

Closure Stage Quality Assurance Report

Form Status: Approved

Overall Rating:	Satisfactory
Decision:	
Portfolio/Project Number:	00090398
Portfolio/Project Title:	Parliamentary Reform Project (PRP)
Portfolio/Project Date:	2019-02-14 / 2022-01-13

Strategic

Quality Rating: Exemplary

1. Did the project pro-actively identified changes to the external environment and incorporated them into the project strategy?

- ☒ 3: *The project team identified relevant changes in the external environment that may present new opportunities or threats to the project's ability to achieve its objectives, assumptions were tested to determine if the project's strategy was valid. There is some evidence that the project board considered the implications, and documented the changes needed to the project in response. (all must be true)*
- ☐ 2: The project team identified relevant changes in the external environment that may present new opportunities or threats to the project's ability to achieve its objectives. There is some evidence that the project board discussed this, but relevant changes did not fully integrate in the project. (both must be true)
- ☐ 1: The project team considered relevant changes in the external environment since implementation began, but there is no evidence that the project team considered these changes to the project as a result.

Evidence:

The project team identified relevant changes in the external environment which were reflected in the project reporting followed by a relevant discussion during Board meeting on 19 November 2019 and 24 June 2020 as well as in the amendments to the Agreement with the EU for no-cost extension of the project for 8 months.

The COVID-19 pandemic and lockdown required changes to the work approaches. Operating in quarantine conditions revealed a number of trends that should be taken into account in future planning to address physical distancing requirements and lockdown. This translated into reducing travel, training and conference expenses, while increasing allocations for contracting, equipment and audio/video materials production. The detailed deviations were addressed by the Steering Committee.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	MinutesPRP_SCmeeting_19112019_9824_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MinutesPRP_SCmeeting_19112019_9824_301.pdf)	olena.kulikovska@undp.org	12/17/2021 5:11:00 PM
2	SCminutes24.06.20_EN_9824_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SCminutes24.06.20_EN_9824_301.pdf)	olena.kulikovska@undp.org	12/17/2021 5:13:00 PM
3	Addendum1-Annexlamendment_9824_301 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Addendum1-Annexlamendment_9824_301.pdf)	olena.kulikovska@undp.org	12/17/2021 5:14:00 PM

2. Was the project aligned with the thematic focus of the Strategic Plan?

- ☒ 3: *The project responded to at least one of the development settings as specified in the Strategic Plan (SP) and adopted at least one Signature Solution .The project's RRF included all the relevant SP output indicators. (all must be true)*
- ☐ 2: The project responded to at least one of the developments settings1 as specified in the Strategic Plan. The project's RRF included at least one SP output indicator, if relevant. (both must be true)
- ☐ 1: While the project may have responded to a partner's identified need, this need falls outside of the UNDP Strategic Plan. Also select this option if none of the relevant SP indicators are included in the RRF.

Evidence:

The project responds to Development setting 2: Accelerate structural transformations for sustainable development and adopts Signature solution 2: Strengthen effective, inclusive and accountable governance. The project contributes to SP Output 2.2.2 Constitution-making, electoral and parliamentary processes and institutions strengthened to promote inclusion, transparency and accountability.

Indicator:

Number of parliaments with improved capacities to undertake inclusive, effective and accountable law-making, oversight and representation.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Relevant**Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory**

3. Were the project's targeted groups systematically identified and engaged, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized, to ensure the project remained relevant for them?

- ☐ 3: Systematic and structured feedback was collected over the project duration from a representative sample of beneficiaries, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized, as part of the project's monitoring system. Representatives from the targeted groups were active members of the project's governance mechanism (i.e., the project board or equivalent) and there is credible evidence that their feedback informs project decision making. (all must be true)
- ☒ 2: *Targeted groups were engaged in implementation and monitoring, with a priority focus on the discriminated and marginalized. Beneficiary feedback, which may be anecdotal, was collected regularly to ensure the project addressed local priorities. 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:

