

## Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

**Overall Project Rating:** **Highly Satisfactory**

**Project Number :** 00090400

**Project Title :** The project aims to build capacities of the Office of the Ombudsperson (OO) to contribute to reform agendas in line with human rights standards and respond to human rights challenges

**Project Date :** 01-Aug-2015

### Strategic

**Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

**1. Did the project pro-actively take advantage of new opportunities and adapt its theory of change to respond to changes in the development context, including changing national priorities? (select the option that best reflects this project)**

- 3: The project team regularly completed and documented a comprehensive horizon scanning exercise to identify new opportunities and changes in the development context that required adjustments in the theory of change. There is credible evidence that the project board considered the scanning and its implications, and documented changes to the project's RRF, partnerships, etc. made in response, as appropriate. (both must be true to select this option)
- 2: *The project team has undertaken some horizon scanning over the life of the project to identify new opportunities and changes in the development context. The project board discussed the scanning and its implications in the board minutes. There is some evidence that the project took action as a result, but changes may not have been fully integrated in the project's theory of change, RRF, partnerships, etc. (all must be true to select this option)*
- 1: The project team may have considered new opportunities and changes in the development context since implementation began, but this has not been discussed in the project board. There is limited to no evidence of considered changes to the project as a result. This option should also be selected if no horizon scanning took place during project implementation.

#### Evidence

The project constantly performed revision of the components to meet current challenge:

- 1) in 2017 3rd (Support to public awareness regarding human rights provided) and 4th (Response to protection of vulnerable groups...). As a result 4th component design was approved and 3rd component reshaped.
- 2) In 2018 due to election of the new OO which resulted in slowing down a number of the OO initiatives, the project was performed a revision of the approved AWP.

**2. Was the project aligned with the thematic focus of the Strategic Plan? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)**

- 3: The project responded to one of the three areas of development **work** as specified in the Strategic Plan. It addressed at least one of the proposed new and emerging **areas** and implementation was consistently incorporated into the project. The project's RRF included all the relevant SP output indicators. (all must be true to select this option)
- 2: *The project responded to one of the three areas of development **work** as specified in the Strategic Plan. The project's RRF included at least one SP output indicator, if relevant. (both must be true to select this option)*
- 1: While the project may have responded to one of the three areas of development **work** as specified in the Strategic Plan, it was based on a sectoral approach without addressing the complexity of the development context. SP indicators were included in the project's RRF. This option is also selected if the project did not respond to any of the three SP areas of development work.

#### Evidence

The project was implemented under the area of 'Inclusive and effective democratic governance'.

UNDAF / CPD outcome # 7: More effective and accountable public institutions respond to the needs of all persons within the jurisdiction of Ukraine, especially the most vulnerable.

The project design did not address any emerging areas.

**3. Evidence generated through the project was explicitly used to confirm or adjust the programme/CPD's theory of change during implementation.**

- Yes
- No

#### Evidence

Project findings were used for drafting CPD for 2018-2022 as of May 2017 (including Output 1.2. National institutions, systems, laws and policies advance the equitable realization of human rights, especially among

### Relevant

**Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory**

**4. Were the project's targeted groups systematically identified and engaged, with a priority focus on the excluded and marginalized, to ensure the project remained relevant for them? (select the option that best reflects the project)**

- 3: Systematic and structured feedback was collected regularly from a representative sample of beneficiaries, with a priority focus on the excluded and marginalized, as part of the project's monitoring system. The project board included at least one member from the targeted group were active members of the project's governance mechanism (i.e., project board or equivalent) and there is credible evidence that their feedback informed decision making. (all must be true to select this option)
- 2: *Targeted groups were engaged in implementation and monitoring, with a priority focus on the excluded and marginalized. Beneficiary feedback, which may be anecdotal, was collected regularly to ensure the project remained relevant for them. This information was used to inform project decision making. (all must be true to select this option)*
- 1: Some beneficiary feedback may have been collected, but this information did not inform project decision making. This option should also be selected if no beneficiary feedback was collected.
- Not Applicable

#### Evidence

Output 4 of the Project was designed specifically to address the needs of IDPs and respond on their rights violations (scoping mission report).

