



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



EVALUATION OF THE RESPONSIBLE ACCOUNTABLE DEMOCRATIC ASSEMBLY (RADA) PROGRAM

PO No. AID-I21-O-17-00040

DISCLAIMER: This is an external assessment. The view expressed in this document are the authors' and do not necessarily reflect the view of the United States Agency for International Development or the United States Government.

Submitted to:
USAID/Ukraine

Prepared by:
John Lis, Team Lead
Taras Kuzio, International Governance Expert
Andriy Meleshevyh, Local Governance Expert
Oksana Vynnychuk, Logistician

Submitted February 2018

Contractor:
Democracy International, Inc.
7600 Wisconsin Avenue, Suite 1010
Bethesda, MD 20814
Tel: 301-961-1660
www.democracyinternational.com



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
EVALUATION PURPOSE AND QUESTIONS	1
PROGRAM BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT	2
EVALUATION METHODS AND LIMITATIONS	4
FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS	8
LESSONS LEARNED	33
ANNEX A: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY IN UKRAINIAN	35
ANNEX B: EVALUATION SOW	43
ANNEX C: EVALUATION TEAM	58
ANNEX D: EVALUATION WORK PLAN	59
ANNEX E: CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENTS	94
ANNEX F: LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED	95
ANNEX G: LISTS OF KEY INFORMANTS, FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSANTS AND SURVEY RESPONDENTS	97
ANNEX H: DATA COLLECTION TOOLS	107
ANNEX I: SURVEY RESULTS	116
ANNEX J: FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION SUMMARIES	127
ANNEX K: TABLE OF EVALUATION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS	131
ANNEX L: MS POWERPOINT PRESENTATION OF EVALUATION DESIGN, FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS	134
ANNEX M: RADA PROGRAM ACTIVITIES	135

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

EVALUATION PURPOSE AND QUESTIONS

The objective of this final performance evaluation is to assess the **relevance** and **effectiveness** of the RADA Program in advancing parliamentary reform in Ukraine and, more specifically, in improving public representation in the legislative process and strengthening independent legislative oversight of the executive branch. The Evaluation Questions are:

1. Which RADA Program activities do RADA Program stakeholders perceive to have been the most beneficial for improving public representation in the legislative process and why?
2. Which RADA Program activities do RADA Program stakeholders perceive to have been the most beneficial for strengthening independent oversight of the legislature over the executive branch and why?
3. What changes in public representation in the legislative process do RADA Program stakeholders perceive to be the result, in whole or in part, of the RADA Program's work?
4. What changes in independent oversight of the legislature over the executive branch do RADA Program stakeholders perceive to be the result, in whole or in part, of the RADA Program's work?
5. How well did the RADA Program respond to opportunities to leverage resources and advance relevant parliamentary reforms through collaboration with other USAID and non-USAID development assistance programs?
6. How relevant was the RADA Program in advancing parliamentary reform in Ukraine?
7. How effective was the RADA Program in advancing parliamentary reform in Ukraine?
8. How well did the RADA Program promote gender equality in its programming, in the Verkhovna Rada, and in public policy in Ukraine?

BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

The opposition that came to power following the Euromaidan Revolution of Dignity prioritized returning Ukraine to a system with a more powerful parliament. This was accompanied by presidential and parliamentary elections in 2014 and local elections the following year. The Ukrainian parliament elects 450 deputies for five-year terms through a mixed system of majoritarian single-mandate districts and national party lists.

Prior to the current program, USAID had funded the Parliamentary Development Program from 1994 to 2013. The RADA Program was initially drafted in early 2013 and was launched in November of that year. Effective implementation of the RADA Program was delayed because of the Euromaidan Revolution, elections, and a new Ukraine-EU relationship. Internally, management difficulties and changes in leadership continued until November 2015.

The RADA Program has three objectives:

1. Improved public representation in the legislative process;
2. Expanded role of citizens in monitoring the work of Parliament;
3. Role of legislature in providing independent oversight of the executive branch strengthened.

EVALUATION METHODS AND LIMITATIONS

This evaluation utilized a mixed-methods approach that relied on both qualitative data (primarily collected from program documents and through key informant interviews and focus group discussions) and quantitative data (primarily monitoring data and results of the online mini-surveys). The DI evaluation team collected data from a variety of sources, including document reviews, key informant interviews, focus group discussion sessions and mini-surveys to reach a broader sample of members of parliament (MPs), staff, local officials, civil society organizations (CSOs) and journalists who participated in RADA activities. Parallel analysis was used to analyze the evidence from interviews, document review, and web-based surveys.