The project key target groups included: the leadership of the VRU (Chairperson, Deputy Chairpersons, Chairperson's and deputy Chairpersons' Offices), VRU Committees, Members of the VRU as well as their assistants, VRU Secretariat, including Committee Secretariats, civil society organizations and analytical think-tanks engaging in parliamentary monitoring and reform support, and the media. All these target groups are permanently involved in project implementation. Prioritization of vulnerable groups participation in project activities was provided through implementation of #RadaForReforms component through the introduction of HRBA and GBA into the legislative process (introduction of the end-to-end legislative approach through pre- and post-legislative scrutiny, upgrading legislative drafting requirements guidelines, guidelines and analytical tools, strategic planning and prioritization of legislative process) and parliamentary oversight function, namely as regards UN human rights instruments.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	EU4RADA_parliamentary_oversight_2019_eng_9824_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/EU4RADA_parliamentary_oversight_2019_eng_9824_303.pdf)	olena.kulikovska@undp.org	12/17/2021 5:22:00 PM
2	Guidance_9824_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Guidance_9824_303.pdf)	olena.kulikovska@undp.org	12/17/2021 5:23:00 PM
3	InternationalA5En3_9824_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/InternationalA5En3_9824_303.pdf)	olena.kulikovska@undp.org	12/17/2021 5:23:00 PM
4	undpanalizA5print_9824_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/undpanalizA5print_9824_303.pdf)	olena.kulikovska@undp.org	12/17/2021 5:23:00 PM
5	PRP_Concept_note_legislative_process_UKR_9824_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PRP_Concept_note_legislative_process_UKR_9824_303.pdf)	olena.kulikovska@undp.org	12/17/2021 5:31:00 PM
6	PRP_On_expertise_UKR_9824_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PRP_On_expertise_UKR_9824_303.pdf)	olena.kulikovska@undp.org	12/17/2021 5:31:00 PM
7	PRP_SDGs_and_parliaments_ENG_9824_303 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/PRP_SDGs_and_parliaments_ENG_9824_303.pdf)	olena.kulikovska@undp.org	12/17/2021 5:31:00 PM

4. Did the project generate knowledge, and lessons learned (i.e., what has worked and what has not) and has this knowledge informed management decisions to ensure the continued relevance of the project towards its stated objectives, the quality of its outputs and the management of risk?

- ☒ 3: Knowledge and lessons learned from internal or external sources (gained, for example, from Peer Assists, After Action Reviews or Lessons Learned Workshops) backed by credible evidence from evaluation, corporate policies/strategies, analysis and monitoring were discussed in project board meetings and reflected in the minutes. There is clear evidence that changes were made to the project to ensure its continued relevance. (both must be true)
- ☐ 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 as a result to ensure its continued relevance. (both must be true)
- ☐ 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 has been regularly updating lessons learned and knowledge gained with further reflection in progress reports and consideration while Steering Committee meetings (with reflection in respective minutes) as well as updated project document (as part of the amendment to the agreement with the EU on no-cost extension of the project duration for 8 months) and the background paper on Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning. The Final Steering Committee approved the lessons learned of the project at its meeting on 18 October 2021.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	MELBackgroundPaperforPRPfinal_9824_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MELBackgroundPaperforPRPfinal_9824_304.pdf)	olena.kulikovska@undp.org	12/22/2021 8:35:00 AM
2	lessonslearned_PRPfinal_9824_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/lessonslearned_PRPfinal_9824_304.docx)	olena.kulikovska@undp.org	12/22/2021 8:36:00 AM
3	minutesoftheSCmeeting_18.10.2021_ENG_9824_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/minutesoftheSCmeeting_18.10.2021_ENG_9824_304.docx)	olena.kulikovska@undp.org	12/22/2021 8:36:00 AM
4	Addendum1-Annexlamendment_9824_304 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Addendum1-Annexlamendment_9824_304.pdf)	olena.kulikovska@undp.org	12/22/2021 8:37:00 AM

5. Was the project sufficiently at scale, or is there potential to scale up in the future, to meaningfully contribute to development change?

- ☒ 3: *There was credible evidence that the project reached 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 project in the future (e.g. by extending its coverage or using project results to advocate for policy change).
- ☐ 1: The project was not at scale, and there are no plans to scale up the project in the future.

Evidence:

The project was sufficiently on scale and significantly contributed to the overall parliamentary reform, namely:

- 50 MPs and their assistants as well as 115 VRU staff developed their capacity on pre- and post-legislative scrutiny;
- More than 850 employees of the VRU Secretariat participated in the online course on document management;
- Over 990 VRU Secretariat staff members and other parliamentary stakeholders took part in the online webinars and passed online training courses developed by the project;
- 18 online training courses have been developed and uploaded to the online training platform of the VRU Secretariat;
- More than 442,000 women and men, girls and boys built their knowledge on the work of Rada through targeted civic engagement activities (offline and online).

