mainstreaming activities through a specific budget line, to be accessible in an accountable way. In order to do so, the Women Caucus and the Gender Committee will need to develop a five-year strategy and an outcome-oriented project document. Since gender is cross cutting in UNDP work, UNDP can also avail additional resources from other practice areas.
9. The evaluation team recommends that the next project design explores the innovative theme of synergies between parliamentary and electoral cycles. Linkages between the two cycles are obvious in terms of the MPs outreach to the constituencies; adoption of electoral legislation and the budget for elections and the Zimbabwe Electoral Commission (ZEC); parliament's role in the appointment of members of the ZEC. No person becomes a member of parliament unless s/he passes through the work of the Electoral Commission in organizing the elections. For the next phase of the parliamentary project, programmatic areas should be identified related to the synergies between parliamentary

development and electoral assistance; i.e.: (i) MPs knowledge on electoral legislation and policy framework can be enhanced as part of the MP induction program, conferences and training modules throughout the parliamentary term. One can envisage regular contacts between the ZEC and the relevant parliamentary commissions as well as the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate; (ii) Review of the legal framework for elections through regular contact between lawyers at the ZEC and the legal advisor at parliament as well as the parliamentary Legal Committee; (iii) ZEC annual report and post-election report are the reports which the ZEC adopts as an independent institution and shares with parliament. Parliament commissions can invite ZEC to present and discuss the report. A CTA can play a catalytic role in the interface between parliament and the ZEC.

10. The evaluation team was informed that a new parliament building will soon be constructed with the support of the People's Republic of China. Since the infrastructure has an impact on the functioning of parliament (e.g. use of ICT, public access in the new building, live broadcast facilities,..), the evaluation team recommends that the next project design carefully reviews the possible impact of the new building on program priorities.

B. Recommendations on Project Implementation

11. With new elections expected to take place soon, the group of MPs who will be elected for the first time will require a comprehensive induction on the functioning of parliament, their roles and responsibilities and the technical areas covered by various committees. The evaluation team recommends that the parliamentary project starts preparing the agenda and materials for the induction course in the latter part of 2012, based upon the existing induction program and enriched with the participation of external experts or contributors from other parliaments, as happens in parliamentary induction programs elsewhere. The project coordinator and parliament secretariat can initiate consultations within parliament and with experts and CSO stakeholders on the content of the enhanced induction program. Following consultations with the Speaker of the House, the President of the Senate and the Clerk of Parliament, the program for the induction can be finalized. The induction can then be scheduled shortly after the parliamentary swearing-in ceremony. The evaluation team recommends that UNDP Trac Resources for 2012 and 2013 be accessed to implement the induction program and bring on board external contributors.
12. As the baseline surveys are expected to be launched in the second half of 2012, the evaluation team recommends that the project coordinator drafts a 'utilization concept note' for the baseline surveys, to be discussed and endorsed by the Steering Committee. The concept should include presentations by the authors and discussions with the relevant committees in 2012, and possibly again in 2013 after the newly elected MPs have joined the committees. The feed-back on the presentation and the discussions will provide valuable additional input for the design of capacity building initiatives during the next project phase.
13. To strengthen the legislative and policy analysis output of parliament, the evaluation team suggests that the next project provides legislative technical advice. In addition to skills building workshops, the project should address the issue of targeted legislative advice to portfolio committees to review incoming bills or to assist in preparing private members bills on topics of good governance within the areas of priorities of the project (e.g. legislation on public access to official documents, transparency, anti-corruption, etc.) and the production of policy briefs. Such technical advice can be offered by either a CTA (depending on his/her profile) or by short-term legal consultants.