The team conducted 71 key informant interviews with 151 people in Kyiv, Volodymyr-Volynski, Kharkiv, Brovary and Chernihiv and conducted four focus groups with 21 people in Kyiv. A total of 172 people were interviewed. Survey responses were fewer than expected. While these survey data were insufficient to draw independent conclusions, they did corroborate findings from interviews, focus groups, and document review.

The evaluation team encountered recall bias, response bias and selection bias. The most effective approach to combating bias is to use multiple sources of data to triangulate on an evaluation issue. By combining information found in documents or interviews from multiple sources, any one piece of biased data did not skew the analysis.

EVALUATION FINDINGS

EVALUATION QUESTION 1: RELEVANCE OF PUBLIC REPRESENTATION ACTIVITIES

The evaluation team found that the Model District initiative was the most widely known representational activity of the RADA Program and one that stakeholders viewed as addressing a need of the Verkhovna Rada for greater connection between MPs and the people they represent. Model District activities resulted in public comments on legislation being incorporated into law. The Model District program also served as a RADA Program vehicle for strengthening cooperation between MPs and local governments. Training provided by the RADA Program offered MPs and staff relevant skills and knowledge that they used in their parliamentary outreach work.

MPs and staff who used the European Information and Research Center reported that it filled a need for comparative international information that could not be found elsewhere in the parliament. For the most part, users found the products to be useful in their parliamentary work, and the Center's rapid turn-around time on requests enabled requesters to use the information in their legislative work.

Stakeholders valued RADA Program efforts to increase transparency and openness, particularly OPORA transparency-promotion efforts. The transparency initiative cited most often was an effort for committees to publish more information on their websites. The Civic Platform NGO Register, E-Petitions and Citizen E-Platform were not among the activities perceived by stakeholders in parliament as most beneficial for improving public representation.

EVALUATION QUESTION 2: RELEVANCE OF OVERSIGHT ACTIVITIES

While aimed at improving public representation in legislation, the Model District initiative included many activities that contained an oversight component. Visits to their districts provided MPs with information about the implementation of laws, programs and agencies, which they took back to Kyiv to inform further oversight activities.

Many activities aimed at strengthening cooperation between deputies and local governments had an oversight component. The RADA Program established partnerships with the Committee on State Building, Regional Policy and Local Self-Government and the Committee on Corruption Prevention and Counteraction. The program organized field visits, meetings and hearings for those committees. The RADA Program's support for oversight of decentralization legislation also extended to initiatives beyond parliamentary committee events.

The European Information and Research Center (EIRC) provided support to parliamentary oversight through policy papers, info briefs and discussions of oversight internationally. Shadow reports by the implementing partner Agency for Legislative Initiatives (ALI) were of limited utility to parliamentary committees. Other oversight initiatives failed to gain support.

EVALUATION QUESTION 3: EFFECTIVENESS OF PUBLIC REPRESENTATION ACTIVITIES

Deputies, staff and outside stakeholders most frequently associated the Model District initiative with the RADA Program. "People know the RADA Program through the Model District program," one deputy said. Stakeholders in Kyiv and in the districts said that the Model District initiative increased deputies' contact with voters through a series of public events, including town hall meetings, forums, hearings and roundtables. The effectiveness of the Model District activity is illustrated by the interest in expanding the activity to include additional deputies and by additional MPs participating in Model District activities or similar activities outside of the RADA Program. The RADA Program included party-list deputies in the Model District initiative, but it did not include a component to work with parliamentary factions.

MPs and staff familiar with the EIRC attribute its re-establishment in 2015 to the RADA Program. Those stakeholders who utilize the EIRC found its products to be an effective and timely resource for their legislative and oversight activities. Stakeholders credited the RADA Program with much of the progress toward greater transparency and openness in the Verkhovna Rada.

EVALUATION QUESTION 4: EFFECTIVENESS OF OVERSIGHT ACTIVITIES

Key informants from inside and outside the parliament agreed that the oversight function in the Verkhovna Rada is weak and there has been little improvement in parliamentary oversight since the RADA Program began its work. Stakeholders pointed to individual achievements of the program, rather than systemic improvements in parliamentary oversight. Stakeholders credited the RADA Program with raising awareness of existing legislation on decentralization and local self-government. Members and staff of two committees credited the RADA Program with facilitating field hearings, meetings and visits of the committees to oversee implementation of relevant legislation. In addition to supporting oversight of decentralization, the Program was credited with improving deputies' and committees' communication with the executive branch.