The project contributed to streamlining business processes of the Parliament in terms of legislative planning by supporting the development and implementation of the first VRU Plan of Legislative Work.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Principled**Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

6. Were the project's measures (through outputs, activities, indicators) to address gender inequalities and empower women relevant and produced the intended effect? If not, evidence-based adjustments and changes were made.

- ☒ 3: *The project team gathered data and evidence through project monitoring on the relevance of the measures to address gender inequalities and empower women. Analysis of data and evidence were used to inform adjustments and changes, as appropriate. (both must be true)*
- ☐ 2: The project team had some data and evidence on the relevance of the measures to address gender inequalities and empower women. There is evidence that at least some adjustments were made, as appropriate. (both must be true)
- ☐ 1: The project team had limited or no evidence on the relevance of measures to address gender inequalities and empowering women. No evidence of adjustments and/or changes made. This option should also be selected if the project has no measures to address gender inequalities and empower women relevant to the project results and activities.

Evidence:

Gender analysis conducted; gender needs reflected in the project strategy and RRF.

All project activities were based on the principles of the human rights based approach (HRBA) and a gender-based approach (GBA). The PRP annual work plans were prepared with integrated gender equality objectives throughout the project's implementation.

PRP mainstreamed gender issues in all its activities with a special emphasis in Human Resources Development Strategy of the VRU Secretariat – to make gender equality an integral part of the Human Resources policies of the Secretariat. PRO experts contributed to developing methodology of conducting gender audit in the VRU Secretariat which was approved and is part of VRU Secretariat procedures.

The Project facilitated gender mainstreaming in the work of VRU Secretariat, in particular by:

- developing methodical recommendations for the introduction of gender equality standards in the Secretariat;
- provision of gender analysis of the structural units of the Secretariat;
- holding trainings for VRU Secretariat gender focal points;
- development of the curriculum for an online course on the implementation of gender equality standards in the Secretariat;
- preparation of the handbook "Integration of gender approaches and increasing the institutional capacity of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine to implement a comprehensive gender approach" upon the request of VRU Secretariat;

Also, upon request of the Human Rights Committee and in cooperation with the leadership of the VRU and Equal Opportunities Caucus the guide "Gender equality: myths, facts and the state policy" for members of the Parliament was developed in cooperation with the Office of the Government Commissioner for Gender Equality Policy. The purpose of the guide is to present key facts and modern trends in the implementation of gender equality state policy in Ukraine. The manual was presented and disseminated on 6 March 2020 - on the eve of the International Women's Day 2020.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Gender_Equality_guide_VRU_20201_9824_306 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Gender_Equality_guide_VRU_20201_9824_306.pdf)	olena.kulikovska@undp.org	12/22/2021 5:18:00 PM
2	Gender_Equality_facts_cards_VRU_2020_9824_306 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Gender_Equality_facts_cards_VRU_2020_9824_306.pdf)	olena.kulikovska@undp.org	12/22/2021 5:18:00 PM
3	26.Експертнийаналіз_ґендер_9824_306 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/26.Експертнийаналіз_ґендер_9824_306.DOC)	olena.kulikovska@undp.org	12/22/2021 5:20:00 PM
4	29.1.Методрекомендації_ґендернийаудит_9824_306 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/29.1.Методрекомендації_ґендернийаудит_9824_306.doc)	olena.kulikovska@undp.org	12/22/2021 5:20:00 PM

7. Were social and environmental impacts and risks successfully managed and monitored?

- ☐ 3: Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. Appropriate assessments conducted where required (i.e., Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) for High risk projects and some level of social and environmental assessment for Moderate risk projects as identified through SESP). Relevant management plan(s) developed for identified risks through consultative process and implemented, resourced, and monitored. Risks effectively managed or mitigated. If there is a substantive change to the project or change in context that affects risk levels, the SESP was updated to reflect these changes. (all must be true)
- ☒ 2: *Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. Appropriate assessments conducted where required (i.e., Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) for High risk projects and some level of social and environmental assessment for Moderate risk projects as identified through SESP). Relevant management plan(s) developed, implemented and monitored for identified risks. OR project was categorized as Low risk through the SESP.*
- ☐ 1: Social and environmental risks were tracked in the risk log. For projects categorized as High or Moderate Risk, there was no evidence that social and environmental assessments completed and/or management plans or measures development, implemented or monitored. There are substantive changes to the project or changes in the context but SESP was not updated. (any may be true)

Evidence:

The project was categorized as Low risk through the SESP.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

8. Were grievance mechanisms available to project-affected people and were grievances (if any) addressed to ensure any perceived harm was effectively mitigated?