Project assessed need of the local CSOs assisting IDPs to enhance effectiveness of their work (infographic).

The monitoring methodology for observing IDP rights and a respective toolkit were developed.

The OO through its regional network conducted monitoring of IDPs rights in 23 oblasts two reports (on IDPs' rights observance and gender gap) were developed and discussed with OO and CSOs experts. This led to the OO recommendations to the Government

**5. Did the project generate knowledge, particularly lessons learned (i.e., what has worked and what has not) – and has this knowledge informed management decisions and changes/course correction? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)**

- 3: Knowledge and lessons learned (gained, for example, from Peer Assists, After Action Reviews or Lessons Learned Workshops) backed by credible evidence from evaluation, analysis and monitoring were meetings and reflected in the minutes. There is clear evidence that the project's theory of change was adjusted, as needed, and changes were made to the project to ensure its continued relevance. (both must be true to select this option)
- 2: Knowledge and lessons learned backed by relatively limited evidence, drawn mainly from within the project, were considered by the project team. There is some evidence that changes were made to the project to ensure its continued relevance. (both must be true to select this option)
- 1: There is limited or no evidence that knowledge and lessons learned were collected by the project team. There is little or no evidence that this informed project decision making.

#### Evidence

The project had been regularly updating lessons learned and knowledge gained through 2017-2018. Lessons learned were regularly considered during development of AWP's and discussed during Project Board meetings.

### 6. Were the project's special measures (through outputs, activities, indicators) to address gender inequalities and empower women relevant and produce the intended effect? If not, were evidence-based changes made? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

- 3: The project team systematically gathered data and evidence on the relevance of the special measures in addressing gender inequalities and empowering women. Analysis of data and evidence were used to make changes, as appropriate. (both must be true to select this option)
- 2: The project team had some data and evidence on the relevance of the special measures in addressing gender inequalities and empowering women. There is evidence that at least some adjustments were made to select this option)
- 1: The project team had limited or no evidence on the relevance of the special measures in addressing gender inequalities and empowering women. No evidence that adjustments and/or changes were made or changes were made if the project had no special measures in addressing gender inequalities and empowering women relevant to project results and activities.

#### Evidence

Project systematically worked on gender mainstreaming and empowerment of women through:

- 1) supporting Ombudsperson participation with alternative position in frame of CEDAW reporting;
- 2) special gender analysis in the framework of IDPs' rights survey;
- 3) assessment of relevant gender trends in the Human Rights Baseline Study (followed by the Progress Study).  
<http://www.ua.undp.org/content/ukraine/en/home/library/recovery-and-peacebuilding/humanrightsresearch.html> ;
- 4) mainstreaming gender into the Regional Coordinators selection process, resulting in OO regional network is a relatively gender-balanced (more than 50% are women).  
<http://www.ombudsman.gov.ua/en/page/secretariat/regionalni-predstavnicztva-upovnovazhenogo/regionalni-koordinatori.html>

### 7. Was the project sufficiently at scale, or is there potential to scale up in the future, to meaningfully contribute to development change? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

- 3: There is credible evidence that the project reached a sufficient number of beneficiaries (either directly through significant coverage of target groups, or indirectly, through policy change) to meaningfully contribute to development change.
- 2: While the project was not considered at scale, there are explicit plans in place to scale up the initiative in the future (e.g. by extending its coverage in a second phase or using project results to advocate for change).
- 1: The project was not at scale, and there are no plans currently to scale up the initiative in the future.