EVALUATION QUESTION 5: COLLABORATION WITH OTHER PROGRAMS

The RADA Program operated cooperatively with several other programs of the Office of Democracy and Governance at USAID/Ukraine; however, the RADA Program and other programs generally did not integrate their work. The RADA Program leveraged USAID's decentralization and local self-government programming. Collaboration between the RADA Program and USAID/Ukraine human rights and labor programs was less frequent, and evaluators found no evidence of collaboration between the RADA Program and programs administered by the Office of Economic Growth and the Office of Health. International donors and implementers reported that the RADA Program has cooperated effectively with their programs.

EVALUATION QUESTION 6: OVERALL RELEVANCE IN ADVANCING PARLIAMENTARY REFORM

The RADA Program was designed in 2013, and its first year of operation saw a revolution and new parliamentary elections. As a result, the program had to delay implementation until the new parliament took office in November 2014. The Pat Cox Needs Assessment Mission (NAM), which took place between September 2015 and February 2016, was tasked with planning interviews and group meetings and collecting data on the work of the Verkhovna Rada with the assistance of RADA Program experts. The Cox NAM interviewed RADA's then two directors and deputy director. The RADA Program's analytical and monitoring reports were supplied to the Cox NAM. The Cox report and roadmap, issued in March 2016, were presented at the USAID/RADA conference "Creating an Effective, Accountable and Responsible Parliament" on April 15, 2016. The RADA Program integrated some of the report's 52 recommendations into its workplan. Nevertheless, the Cox report, which was released mid-way through the RADA Program cycle, was not fully integrated into the program design.

Improving representation is relevant and important for Ukraine's democratic consolidation, and a range of RADA activities were relevant towards improving representation. However, RADA activities directed towards oversight were overly ambitious. Nevertheless, some RADA activities were directly relevant by supporting various means to increase parliament's oversight of government, such as technical assistance for government ministers to report to hearings and committees.

EVALUATION QUESTION 7: OVERALL EFFECTIVENESS IN ADVANCING PARLIAMENTARY REFORM

The RADA Program was praised by many of those interviewed by the team who described it as the most active internationally-funded program involved in reforming parliament. The program was also associated with the Parliamentary Internship Program and trainings that improved the professionalism of young and eager people committed to European integration. Initiatives promoting greater transparency and support to two parliamentary committees were effective.

A majority of stakeholders stated that public representation in the legislative process improved, due in part to the RADA Program. The oversight component of the Program contributed little to systematic improvement in oversight. Where the RADA Program did contribute effectively to oversight was through individual stand-alone activities. Most survey respondents said that oversight had not improved significantly in the Verkhovna Rada since 2014.

EVALUATION QUESTION 8: GENDER EQUALITY

The RADA Program undertook a range of policies promoting gender equality. The movement of gender issues to the mainstream of public policy is testimony to the work of the RADA Program as well as the determination of many actors working at different levels in this field. The RADA Program assisted parliament in building its capacity for gender analysis of legislation. Trainings on gender issues were undertaken in a professional manner, combining theoretical knowledge with practical tools. The RADA Program mobilized young women and established networks with civil society organizations and experts.

EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS

1. Model District is the most relevant activity to strengthen public representation in the legislative process. The EIRC fills a need for comparative international information on legislation and legislatures, and MPs and staff use the information and analysis in their legislative work. Stakeholders valued initiatives' work toward increasing transparency and openness.
2. Few of the RADA Program's activities to strengthen oversight were relevant. The most successful oversight activities were designed to promote public representation in the legislative process. Most citizens do not propose legislative changes; citizens report to their deputies when government is failing them. While several activities reported under Objective 3 corresponded to Cox report recommendations, they had little support.
3. The Model District initiative is the signature activity of the RADA Program. Stakeholders credit the RADA Program with increasing the contact of deputies with constituents. In the future, local party offices could provide resources and support for participating party-list MPs. Parliamentary research services are essential for the legislature to have its own independent source of information and analysis, and the re-established EIRC provides a good foundation for a research service. Transparency initiatives have been effective.
4. The RADA Program contributed little to improving parliamentary oversight. The main achievements in oversight were related to the Model District initiative and similar activities promoting cooperation between local officials and parliament.
5. The RADA Program collaborated effectively with other parliamentary strengthening programs and with some USAID democracy and governance programs. The Program successfully supported decentralization and local self-government oversight activities.
6. The different components of the RADA Program were relevant within the context of developments in Ukraine between 2013 and 2015.
7. The Euromaidan Revolution, elections in 2014 and 2015, Russia's military aggression, and a new era of EU-Ukraine cooperation and EU-supported reforms substantially impacted the first two years of the RADA Program's activities. Added to this were internal management difficulties during the same period. Despite these developments, the RADA Program during its early phase supported the work of the Constitutional Commission and Council on Judicial Reform under the Presidential Administration which was responsible