- ☐ 3: Project-affected people actively informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism (SRM/SECU) and how to access it. If the project was categorized as High or Moderate Risk through the SESP, a project -level grievance mechanism was in place and project affected people informed. If grievances were received, they were effectively addressed in accordance with SRM Guidance. (all must be true)
- ☒ 2: *Project-affected people informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism and how to access it. If the project was categorized as High Risk through the SESP, a project -level grievance mechanism was in place and project affected people informed. If grievances were received, they were responded to but faced challenges in arriving at a resolution.*
- ☐ 1: Project-affected people was not informed of UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism. If grievances were received, they were not responded to. (any may be true)

Evidence:

Project design does not provide separate informing on UNDP's Corporate Accountability Mechanism, therefore it is made by means of UNDP communication resources.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Management & Monitoring**Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

9. Was the project's M&E Plan adequately implemented?

- ☒ 3: The project had a comprehensive and costed M&E plan. Baselines, targets and milestones were fully populated. Progress data against indicators in the project's RRF was reported regularly using credible data sources and collected according to the frequency stated in the Plan, including sex disaggregated data as relevant. Any evaluations conducted, if relevant, fully meet decentralized evaluation standards, including gender UNEG standards. Lessons learned, included during evaluations and/or After-Action Reviews, were used to take corrective actions when necessary. (all must be true)
- ☐ 2: The project costed M&E Plan, and most baselines and targets were populated. Progress data against indicators in the project's RRF was collected on a regular basis, although there may be some slippage in following the frequency stated in the Plan and data sources was not always reliable. Any evaluations conducted, if relevant, met most decentralized evaluation standards. Lessons learned were captured but were used to take corrective actions. (all must be true)
- ☐ 1: The project had M&E Plan, but costs were not clearly planned and budgeted for, or were unrealistic. Progress data was not regularly collected against the indicators in the project's RRF. Evaluations did not meet decentralized evaluation standards. Lessons learned were rarely captured and used. Select this option also if the project did not have an M&E plan.

Evidence:

The project had a comprehensive and costed M&E plan reflected in the project RRF. Costs were properly budgeted.

Baselines, targets and milestones were fully populated. Progress data against indicators in the project's RRF were reported regularly using credible data sources and collected according to the frequency stated in the Plan, including sex disaggregated data as relevant. Lessons learned were used to take corrective actions, especially regarding the COVID-19 pandemics.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	lessonslearned_PRPfinal_9824_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/lessonslearned_PRPfinal_9824_309.docx)	olena.kulikovska@undp.org	12/22/2021 5:23:00 PM
2	MELBackgroundPaperforPRPfinal_9824_309 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MELBackgroundPaperforPRPfinal_9824_309.pdf)	olena.kulikovska@undp.org	12/22/2021 5:23:00 PM

10. Was the project's governance mechanism (i.e., the project board or equivalent) function as intended?

- ☐ 3: The project's governance mechanism operated well, and was a model for other projects. It met in the agreed frequency stated in the project document and the minutes of the meetings were all on file. There was regular (at least annual) 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 evaluations, as the basis for informing management decisions (e.g., change in strategy, approach, work plan.) (all must be true to select this option)
- ☐ 2: 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)
- ☒ 1: *The project's governance mechanism did not meet in the frequency stated in the project document over the past year and/or the project board or equivalent was not functioning as a decision-making body for the project as intended.*

Evidence:

The project Steering Committee didn't meet in the frequency stated in the project document over the past year due to the postponements initiated by the donor and the beneficiary.

Furthermore, one of the project management mechanisms (PRO Consultative and Oversight Board) has not been established.

Management Response:

The challenge was discussed with the stakeholders at the final steering committee meeting held on 18 October 2021. The feedback collected during the meeting as well as through the final evaluation of the EU support to parliamentary reform will be duly reflected in the project lessons learned to take into consideration in the future interventions.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

11. Were risks to the project adequately monitored and managed?

- ☐ 3: The project monitored risks every quarter and consulted with the key stakeholders, security advisors, to identify continuing and emerging risks to assess if the main assumptions remained valid. There is clear evidence that relevant management plans and mitigating measures were fully implemented to address each key project risk and were updated to reflect the latest risk assessment. (all must be true)
- ☒ 2: *The project monitored risks every year, as evidenced by an updated risk log. Some updates were made to management plans and mitigation measures.*
- ☐ 1: The risk log was not updated as required. There was may be some evidence that the project monitored risks that may affected the project's achievement of results, but there is no explicit evidence that management actions were taken to mitigate risks.