#### Evidence

- 1) Through the OO regional network project activities covered all the territory of Ukraine, including small-towns and rural areas (<http://www.ombudsman.gov.ua/en/page/secretariat/regionalni-predstavnicztva-upovnovazhenogo>). More than 12 500 people were assisted by the OO regional network during project implementation.
- 2) The training course on human rights for investigating judges is now institutionalized in the National School of Judges. This course is included into mandatory training package for candidates who are designated for the OO regional network (<http://www.ua.undp.org/content/ukraine/en/home/presscenter/articles/2017/08/03/new-human-rights-course-developed-for-ukrainian-judges.html>);
- 3) The course on Human Rights and the Methodological Materials for journalism education were developed and integrated into curricula of 16 journalism institutes;
- 4) results of the Human Rights Baseline Study included into the textbooks on civic education <https://pidruchnyk.com.ua/1187-gromadyanska-osvita-10-klas-vasykiv.html>

## Social & Environmental Standards

Quality Rating: Exemplary

### 8. Did the project seek to further the realization of human rights using a human rights-based approach? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

- 3: There is credible evidence that the project aimed to further the realization of human rights, on the basis of applying a human rights based approach. Any potential adverse impacts on enjoyment of human rights were managed and mitigated through the project's management of risks. (all must be true to select this option)
- 2: There is some evidence that the project aimed to further the realization of human rights. Potential adverse impacts on the enjoyment of human rights were identified and adequately mitigated through the project's management of risks. (all must be true to select this option)
- 1: There is no evidence that the project aimed to further the realization of human rights. There is limited or no evidence that potential adverse impacts on the enjoyment of human rights were managed.

#### Evidence

- 1) All activities of the Project directly aimed on implementation of HRBA.
- 2) Moreover, the project was involved into human rights monitoring in the country (Human Rights Baseline Study <http://www.ua.undp.org/content/ukraine/en/home/library/recovery-and-peacebuilding/humanrightsresearch-2018.html>; Progress Study [http://www.ua.undp.org/content/ukraine/uk/home/library/democratic\\_governance/humanrightsresearch-2018.html](http://www.ua.undp.org/content/ukraine/uk/home/library/democratic_governance/humanrightsresearch-2018.html); Monitoring of IDPs' rights [http://www.ua.undp.org/content/ukraine/en/home/library/democratic\\_governance/IDPs-human-rights-observance.html](http://www.ua.undp.org/content/ukraine/en/home/library/democratic_governance/IDPs-human-rights-observance.html) etc.)
- 3) As a result of the project activities Human Rights and HRBA became an integral part of the journalists' education (<http://www.ua.undp.org/content/ukraine/en/home/presscenter/articles/2017/11/20/changing-journalists-values-foundation.html>) <http://www.ua.undp.org/content/ukraine/en/home/presscenter/articles/2018/UNDP-promotes-human-rights-in-journalism-education.html>
- 4) Special HRBA training was conducted for the OO regional network to increase their capacities in the respective area;
- 5) Project constantly supported promotion of implementation of the UPR recommendations <http://www.ua.undp.org/content/ukraine/en/home/presscenter/pressreleases/2018/forum-to-mark-70th-anniversary-of-the>

### 9. Were social and environmental impacts and risks (including those related to human rights, gender and environment) successfully managed and monitored in accordance with the project document? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project) (projects that have no social and environmental risks the answer is "Yes")

- Yes
- No

#### Evidence

Risks related to human rights and gender were monitored on regular basis and relevant update included in the progress reports.

Moreover, relevant assessment was used as a background for the new phase of the project - Human Rights for Ukraine 2019-2023

**10. Were any unanticipated social and environmental issues or grievances that arose during implementation assessed and adequately managed, with relevant management plans updated? (for project unanticipated social and environmental risks or grievances the answer is "Yes")**

- Yes
- No

#### Evidence

The project did not face any unanticipated risks in frame of the project cycle

### Management & Monitoring

Quality Rating: Exemplary

**11. Was the project's M&E Plan adequately implemented? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)**

- 3: Progress data against indicators in the project's RRF was reported regularly using highly credible data sources and collected according to the frequency stated in the project's M&E plan, including sex disaggregated evaluations, if conducted, fully met decentralized evaluation standards, including gender UNEG standards, and management responses were fully implemented. Lessons learned, including during evaluations, were captured and used when necessary. (all must be true to select this option)
- 2: Progress data against indicators in the project's RRF was collected on a regular basis, although there may have been some slippage in following the frequency stated in the project's M&E plan and data source evaluations conducted meet most decentralized evaluation standards; management responses were fully implemented to the extent possible. Lessons learned have been captured but not used to take collective action on them (this option)
- 1: Progress data either was not collected against the indicators in the project's RRF, or limited data was collected but not regularly; evaluations did not meet decentralized evaluation standards; and/or lessons learned were not used.