for drafting key legislation on decentralization and judicial reform. Throughout the program period under review the RADA Program undertook numerous successful initiatives.

8. Trainings promoted a more gender-sensitive parliament and a greater willingness of MPs to focus on gender equality. The greatest accomplishment of the RADA Program related to gender is the development of capacity for parliamentary staff to undertake gender analysis of legislation and policy issues.

LESSONS LEARNED

- Flexibility is essential in legislative strengthening.
- Revisit program design in case of major political changes.
- Consult with beneficiaries during program design.
- Program activities need to be focused.
- Double-down on what is working.
- Transition activities to parliament when it is ready.
- Representative democracy needs representatives.
- Consider work with factions.
- Citizens have problems, not amendments.
- Effective collaboration can advance other democracy and governance goals.
- Interviews are more valuable than surveys for parliamentary strengthening evaluations.

EVALUATION PURPOSE AND QUESTIONS

PURPOSE

The United States Agency for International Development (USAID)/Ukraine engaged Democracy International (DI) to conduct a final performance evaluation of its Responsible Accountable Democratic Assembly (RADA) Program, implemented by the East Europe Foundation (EEF).

The objective of this final performance evaluation is to assess the **relevance** and **effectiveness** of the RADA Program in advancing parliamentary reform in Ukraine and, more specifically, in improving public representation in the legislative process and strengthening independent legislative oversight of the executive branch.

The Mission will use performance evaluation findings and conclusions to understand what the RADA Program has achieved, how it is perceived and valued, and what opportunities for collaboration were available and utilized. Other stakeholders with an interest in the evaluation findings and conclusions include the legislative and executive branches in Ukraine, political parties, CSOs, USAID/Washington, U.S. Embassy in Ukraine, and other donors and implementing partners. The EEF and its partners will have an opportunity to learn about their strengths and areas for improvement.

QUESTIONS

1. Which RADA Program activities do RADA Program stakeholders perceive to have been the most beneficial for improving public representation in the legislative process and why?
2. Which RADA Program activities do RADA Program stakeholders perceive to have been the most beneficial for strengthening independent oversight of the legislature over the executive branch and why?
3. What changes in public representation in the legislative process do RADA Program stakeholders perceive to be the result, in whole or in part, of the RADA Program's work?
4. What changes in independent oversight of the legislature over the executive branch do RADA Program stakeholders perceive to be the result, in whole or in part, of the RADA Program's work?
5. How well did the RADA Program respond to opportunities to leverage resources and advance relevant parliamentary reforms through collaboration with other USAID and non-USAID development assistance programs?
6. How relevant was the RADA Program in advancing parliamentary reform in Ukraine?
7. How effective was the RADA Program in advancing parliamentary reform in Ukraine?
8. How well did the RADA Program promote gender equality in its programming, in the Verkhovna Rada, and in public policy in Ukraine?

The last three evaluation questions were proposed by the evaluation team in response to the Mission's suggestion to add general questions on relevance and effectiveness of the RADA Program and to devote greater attention to gender issues.

PROGRAM BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

POLITICAL CONTEXT

The opposition that came to power following the Euromaidan Revolution prioritized returning Ukraine to a system with a more powerful parliament. Ukraine's new constitution established a semi-presidential system in which the executive is divided between the government, which is formed by a parliamentary coalition, and the president. Parliamentary oversight of the executive in the RADA Program refers to the government, not the president.