14. Workshops on international human rights standards, ratification and domestication of treaties, parliamentary diplomacy and inter-parliamentary relations have proven to be very beneficial for all MPs participating in the workshops. The workshops were beneficial in terms of conflict resolution and improving relationships between MPs across party lines. In order to optimize the impact of these workshops, it is recommended that they be organized in the first year of the project and at regular intervals thereafter. As a follow-up, further technical advice by the project to support the actual ratification of specific treaties or conventions can be considered as well.
15. Workshops on conflict management negotiating skills, healing etc are very crucial especially in the context of ongoing consensus building initiatives in the country. However they should be part of the induction and not one-off; they should be regular and they should be based on modules developed by experts in conjunction with relevant entities such as the Organ on National Healing, Reconciliation and Integration.
16. The baseline surveys showed significant deficiencies in the knowledge of and awareness by many MPs of the roles and responsibilities of the committee to which they belonged. Planning and management of Committee work is another area in which Committees require skills and capacity, in particular parliamentary procedures related to the operations of committees. The evaluation team recognizes the need to develop focused committee work plans, to clarify the committees' Terms of Reference and to produce manuals and guidelines on subjects within the committees' scope of responsibility.
17. One of the obstacles to more effective parliamentary oversight over government, is the limited understanding and acceptance of parliamentary scrutiny by the executive. The evaluation team recommends that in addition to the building of knowledge and skills of MPs and Committees, the successor project should involve the executive in order to sensitize ministers on their obligations and accountability to parliament. This can be done through high level policy / leadership dialogue with the executive, taking into account the doctrine of separation of powers.
18. The agenda development and the selection of keynote speakers for capacity building activities is a process where UNDP input and contributions can be enhanced. The evaluation team recommends that invited experts be engaged in discussions on draft agendas prior to the design/offering of the modules in order to better familiarize them with the level of knowledge and skills of their target audiences. Where possible and appropriate, UNDP may attend as facilitators or observers. This will be part of monitoring and quality assurance by UNDP.
19. The creation of a Budget Office will be an important step in the further institutional development of parliament. The project's Concept Note suggests that the Budget Office will work primarily for the Budget and Finance Committee and the Public Accounts Committee, but be open to requests from other committees. The Budget Office would become the technically competent resource center within parliament, staffed with appropriately qualified and well remunerated professionals and be allowed to set its own agenda on a non-partisan basis. The evaluation team recommends that the next phase of the UNDP project provides technical support to the Budget Office and that the sustainability of the Budget Office be analyzed carefully to avoid excessive donor-dependency. The evaluation team also recommends that consultations be held with the government on the needed resources for this Office. In addition, there should be activities to capacitate the parliament library and Research Department on current issues of economic and budgetary developments.
20. The Parliamentary Constituency Information Centers (PCICs) have been designed as an important tool for MPs interaction with their voters. Since the PCICs are relatively underdeveloped and unequipped to perform their functions, the new concept paper on PCICs should be reviewed and finalized. This concept document needs to be broadly discussed in parliament, with the government and at an

Harare international roundtable where a wide audience of MPs, political leaders, CSOs and development partners can learn more from the experiences in two or three countries which have a similar model to the one which Zimbabwe would like to adopt. The evaluators recommend the drafting of a separate Project Document on PCICs, which the Government and bilateral donors might be interested in supporting. It is therefore advisable not to include the PCICs in the next phase of the multi-donor rolling parliamentary program since the idea of the nature and the functions of the PCICs still requires further thinking, as reflected in the evaluators' observations. It is the evaluators' recommendation that the issue of the PCICs be the subject of a separate Project Document.

C . Recommendations on Project Management

21. During the implementation of the project and because of the changing political environment in parliament, UNDP has demonstrated considerable flexibility to adjust work plans, assist in reporting to the donor, disburse payments and other administrative support. The evaluation team commends the flexible approach of UNDP and encourages its continuation in the next phase in order to accommodate the evolving political circumstances.
22. The chapter on 'project management' has outlined the challenges in terms of the role of the Steering Committee in providing guidance to the project and making policy decisions. In order to optimize the role of the Steering Committee, the evaluation team recommends that the Steering Committee meets three times a year (every fourth month) under the chairmanship of the Speaker of the House. Its meetings should be significant events for all participants. Sufficient time should be set aside for proper consideration of "Matters Arising" and substantive issues. Appropriate preparations by the project team and the leadership of parliament should be made prior to Steering Committee meetings. The main donor(s) should receive timely invitations to the Steering Committee. UNDP can be represented by the RR or CD. Preferably, the three meetings for the year are planned at the beginning of the year in order to ensure that they are entered into the diaries of those affected, way in advance.
23. In February 2010 and February 2011 parliament conducted its last meeting with development partners. In order for parliament to enhance its relations with development partners, the evaluation team suggests the creation of a "Parliament–Donor Group", chaired by the Speaker of the House or, in his/her absence, the President of the Senate. As is the case in other parliaments supported by UNDP, such "Parliament – Donor Group" convenes regular (e.g. twice a year), well focused meetings based on an interesting and relevant agenda. It should be used not only to brief donors and development partners on project activities but also to inform them on policy discussions and what is on the agenda of parliament. In addition to the UNDP RR or Country Director, also *potential* donors might be interested in attending from time to time. The meetings should be hosted by Parliament as much as possible, but donors may also wish to host them. Sufficient time needs to be set aside for the meetings which should be significant events for all participants. [The UNDP parliamentary program in Vietnam provide a good example for a functioning "Parliament – Donor Group".]
24. The chapter on 'project management' has discussed in depth the question of the recruitment of a Chief Technical Advisor (CTA). The evaluation team supports the recruitment of a CTA on the basis of seven pre-conditions, namely: written request from parliament, ToR validated by Speaker and Clerk and subjected to Steering Committee clearance, joint Parliament & UNDP decision for a national or international Advisor, clear and accountable timeline for recruitment which includes parliament, UNDP-issued contract, clear reporting lines, and deployment within two weeks of the start of the project. The ToR for the CTA needs to be streamlined with the ToR of the project coordinator, in confirming the latter's organizational and project support role as is currently already the case. While