Evidence:

The project monitored risks on a regular basis (in progress reports; during the Board Meeting in November 2019, June 2020, October 2021 and in regular portfolio / project reporting and planning sessions in July 2019, January 2020, July 2020, July 2021), relevant changes were introduced in the Project management module in Atlas.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	AnnexC.RisksAnalysis_Sept2021_ENG_9824_311 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/AnnexC.RisksAnalysis_Sept2021_ENG_9824_311.docx)	olena.kulikovska@undp.org	12/22/2021 5:30:00 PM

Efficient**Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory**

12. 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. Also, due to EUR/USD exchange rate fluctuations while receiving of the second tranche the total budget decreased by USD 63,282, which had required budget revision. The respective budget revision was approved by the Steering Committee.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	SCminutes24.06.20_EN_9824_312 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SCminutes24.06.20_EN_9824_312.pdf)	olena.kulikovska@undp.org	12/22/2021 5:31:00 PM

13. Were project inputs procured and delivered on time to efficiently contribute to results?

- ☐ 3: The project had a procurement plan and kept it updated. The project quarterly reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addressed them through appropriate management actions. (all must be true)
- ☒ 2: *The project had updated procurement plan. The project annually reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs in a timely manner and addressed them through appropriate management actions. (all must be true)*
- ☐ 1: The project did not have an updated procurement plan. The project team may or may not have reviewed operational bottlenecks to procuring inputs regularly, however management actions were not taken to address them.

Evidence:

The project had a relevant procurement plan updated on a regular basis.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

14. Was there regular monitoring and recording of cost efficiencies, taking into account the expected quality of results?

- ☒ 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 with given resources. The project 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)*
- ☐ 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 delivered. The project coordinated activities with other projects to achieve cost efficiency gains.
- ☐ 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.

Evidence:

The project was the EU-funded initiative strongly connected to UNDP's Democratic Governance Programme. Support to the Parliamentary Committee on Human Rights in strengthening its oversight capacity was provided in synergy with the Human Rights for Ukraine project as well as other UNDP projects that had a strong human rights Component. Within the support provided by the CSDR project to the development of legislation on youth, the PRP provided advice on ensuring proper legislative drafting, cooperation and discussion of the draft law.

The project coordinated closely with other UN Agencies – UNHCR, UN Women – on supporting VRU activities on monitoring implementation of the international human right treaties.

The project worked with other actors supporting parliamentary development and public administration reform in Ukraine. With regard to supporting the improvement of the legislative process and parliamentary oversight in Ukraine, the project cooperated closely with the USAID RADA program and the Westminster Foundation for Democracy (WfD). The project and PRO cooperated with the USAID Rada Program to support the VRU Secretariat in citizen education and engagement activities. Activities in support of the VRU Education Centre were coordinated by the working group established in March 2019. The Project (through a PRO expert) contributed to a 5-year strategic plan for the Education Centre on which the USAID RADA Program is currently working. On the other hand, the USAID RADA Program actively engaged in the development of a communication strategy for the Educational Centre that is led by PRO experts. The Project organized online Coordination meetings with the USAID RADA Program to discuss the plans and future cooperation.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

Effective**Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

15. Was the project on track and delivered its expected outputs?

- ☒ Yes
☐ No

Evidence:

The project was on track and delivered expected outputs, as reflected in project reporting. However, to finalize delayed activities, including procurement cases, caused by Covid-19 and pending clearance of the necessary technical requirements by the beneficiary, the project was extended in duration two time by 8 and 3 months respectively.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Addendum1-AnnexAmendment_9824_315 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Addendum1-AnnexAmendment_9824_315.pdf)	olena.kulikovska@undp.org	12/22/2021 5:34:00 PM
2	AmendmenttoAnnexIDoAADDENDUM2_9824_315 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/AmendmenttoAnnexIDoAADDENDUM2_9824_315.pdf)	olena.kulikovska@undp.org	12/22/2021 5:35:00 PM

16. 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?