Ukraine's return to a stronger parliamentary system was accompanied by presidential and parliamentary elections in 2014 and local elections the following year, which elected politicians who supported European integration. The pro-Russian camp was diminished following the disintegration of the Party of Regions and the banning of the Communist Party.

There is no longer a Ukrainian multi-vector foreign policy balancing between Russia and the West. Ukraine has no alternative to European integration. Nevertheless, the European Union Association Agreement (AA) offers integration without membership and therefore lacks the incentive of membership, which was key to successfully overcoming reform difficulties in many countries in Central-Eastern Europe, including Romania, Bulgaria, and Slovakia.

The election of reformers in Ukraine's pro-European parties was accompanied by another important development: the political maturity of Ukrainian society in general, particularly civil society and journalists. There was a general understanding of the need for civil society and journalists to remain engaged after the revolution in the policy process, democratization and European integration. Since 2014 therefore, civil society has worked with Western governments and international organizations to pressure and lobby for reforms, particularly in areas such as the rule of law and corruption, where obstacles arise when proposed reforms threaten elite interests. Domestic and external actors have supporters inside parliament among the new cohort of deputies elected in 2014, many of whom have supported and cooperated with the RADA Program, and who came from civil society.

In 2014-2015, the EU and Ukraine quickly completed the signing of the Association Agreement and Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Agreement (DCFTA) which were followed in 2017 by the introduction of a visa-free regime.

Since 2014, reforms in Ukraine in general, including those pertaining to parliament, have been taking place within the context of Russia's undeclared war of aggression in the Donbas. Russia's aggression presents both a stimulant and an impediment to pursuing democratization and European integration. Countries at war and/or with conflict zones on their territory are not traditionally invited to join NATO and the EU, two organizations in which Ukraine seeks membership. Additionally, the war has generated over 300,000 veterans, who together with their families account for more than 15 percent of Ukrainian voters. This and the public perception of

foot-dragging on fighting high-level corruption generate political instability that is capitalized upon by populists and nationalists.

The Ukrainian parliament elects 450 deputies for five-year terms through a mixed system of majoritarian single-mandate districts and national party lists. Twenty-eight seats representing Russian-occupied Crimea and parts of Donetsk and Luhansk oblasts are unfilled. The threshold is 5 percent for national party lists to enter parliament. The current parliament was elected in October 2014 from the following factions: Petro Poroshenko bloc (138), National Front (81), Independents (52), Opposition Bloc (43), Samopomich (25), Radical Party (20), Batkivshchyna (20), Vidrozhnnya (26), and Volya Narodu (18). The parliament has 27 committees.

Decentralization began in April 2014 with a government resolution, followed by a 2015 law on the voluntary consolidation of communities. The law called for 1,500 communities to be created through amalgamation of towns, settlements and villages into larger entities that would be more viable to collect revenues and provide local services. These would have the right to levy local taxes and fees. In 2016, the government promoted a five-point action plan to reinvigorate decentralization that would reduce the functions of higher regional councils and pledged funding for local self-government, especially in health and education. The constitution will need to be changed for these reforms and when Ukraine implements the clause of the Minsk accords regarding special status for the two Donbas enclaves.

PROGRAM BACKGROUND

Prior to the current program, the USAID funded the Parliamentary Development Program (PDP) from 1994 to 2013, which was implemented initially by Indiana University and later by Ohio State University. It was the only legislative strengthening program operated by those institutions. In contrast to PDP, the RADA Program is the first to be managed by a Ukrainian implementer – the East European Foundation, a legacy of the Eurasia Foundation.

The RADA Program was initially drafted in early 2013 and was launched in November of that year. Effective implementation of the RADA Program was delayed because of the Euromaidan Revolution, elections, and a new Ukraine-EU relationship. Internally, management difficulties and changes in leadership continued until November 2015, when Ihor Kohut became head of the RADA Program.

RADA's implementing partners are: the Agency for Legislative Initiatives (ALI), which assisted in activities such as town hall meetings, policy papers and shadow reports; OPORA, which works at the national level monitoring parliament and at the local level on civic education of voters; Internews, which provides trainings, communications materials for deputies and civic education videos for television and government ministries; and the Interns League which manages the interns program within parliament.

The RADA Program has three objectives:

1. Improved public representation in the legislative process;
2. Expanded role of citizens in monitoring the work of parliament;

3. Role of legislature in providing independent oversight of the executive branch strengthened.

Activities under Objective 1 include a Model District program that supports constituent outreach by seven deputies; training on constituent outreach; a registry of civil society organizations; electronic platforms for citizen engagement; a European Information and Research Center (EIRC) to provide information about comparative legislation to members and staff; and promotion of cooperation between deputies and local officials.