#### Evidence

M&E plan developed, progress data against project's RRF is being reported regularly (the latest presentation on the board meeting in November 2018). Moreover, based on developed M&E plan indicators matrix of the Project logframe was updated and approved on the board meeting in 2017. Lessons learned were captured regularly and considered during development of AWP's and discussed on the Project Boards

**12. Did the project's governance mechanism (i.e., the project board or equivalent) function as intended? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)**

- The project's governance mechanism operated very well, and is a model for other projects. It met in the agreed frequency stated in the project document and the minutes of the meetings are all on file. There was progress reporting to the project board or equivalent on results, risks and opportunities. It is clear that the project board explicitly reviewed and used evidence, including progress data, knowledge, lessons and evaluation findings to inform management decisions (e.g., change in strategy, approach, work plan.) (all must be true to select this option)
- The project's governance mechanism met in the agreed frequency and minutes of the meeting are on file. A project progress report was submitted to the project board or equivalent at least once per year, covering results, risks and opportunities. (both must be true to select this option)
- The project's governance mechanism did not meet in the frequency stated in the project document, and/or the project board or equivalent did not function as a decision making body for the project as intended.

#### Evidence

The Project Board meetings and reporting were performed accordingly to the Project document and ToR of the Project Board.

**13. Were risks to the project adequately monitored and managed? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)**

- 3: The project actively monitored risks every quarter including consulting with key stakeholders at least annually to identify continuing and emerging risks to project implementation and to assess if the main risks were being managed. There is clear evidence that relevant management plans and mitigating measures were fully implemented to address each key project risk, and some evidence that risk mitigation has benefitted performance. (all must be true to select this option)
- 2: The project monitored risks every quarter, as evidenced by a regularly updated risk log. Some updates were made to management plans and mitigation measures. (both must be true to select this option)
- 1: The risk log was not updated every quarter as required. There may be some evidence that the project monitored risks that could have affected the project's achievement of results, but there is no explicit evidence that mitigation measures were taken to mitigate risks. The project's performance was disrupted by factors that could have been anticipated or managed.

#### Evidence

The risks were monitored on the regular basis, presented and discussed on the Project Board meetings. During mid-term evaluation of the project by the donor this practice was recognized as a positive one.

### Efficient

Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory

**14. Adequate resources were mobilized to achieve intended results. If not, management decisions were taken to adjust expected results in the project's results framework.**

- Yes
- No

#### Evidence

The project was designed adequately to achieve relevant results.

**15. Were project inputs procured and delivered on time to efficiently contribute to results? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)**

- 3: The project had a procurement plan and kept it updated. Implementation of the plan was generally on or ahead of schedule. On a quarterly basis, the project reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs and addressed them through appropriate management actions. (all must be true to select this option)

2: The project had a procurement plan and kept it updated. The project annually reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addressed them through appropriate management actions (this option)

1: The project did not have an updated procurement plan. The project team may have reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs regularly, however management actions were not taken to address them. Operational bottlenecks were not reviewed during the project in a timely manner.

#### Evidence

Project had relevant procurement plan relevantly updated on regular basis.

#### 16. Was there regular monitoring and recording of cost efficiencies, taking into account the expected quality of results? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

3: There is evidence that the project regularly reviewed costs against relevant comparators (e.g., other projects or country offices) or industry benchmarks to ensure the project maximized results delivered while actively coordinated with other relevant ongoing projects and initiatives (UNDP or other) to ensure complementarity and sought efficiencies wherever possible (e.g. joint activities.) (both must be true to select this option)

2: The project monitored its own costs and gave anecdotal examples of cost efficiencies (e.g., spending less to get the same result,) but there was no systematic analysis of costs and no link to the expected quality of results. The project communicated with a few other projects to coordinate activities. (both must be true to select this option)

1: There is little or no evidence that the project monitored its own costs and considered ways to save money beyond following standard procurement rules. It is not clear that the link between cost savings and quality of results was established.