- ☐ 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 (including from evaluations /or After-Action Reviews) were used to inform course corrections, as needed. Any necessary budget revisions were made. (both must be true)
- ☒ 2: *There was at least one review of the work plan per year with a view to assessing if project activities were on track to achieving the desired development results (i.e., outputs.) There may or may not be evidence that data or lessons learned were used to inform the review(s). Any necessary budget revisions have been made.*
- ☐ 1: While the project team may have reviewed the work plan at least once over the past year to ensure outputs were delivered on time, no link was made to the delivery of desired development results. Select this option also if no review of the work plan by management took place.

Evidence:

The work plan of the project was duly revised during the Steering Committee meetings in November 2019 and June 2020, portfolio / project planning sessions in July 2019, January 2020, July 2020, January 2021 and July 2021. Lessons learned were used to inform course corrections, especially during COVID-19 pandemics.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	SCminutes24.06.20_EN_9824_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/SCminutes24.06.20_EN_9824_316.pdf)	olena.kulikovska@undp.org	12/22/2021 5:37:00 PM
2	MinutesPRP_SCmeeting_19112019_9824_316 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/MinutesPRP_SCmeeting_19112019_9824_316.pdf)	olena.kulikovska@undp.org	12/22/2021 5:37:00 PM

17. Were the targeted groups systematically identified and engaged, prioritizing the marginalized and excluded, to ensure results were achieved as expected?

- ☐ 3: The project targeted specific groups and/or geographic areas, identified by 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 clear evidence that the targeted groups were reached as intended. The project engaged regularly with targeted groups over the past year to assess whether they benefited as expected and adjustments were made if necessary, to refine targeting. (all must be true)
- ☒ 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. Some evidence is provided to confirm that project beneficiaries are members of the targeted groups. There was some engagement with beneficiaries in the past year to assess whether they were benefiting as expected. (all must be true)*
- ☐ 1: The project did not report on specific targeted groups. There is no evidence to confirm that project beneficiaries are populations have capacity needs or are deprived and/or excluded from development opportunities relevant to the project area of work. There is some engagement with beneficiaries to assess whether they benefited as expected, but it was limited or did not occurred in the past year.
- ☐ Not Applicable

Evidence:

HRBA was part of the project design, incorporated in the Theory of Change, RRF, as well as directly addressed through the capacity development measures for VRU Secretariat. Specifically project targeted women and vulnerable groups through improvement of expertise of draft legislation and parliamentary oversight activities over implementation of UN human rights instruments.

For supporting VRU Committees to strengthen their oversight functions, the project selected the Committee on Human Rights, De-occupation and Reintegration of Temporarily Occupied Territories in Donetsk, Luhansk Regions and Autonomous Republic of Crimea, National Minorities and Interethnic Relations itself and Committee on Digital Transformation as pilots, since their work is concentrated on reducing corruption by digitalizing most of the services state provides to people which greatly affects human rights.

Following the prepared recommendations on building the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine's capacity to monitor international human rights treaties the project developed:

- database for monitoring of reporting of Ukraine to the UN treaty bodies with the timetable for years 2020-2021 and reference to available reports, lists of issues, CSO and NHRI submissions;
- guidelines on the monitoring by the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine of the international human rights treaties' implementation. The training for the committee's members and secretariats took place in June 2020 based on the guidelines.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
---	-----------	-------------	-------------

No documents available.

Sustainability & National Ownership**Quality Rating: Satisfactory**

18. Were stakeholders and national partners fully engaged in the decision-making, implementation and monitoring of the project?

- ☐ 3: Only national systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) were used to fully implement and monitor the project. All relevant stakeholders and partners were fully and actively engaged in the process, playing a lead role in project decision-making, implementation and monitoring. (both must be true)
- ☒ 2: *National systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluation, etc.) were used to implement and monitor the project (such as country office support or project systems) were also used, if necessary. All relevant stakeholders and partners were actively engaged in the process, playing an active role in project decision-making, implementation and monitoring. (both must be true)*
- ☐ 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:

The project beneficiaries duly participated in project decision-making, implementation and monitoring in accordance with the project document. The project did not succeed in engaging all the Members of the Working Group on Internal Reform and Capacity Building of the Parliament into implementation of planned activities and results.

The project was 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 the international technical assistance" of 15 February 2002.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

19. Were there regular monitoring of changes in capacities and performance of institutions and systems relevant to the project, as needed, and were the implementation [arrangements](#)⁸ adjusted according to changes in partner capacities?