Activities under Objective 3 include strengthening anti-corruption efforts, strengthening structural effectiveness of oversight, training on lawmaking, and institutionalization of the Parliamentary Intern Program. Objective 2 was not included in the scope of work for this evaluation.

In February 2016, the European Parliament's NAM led by Pat Cox published the Report and Roadmap on Internal Reform and Capacity-Building for the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine which listed 52 recommendations.¹ The following month, the Ukrainian parliament adopted a Special Resolution to implement the recommendations in which "Ukraine's irreversible course towards European integration" is recognized as "guided by the provisions of the Association Agreement."²

EVALUATION METHODS AND LIMITATIONS

OVERVIEW

DI's evaluation design and approach reflect principles outlined in USAID's 2017 Evaluation Policy. By analyzing program effectiveness, relevance, and challenges to date, DI is providing USAID with objective information to inform evidence-based decision-making on future programming. DI worked closely with USAID and other key stakeholders to ensure that the evaluation responds to the questions articulated by USAID.

This evaluation utilized a mixed-methods approach that relied on both qualitative data (primarily collected from program documents, key informant interviews, and focus group discussions) and quantitative data (primarily by monitoring data and results of online mini-surveys). This design allowed the evaluation team to generate an in-depth, comprehensive description and understanding of the RADA Program as a whole and in its context. This approach actively promoted diverse ways of thinking about issues related to the program, including whether or not and why program stakeholders perceived the program to be effective and relevant in advancing parliamentary reforms in Ukraine.

By triangulating findings using multiple data collection methods and soliciting views from persons most knowledgeable about the program—a critical characteristic of a non-experimental design—DI can describe program outcomes more accurately and with a greater degree of nuance.

DATA SOURCES AND INSTRUMENTS

¹ <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/resources/library/media/20160229RES16408/20160229RES16408.pdf>

² <http://zakon2.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1035-19>. The Ukrainian parliamentary web site has no translation of the resolution in its English-language pages.

The DI evaluation team collected data from a variety of sources, including document reviews, key informant interviews, focus group discussion sessions, and mini-surveys to reach a broader sample of MPs, staff, local officials, CSOs and journalists who participated in RADA activities.

The selection of informants was purposive and was informed by suggestions from USAID, participant lists from project activities, desk research, and recommendations by experts. Although the East Europe Foundation and the program implementer were asked for suggestions and contact information to facilitate the process of arranging meetings, the final decision on informants was made by the DI evaluation team in collaboration with USAID. DI contacted informants in Kyiv directly to request appointments. In locations outside of Kyiv, the evaluation team worked with MPs from Model Districts to arrange meetings with their staff, local officials, journalists, and members of civil society.

The selection of informants, focus group participants, and survey respondents took into account such factors as direct relationship to the program, type of assistance received (technical assistance or training), and geographic location. Please see Annex G for a list of interviewees.

Table 1: Stakeholder groups and evaluation tools

Stakeholder group	Key Informant Interviews	Focus Group Discussions	Web-based Survey
Members of Parliament	11		24
Parliamentary staff	37	18	14
Government officials	7		
Local officials	19		
Civil society	15		9
Journalists	14	3	14
Donors	8		
Implementers	40		
Total	151	21	61

Note: Because the survey was anonymous, survey respondents may include key informants and focus group participants.

The semi-structured interview protocols were finalized by the team after discussions with USAID personnel and implementer staff. Each protocol differed depending on the key informant's role and "causal distance" from activities, as well as the extent of the key informant's involvement in parliament-related activities and the time available for interviewing; the questions addressed not just knowledge and general perceptions, but more importantly probed for specific examples of attitude and behavior change. For a list of interview questions please refer to Annex H. Most individual interviews lasted about one hour. These interviews enabled the team to gather detailed inputs on the topics covered by the evaluation questions, based on the informant's unique perspective.

DI conducted four mini-surveys using a web-based tool (Survey Monkey™) to ensure a confidential, easily accessible, and fast methodology of collecting and analyzing data. The surveys

were used to complement the findings collected through desk reviews, interviews, and focus group discussions, rather than attempt to be representative of program stakeholders. A proposed survey of local officials was not conducted due to the unavailability of e-mail addresses for officials who participated in the RADA Program.