#### Evidence

Project had built good synergies with other sister UNDP projects (DHRP, CSDR, ETI, Rada for Europe, Rule of Law) as well good cooperation was established with CoE projects (on monitoring methodology of IDP Twinning project for the OO etc.

Relevant cooperation on the regular basis reported to donor being a part of reporting template (the latest in July 2018)

Effective

Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory

#### 17. Is there evidence that project outputs contributed to the achievement of programme outcomes?

Yes

No

#### Evidence

The project had contributed into implementation of CPD Output 2.3: Capacities of human rights institutions strengthened

#### 18. The project delivered its expected outputs.

Yes

No

#### Evidence

Project was on track to deliver its expected output as reflected in project reporting with further approval by the Project Board. The final Project Board positively assessed the achievement of the Project results.

#### 19. Were there regular reviews of the work plan to ensure that the project was on track to achieve the desired results, and to inform course corrections if needed? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

3: Quarterly progress data informed regular reviews of the project work plan to ensure that the activities implemented were most likely to achieve the desired results. There is evidence that data and lessons learned were used to inform course corrections, as needed. (both must be true to select this option)

2: There was at least one review of the work plan each year with a view to assessing if project activities were on track to achieving the desired development results (i.e., outputs.) There is no evidence that data and lessons learned were used to inform the review(s).

1: While the project team may have reviewed the work plan at least once per year to ensure outputs were delivered on time, no link was made to the delivery of desired development results. Select this option if the work plan by management took place.

#### Evidence

Work plans were duly revised during Project Boards and in the framework of the UNDP AWP review procedure.

#### 20. Were the intended targeted groups systematically identified and engaged, prioritizing the marginalized and excluded, to ensure results were achieved as expected? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)

3: Targeted groups were systematically identified using credible data sources on their capacity needs, deprivation and/or exclusion from development opportunities relevant to the project's area of work. There is evidence that targeted groups were reached as intended. The project engaged regularly with targeted groups to assess whether they benefitted as expected and adjustments were made if necessary to refine targeting. (all must be true to select this option)

2: The project targeted specific groups and/or geographic areas, based on some evidence of their capacity needs, deprivation and/or exclusion from development opportunities relevant to the project's area of work. There was some engagement with beneficiaries to assess whether they benefitted as expected. (all must be true to select this option)

1: The project did not report on specific targeted groups, or there is no evidence to confirm that project beneficiaries have capacity needs or are populations deprived and/or excluded from development opportunities relevant to the project's area of work. There may have been some engagement with beneficiaries to assess whether they benefitted as expected, but not regularly.

Not Applicable

#### Evidence

1) Output 4 of the Project was designed specifically to address the needs of IDPs and respond on their rights violations.

2) The monitoring methodology for observing IDP rights and a respective toolkit were developed.

3) OO key staff and OO regional network were trained to use this toolkit;

[http://www.coe.int/en/web/kyiv/idps/-/asset\\_publisher/apxzANo4kCFp/content/approbation-of-a-methodology-on-monitoring-the-human-rights-of-internally-displaced-persons-in-the-regions-of-ukraine?](http://www.coe.int/en/web/kyiv/idps/-/asset_publisher/apxzANo4kCFp/content/approbation-of-a-methodology-on-monitoring-the-human-rights-of-internally-displaced-persons-in-the-regions-of-ukraine?)

inheritRedirect=false&redirect=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.coe.int%2Fuk%2Fweb%2Fkyiv%2Fids%3Fp\_id%3D101\_INSTANCE\_apxzANo4kCFp%26p\_p\_lifecycle%3D0%26p\_p\_state%3Dnormal%26p\_p\_mode%3%26p\_p\_col\_count%3D1)

4) The OO through its regional network conducted monitoring of IDPs rights in 23 oblasts and relevant report was developed and recommendations submitted to the Government.