- ☐ 3: Changes in capacities and performance of national institutions and systems were assessed/monitored using clear indicators, rigorous methods of data collection and credible data sources including relevant HACT assurance activities. Implementation arrangements were formally reviewed and adjusted, if needed, in agreement with partners according to changes in partner capacities. (all must be true)
- ☒ 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 including relevant HACT assurance activities. Some adjustment was made to implementation arrangements if needed to reflect changes in partner capacities. (all must be true)*
- ☐ 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 have not been considered. Also select this option if changes in capacities and performance of relevant national institutions and systems have not been monitored by the project.
- ☐ Not Applicable

Evidence:

Functional and institutional analysis of the VRU Secretariat was conducted by the project. The exercise aimed at improving the organizational framework of the parliamentary Secretariat. The analysis included: 1) the analysis of the functions of the VRU Secretariat, and 2) the analysis of the operating and decision-making processes. The priority was given to the recommendations of the 2016 Needs Assessment Mission (NAM) of the European Parliament. The results of the functional review with the appropriate recommendations were presented and discussed with key parliamentary stakeholders, members of the Task force, WFD experts, other local and international experts, representatives of the EUD and European parliament on 12 June 2020.

Following the results of the mentioned functional and institutional analysis of the VRU Secretariat, the Project also supported the establishment and activities of the Task Force on developing the strategic planning in the VRU Secretariat. The strategic (online) session with the participation of MPs, VRU Secretariat leadership, representatives of the European Parliament, national parliaments of UK, Republic of Moldova and Scotland, international and national experts was organized on 23 June 2020. As a result, the draft Strategic Plan and Action Plan for its implementation were developed (taking into account the input and recommendations from VRU Secretariat structural units, members of the Task Force, and international and local experts). Several recommendations of the functional and institutional analysis were translated into the draft law "On Parliamentary Service", that had been adopted in the first reading by the Parliament.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
1	Functional_Analysis_Executive_Summary_ENG_9824_319 (https://intranet.undp.org/apps/ProjectQA/QAFormDocuments/Functional_Analysis_Executive_Summary_ENG_9824_319.pdf)	olena.kulikovska@undp.org	12/22/2021 5:40:00 PM

20. Were the transition and phase-out arrangements were reviewed and adjusted according to progress (including financial commitment and capacity).

- ☐ 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. The plan was implemented as planned by the end of the project, taking into account any adjustments made during implementation. (both must be true)
- ☒ 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.*
- ☐ 1: The project may have had a sustainability plan but there was no review of this strategy after it was developed. Also select this option if the project did not have a sustainability strategy.

Evidence:

The sustainability and exit strategy of the project remained unchanged (as confirmed by the Steering Committee), and foresees the following logic:

1) The sustainability of the project results was ensured by implementation of a number of interrelated activities aimed at building capacities of the Verkhovna Rada to play its effective role in the national development of Ukraine. As parliament was able to assume effective legislative, oversight and representation roles, the need for external input and funding to support streamlining and enhancement of these functions was reduced. Given the strong human resource base in Ukraine, it was anticipated that support to establish effectively functioning institutions would quickly result in enhanced outcome.

2) The project focused on building partnerships with European member state parliaments, and as these partnerships enabled durable support and information exchange relationships to multiply, these would continue beyond the end of the PRP, as had already been seen in the VRU's initiation of continuing work with the European Parliament and parliaments of European countries following links that had helped to enhance VRU officials' comfort in leveraging international knowledge. Recommendations on new legislative, oversight and representation business workflow models were developed based on European and international best practices and partially adopted to ensure effective legislative process and parliamentary business processes after the project completion.

3) Transfer to VRU Secretariat of developed software, online training courses and other project deliverables will help to sustain the VRU capacity in terms of horizontal management functions, as well as to scale up implementation of the project recommendations. Specific training curricula on civic education will help to reach wider audience. Collaboration will also be pursued with the education sector, in particular schools and universities.

4) The project activities will be integrated into other UNDP projects to ensure sustainability and scaling up of the results. Working together within the UNDP Democratic Governance Portfolio and other UNDP Programmes, will help enhance project outcomes and good resource management.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

QA Summary/Final Project Board Comments

The Project Steering Committee approved the draft closure QA report at its final meeting on 18 October 2021.