every country is different, the practices of the UNDP parliamentary program in e.g. Moldova and Solomon Islands indicate the mutual advantages of having both a CTA and a Program Coordinator.

25. Reviewing current project practices, the evaluation team suggests a more considerate approach to the issue of quality review and control by UNDP. Currently, the project seems not to pay sufficient attention to quality control. This has relegated the UNDP to the role of administering payments while parliament takes almost exclusive responsibility for the implementation of the program. While UNDP took a rather hands-off approach, in order not to give any impression of being intrusive parliament and the UNDP could create more opportunities for mutual engagement and technical input, thus reinforcing the quality of the project delivery. The project coordinator and possibly the CTA can engage UNDP, and other UN agencies in the country, in providing this technical input.
26. Good project management requires the possibility for MPs and staff to call upon the support of the project for the capacity needs they would like to see addressed. In order to do so, comprehensive information on the project's objectives, timeline, financial and human resources and areas of expertise need to be made available to all stakeholders and beneficiaries. The evaluation team recommends a detailed 'project communication plan' to prepare for a comprehensive effort to regularly inform MPs and parliament staff on the UNDP project and what it has to offer. The 'project communication plan' will include, amongst others, a circular on the overall UNDP project distributed within parliament, a monthly update email or newsletter to all MPs and staff, a project calendar widely disseminated in parliament and to other partners and beneficiaries (CSOs, government ministries, etc.), a presentation leaflet on the project, etc. UNDP Senior Officials should also be invited timely to attend the opening of some high level activities.
27. Project reporting and file management should be improved. The evaluation team recommends additional efforts to create a better institutional memory of the project through hard-copy and electronic filing system. The quality of quarterly and annual reports can be improved by ensuring that progress reports match the structure of the work plans and that they have sufficient, well written and well motivated narratives to the information provided in tables and summary overviews.
28. Monitoring and Evaluation is an ongoing sound project management practice. This can be achieved through constant improving of project practices, end of year review meetings with all stakeholders, and UNDP Atlas project monitoring. There should be a clear and comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation template, which should be filled in and submitted quarterly to the Steering Committee.
29. Through a series of MoUs, the project should establish a framework for co-funding and co-implementation of activities with local and international NGOs and partner institutions. The availability of the MoUs to UNDP and other project donors will provide clarity on resource sharing among the agencies financing the project.
30. UNDP is in the process of assessing Parliament and other Implementing Partners in terms of their capacity in financial management. Once this assessment has been completed and upon positive qualification a new Project should be based on advances with follow-up by UNDP program officers in timely, transparent and accountable acquittals . This format of financial management will be in line with UNDP NIM guidelines and the Paris Declaration of AID Coordination and Effectiveness. It further enhances the ownership over the project by the Parliament of Zimbabwe.

VII. Annexes:

Annex 1. Persons interviewed by the evaluation team, June 2012

Members of Parliament of Zimbabwe

- Hon. Lovemore Moyo, Speaker of the House of Assembly
- Mrs. Edna Madzongwe, President of the Senate
- Hon. Zhanda, Chairperson of the Portfolio Committee on Budget, Finance and Investment Promotion
- Hon. Mkanduri, Chairperson of the Portfolio Committee on Foreign Affairs and Regional Integration
- Hon. Chindori Chininga, Chairperson of the Portfolio Committee on Mines and Energy
- Hon. Mwonzora, Chairperson of the Portfolio Committee on Justice, Legal, Constitutional and Parliamentary Affairs
- Hon. Mushonga, Chairperson of the Portfolio Committee on Parliamentary Legal Committee
- Hon Nyamupinga, Chairperson Women's Parliamentary Caucus
- Hon Matienga, Chairperson of the Portfolio Committee on Women Affairs, Gender and Community Development
- Chairperson of the Thematic Committee on Peace and Security