The survey questionnaires were finalized after discussions with USAID. The survey protocols were based closely on related interview protocol questions. Surveys were e-mailed to all RADA Program participants whose e-mail addresses were provided on contact lists by the East Europe Foundation for the following groups:

- Members of Parliament (All 422 MPs, plus additional questions for RADA Program participants);
- Verkhovna Rada staff (76 staff contacted);
- Civil Society Organizations (both Kyiv and Model Districts; 46 CSO representatives contacted);
- Journalists (46 journalists contacted).

The team also conducted four focus group discussion sessions with a homogeneous group of stakeholders who benefitted from program activities (i.e. parliamentary staff and journalists). Each discussion lasted approximately 1.5 hours. These facilitated discussions allowed for exchange and discussion of experiences and viewpoints and enabled the team to probe for perceptions of relevance and effectiveness as well as to identify lessons learned and recommendations for any future activity.

The team conducted 71 key informant interviews with 151 people in Kyiv, Volodymyr-Volynskyy, Kharkiv, Brovary, and Chernihiv and conducted four focus groups with 21 people in Kyiv. A total of 172 people were interviewed. Demonstrations and unrest did not interfere with the team's access to parliament, other governmental buildings, or other locations.

Survey responses were fewer than expected. Twenty-four MPs, 14 parliamentary staff, and 14 journalists answered the survey. While these survey data were insufficient to draw independent conclusions, they did corroborate findings from interviews, focus groups, and document review. Only nine civil society representatives responded to the survey, though many of them declined to respond to several questions, leaving only two to four responses for nine of the ten questions. The evaluation team elected not to use those data.

ANALYTICAL APPROACH

Parallel analysis was used to analyze the evidence from interviews, document review, and web-based surveys. In this analytical approach, each type of data for an activity is analyzed in parallel, and then across data type. For example, the team developed preliminary findings by first analyzing interviews with trainees and with supervisors or other leadership of those trainees; then developed complementary preliminary findings from the survey questions; then developed additional complementary preliminary findings from the key documents and other secondary materials; and finally analyzed preliminary findings across the types of data to develop activity-level findings.

BIASES AND OTHER LIMITATIONS

As with any evaluation, there are biases and other limitations that must be addressed through methodological or analytical methods. An evaluation of parliament-related activities is subject to many of these issues:

- First, recall bias was present, such as parliamentary staff responding to team questions with answers related to other donor training programs or USAID parliamentary strengthening programs that preceded the RADA Program. The fact that a major revolution and new elections occurred at the start of the RADA Program helped mitigate this bias; interviewers were able to redirect interviews by asking specifically about activities that occurred after the latest parliamentary elections.
- Second, response bias is a common problem for program evaluations, particularly for highly technical DRG subsectors such as parliamentary strengthening. The evaluation team often encountered attempts by interviewees to portray their experience with the RADA Program as very positive. Evaluators found that many participants wanted the program to continue and answered questions in a way that they appeared to believe might help to continue the program. In such cases, evaluators followed up by seeking specific examples of how recipients had benefitted from and utilized program support. Because much of the evaluation concerned program activities, evaluators were less focused on generally positive assessments of the overall program and a general desire by beneficiaries that it continue. Evaluators focused on individual activities, where participants were more willing to differentiate between activities that were relevant and effective and those that were not.
- Third, selection bias in the form of contacts provided by the implementers can mean that the team only hears from people with positive experiences; again, this is particularly a problem for parliamentary strengthening. Selection bias was less of an issue for this evaluation because the team took a comprehensive approach to selection and chose key informants based on their positions and interactions with the program, rather than the recommendations of the implementer. Selection bias was most evident in interviews outside of Kyiv, where local members of parliament and their staff arranged interviews with local officials, journalists, and members of civil society. As with the above biases, evaluators were able to mitigate selection bias by asking specific questions about interviewees' involvement with the program and by focusing on individual activities rather than the overall program. In some cases, the willingness of key informants to participate in an interview provided some insight into how much they valued the program.

The most effective approach to combating bias is to use multiple sources of data to triangulate on an evaluation issue. By combining information found in documents or interviews from multiple sources, any one piece of biased data did not skew the analysis. Another approach that pertains specifically to interviews is the inclusion of key informants from organizations that do not directly benefit from the assessed program and the use of questions regarding specific examples of knowledge use.