**21. Were at least 40 per cent of the personnel hired by the project, regardless of contract type, female?**

- Yes
- No

**Evidence**

4 staff members were female, 1 - male.

**Sustainability & National Ownership**

**Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory**

**22. Were stakeholders and partners fully engaged in the decision-making, implementation and monitoring of the project? (select the option from 1-3 that best reflects the project)**

- 3: Only national systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) were to fully implement and monitor the project. All relevant stakeholders and partners were fully and actively engaged in the process, decision-making, implementation and monitoring. (all must be true to select this option)
- 2: *National systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) were used in combination with other support (such as country office support or project systems) to implement and monitor the project, as national stakeholders and partners were actively engaged in the process, playing an active role in project decision-making, implementation and monitoring. (both must be true to select this option)*
- 1: There was relatively limited or no engagement with national stakeholders and partners in the decision-making, implementation and/or monitoring of the project.
- Not Applicable

**Evidence**

Project Beneficiary duly participated in project decision-making, implementation and monitoring in accordance with the Project document. The project was a subject to a standard national monitoring and evaluation under the Regulation of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine #153 "On establishment of the unified system of attraction, usage and monitoring of assistance" of 15 February 2002.

**23. Were there regular monitoring of changes in capacities and performance of institutions and systems, and were the implementation arrangements adjusted according to changes in partner capacities that best reflects the project)**

- 3: *Changes in capacities and performance of national institutions and systems were regularly and comprehensively assessed/monitored using clear indicators, rigorous methods of data collection and credible evidence that capacities and performance of national institutions and systems improved by the end of the project, if applicable. Implementation arrangements were formally reviewed and adjusted, if needed, in accordance with changes in partner capacities. (all must be true to select this option)*
- 2: Aspects of changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems were monitored by the project using indicators and reasonably credible data sources. There is limited evidence that national institutions and systems improved by the end of the project, if applicable. Some adjustment was made to implementation arrangements if needed to reflect changes in partner capacities. (all must be true to select this option)
- 1: Some aspects of changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems may have been monitored by the project, however changes to implementation arrangements were not made in response to changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems were not monitored by the project.
- Not Applicable

**Evidence**

1) In the framework of the Human Rights Baseline Study a number of questions in the national survey and target groups polls were dedicated to the effectiveness of the OO and its awareness among population and institutions (http://www.ua.undp.org/content/ukraine/en/home/library/recovery-and-peacebuilding/humanrightsresearch.html) as well in frame of the Progress Study, which allowed to assess achievements. The results were presented at the final project board

2) Project closely cooperated with EU Twinning project aimed on assessment capacities of the OO and providing recommendations on increasing its effectiveness (http://www.ombudsman.gov.ua/ua/all-news/pr/21017-bq-yevropejski-eksperti-rekomenduyut-zaluchiti-gromadyanske-suspilstvo-do/)

3) An assessment of the OO regional network effectiveness was conducted.

**24. Were the transition and phase-out arrangements implemented as planned by the end of the project, taking into account any adjustments made to the plan during implementation? (select the option that best reflects the project)**

- 3: *The project's governance mechanism regularly reviewed the project's sustainability plan, including arrangements for transition and phase-out, to ensure the project remained on track in meeting the requirements set out by the plan, taking into account any adjustments made during implementation. (both must be true to select this option)*
- 2: There was a review of the project's sustainability plan, including arrangements for transition and phase-out, to ensure the project remained on track in meeting the requirements set out by the plan. The project, taking into account any adjustments made during implementation. (both must be true to select this option)
- 1: The project may have had a sustainability plan that specified arrangements for transition and phase-out, but there was no review of this strategy after it was developed. Also select this option if the project did not have a sustainability plan.

**Evidence**

The project sustainability plan had been developed and presented to the donor with relevant update on the regular basis (the later on July 2018).

**25. Please upload the final lessons learned report that was produced for this project.**

**Summary/Final Project Board Comments:**

The Project implementation had provided for adequate quality.