Administration of Parliament Of Zimbabwe

- Mr. Austin M. Zvoma, Clerk of Parliament
- Mr Chokuda, Deputy Clerk
- Mrs Sunga, Assistant Clerk
- Mr Gandiwa, Assistant Clerk
- Dr Andries M. Rukobo, Principal Director of Information Services
- Mrs Mafoko, Director Research
- Dr Chipare, Principal Director External Relations
- Ms Doka, Director External Relations
- Rtd Major Mbewe Edward, Director Public Relations
- Mr Malunga, Principal Director Human Resources & Administration
- Mr Nesbert Samu, Parliamentary Programme Coordinator UNDP
- Mr Makuwaza, Parliamentary Programme Accountant UNDP

Parliamentary Constituency Information Centres (PCICs)

- Beverly Tagwirei, Office Assistant to Hon. Chenayimoyo Dunstan Francis Nhema, Shurungwi North
- Tonderai Graham Chorira, Office Assistant to Hon. Amos Chibaya, Mkoba
- Nomacebo Khumalo, Office Assistant to Hon. Mkhosi Edward Moyo, Mangwe
- Cornwel Mpofu, Office Assistant to Hon. Moses Mzila Ndlovu, Bulilima West
- Sikhanyisiwe Dlamini, Office Assistant to Hon. Obert Moses Mpofu, Umguza
- Mkozho Georgina, Office Assistant to Hon. Dorcas Sibanda, Bulawayo Central

Experts, civil society, media, independent institutions

- John Makamure, SAPST Executive Director
- Naome Chimbetete, ZWRCN
- Musa Zindoca, Zimbabwe Initiative
- Aulline Chapisa, FES Program Coordinator
- Patricia Muwandi, WIPSU Program Manager
- Ambassador Mothobi
- Justice Rita Makaura, Judge of Supreme Court
- M. Mataura, PAPST
- G. Chigumira, Zimbabwe Economic Policy Institute Executive Director
- Jacob Nyamadzawo, Zimbabwe Economic Policy Institute Research Fellow
- Mrs Joyce Laetita Kazembe, ZEC Deputy Chairperson
- Professor J. Feltoe, ZEC Commissioner
- Dr. P. Makoni, ZEC Commissioner
- Mr. Sekeramayi, ZEC Chief Election Officer
- Mr. Utloile Silaigwana, Deputy Chief Elections Officer
- Ms. Shamiso Chahuruva, Chief Legal Officer
- AttleeMunyaradzi Gamundani, Total Motor Mart company, vice President
- Ms. P. Mapondera Director ICT
- Handricks Ngena, Zimbabwe insurance Brokers Limited, Accountant Executive

Development partners

- Mrs. Caroline Valette-Landrey, European Commission Delegation Attaché Governance
- Neil Satchwell-Smith, DFID, UK Embassy
- Otto Saki, USAID Senior Advisor Democracy, Rights and Governance Office

UNDP & UN

- Alain Noudéhou, UNDP Resident Representative & UN Resident Coordinator
- Christine N. Umutoni, UNDP Country Director
- Martim Faria e Maya, Deputy Country Director – Programmes
- Mfaro Moyo, Assistant Resident Representative Governance and Gender
- Wadzanai Madombwe, Programme Analyst – Governance
- Doreen Mutsa Nyamukapa, Programme Analyst Gender and Parliament
- Jelda Nhliziyo Consultant, Programme Specialist, UN WOMEN
- Memory Zonde-Kachambwa, Programme Specialist, UN WOMEN

Annex 2: Documents consulted by the evaluation team

Carl Le Van, Power Sharing and Inclusive Politics in Africa's Uncertain Democracies, in: Governance. An International Journal of Policy, Administration and institutions, Vol. 24, No. 1, January 2011, 35 pg.

COPAC, Milestones towards a New Constitution for Zimbabwe, 2011, 8 pg.

European Commission, Contribution Agreement with an International organization, Financing proposal 9 ACP ZIM 12 / 1; N ZIM/004/04; CRIS Decision FED/2006/18760; 18 pg.

European Commission, Contribution Agreement with an International organization, Financing proposal 9 ACP ZIM 12 / 1; N ZIM/004/04; CRIS Decision FED/2006/18760 – Addendum 1

European Commission, Contribution Agreement with an International organization, Financing proposal 9 ACP ZIM 12 / 1; N ZIM/004/04; CRIS Decision FED/2006/18760 – Revised Annex 1 C

European Commission, Contribution Agreement with an International organization, Financing proposal 9 ACP ZIM 12 / 1; N ZIM/004/04; CRIS Decision FED/2006/18760 – Addendum 2

European Commission, Reference Document on Strategies & Methodologies for working with Parliaments, Brussels, 2010, 192 p.

Fish, Steven & Kroenig, Matthew, The Handbook of National Legislatures. A Global Survey, Cambridge University press, 2009, p. 451-455.

MURPHY, Jonathan, Strengthening Effectiveness and Transparency of the Parliament of Georgia - Project Evaluation and Formulation, London / Tbilisi, August 2008, 32 pp.

Parliament of Zimbabwe, Baseline Survey on Capacity of Parliamentarians for Legislative Analysis in Zimbabwe, Harare, 2011, 76 pg.

Parliament of Zimbabwe, Baseline Survey on Economic Literacy for the Parliament of Zimbabwe, Harare, 2012, 36 pg.

Parliament of Zimbabwe, Baseline Survey on Sector Specific Capacity Building Requirements for Committees of Parliament, Harare, 2012, 52 pg.

Parliament Of Zimbabwe, Baseline Survey On The Capacity Of Mps In Human Rights And Rule Of Law, Harare, 2011, 52 Pg.

Parliament of Zimbabwe, Committee Operations Manual, Harare, 2004, 51 pg.

Parliament of Zimbabwe, Concept Note on the Establishment of a Parliament Budget Office at the Parliament of Zimbabwe, Harare, 2010, 17 pg.

Parliament of Zimbabwe, Developing A Model Constituency Office In Zimbabwe: A Conceptual Framework, Harare, 2012, 26 pg.

Parliament of Zimbabwe, Public Hearing Guidelines, Harare, 2003, 11 pg.

Parliament of Zimbabwe, Public Outreach Strategy, Harare, 2011, 24 pg.

Sid Noel, From Power Sharing to Democracy, Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press, 2005, 250 pg.

UNDP & Government of Zimbabwe, Country Programme Action Plan 2007 – 2011, 29 pg.

UNDP Zimbabwe, Evaluation of the Three Year Rolling Multi-Donor Parliamentary Support Programme: January 2005 – December 2007, Final Report, October 2008, 24 pg.

UNDP Zimbabwe, Parliamentary Support Programme 2010-2011 – Annual Progress Report 2011.

UNDP Zimbabwe, Parliamentary Support Programme 2010-2011 – Annual Progress Report 2010.

UNDP Zimbabwe, Parliamentary Support Programme 2010-2011 – Project Document, Harare, 2010, 22 pg.

UNDP Zimbabwe, Parliamentary Support Programme 2010-2011 – Quarterly Progress Report 2010 – Second Quarter.

UNDP Zimbabwe, Parliamentary Support Programme 2010-2011 – Quarterly Progress Report 2010 – Third Quarter.

UNDP Zimbabwe, Parliamentary Support Programme 2010-2011 – Quarterly Progress Report 2010 – Fourth Quarter.

UNDP Zimbabwe, Parliamentary Support Programme 2010-2011 – Quarterly Progress Report 2011 – First Quarter.

UNDP Zimbabwe, Parliamentary Support Programme 2010-2011 – Quarterly Progress Report 2011 – Second Quarter.

UNDP Zimbabwe, Parliamentary Support Programme 2010-2011 – Quarterly Progress Report 2011 – Third Quarter.

UNDP Zimbabwe, Parliamentary Support Programme 2010-2011 – Quarterly Progress Report 2011 – Fourth Quarter.

UNDP Zimbabwe, Three Year Rolling Multi Donor Parliamentary Support Programme - Final narrative and financial report - May 2008 - October 2011, Harare, 16 pg.

UNDP, Strategy Note on Parliamentary Development, New York, 2009, 48 p.

United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG), “Standards for Evaluation in the UN System”, New York, April 2005, 25 pp.

United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG), “Norms for Evaluation in the UN System”, New York, April 2005, 11 pp.