Every evaluation presents evaluators with decisions as to which stakeholders will provide the most valuable information to answer questions, and parliamentary strengthening evaluations

face a further challenge of trying to arrange interviews with busy politicians whose schedules change in response to parliamentary business. The evaluation team chose to target MPs who participated in RADA Program activities that program reports showed to be the most active, anticipating that they would be most knowledgeable about the program. For example, MPs participating in the Model District activity, as well as committees participating in the shadow reports, roundtable discussions, and field meetings, were a particular focus of evaluation interviews. As a result, other MPs and committees that were less involved with the RADA Program were not interviewed. The findings and conclusions of the evaluation therefore reflect the perceptions of the MPs and committees who are most familiar and most active with the RADA Program, rather than the entire Verkhovna Rada.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

QUESTION 1: WHICH RADA PROGRAM ACTIVITIES DO RADA PROGRAM STAKEHOLDERS PERCEIVE TO HAVE BEEN THE MOST BENEFICIAL FOR IMPROVING PUBLIC REPRESENTATION IN THE LEGISLATIVE PROCESS AND WHY?

In general, RADA Program activities aimed at improving public representation in the legislative process were included under Objective 1 (Improved public representation in the legislative process). However, the evaluation team found that some activities under Objective 2 (Expanded role of citizens in monitoring the work of parliament) and Objective 3 (Role of legislature in providing independent oversight of the executive branch strengthened) in actuality were intended to improve public representation in the legislative process. As a result, the relevance of all representational activities will be considered in this section, regardless of where they are found in the reporting framework.

FINDINGS

Model District MP Offices

The evaluation team found that the Model District initiative was the most widely known representational activity of the RADA Program, and one that stakeholders viewed as addressing a need of the Verkhovna Rada for greater connection between MPs and the people they represent. The program was viewed as beneficial by the MPs and staff who participated in the program; by non-participating MPs and staff; by citizens of the Model Districts, notably local officials, members of civil society, and journalists; and by outside observers of the RADA Program.

When asked about RADA Program activities, deputies, staff, and outside stakeholders most frequently cited the Model District initiative or one of its activities. “People know the RADA Program through the Model District program,” one deputy said. In all, eight MPs, seven staff, four implementers, two journalists, six local officials, and one USAID official said that the Model District program addressed a need for greater connection between MPs and the people that they represent. Greater numbers cited the effectiveness of the initiative, as discussed under Evaluation Question 3.

Both parliamentary beneficiaries and stakeholders in the districts stated in interviews that they viewed positively the various public outreach activities, such as town hall meetings, forums, and

roundtables. In interviews in Kyiv and in four of the districts, they provided evaluators with examples of how these activities enabled oblast, rayon, and municipal officials to communicate their views to the parliamentary deputy and how ordinary citizens had a voice in recommending policy options. In most cases the Model District policy discussions centered on local issues – such as delays at a border crossing, refuse collection, youth centers, collection of primary and secondary school fees, or a proposed oil refinery – that residents said were related to their own interests and concerns.

Model District activities resulted in public comments on legislation being incorporated into law, according to deputies and RADA Program reports. For example, public comments from a July 2015 hearing in Volyn Oblast on a bill on the rehabilitation of victims of political repression during the Soviet era were incorporated into the bill introduced in July 2017, according to the FY 2017 annual report. A Model District MP said she used information from a visit to Luhansk Oblast to draft bills amending electoral and pension rights of internally displaced persons.

The Model District program also served as a RADA Program vehicle for strengthening cooperation between MPs and local governments in several regions, including Volyn, Chernihiv, Transcarpathia, and Kyiv Oblasts. According to RADA Program reports, USAID officials, and interviews with MPs, staff, local officials, journalists, and members of civil society, programming focused on the issues of decentralization and local self-government, thereby complementing other USAID projects and priorities. While RADA Program reporting distinguishes its Model District activities from its activities promoting cooperation between deputies and local governments and from activities supporting decentralization, evaluators reviewing program reports found strong synergy among these activities. Based on interviews, evaluators found a tendency by beneficiaries to view all such activities as related to the Model Districts. For example, evaluators observed a forum in Brovary organized by a Model District MP and attended by city and rayon councilors that dealt exclusively with decentralization issues.

MPs and staff participating in the Model District initiative reported in interviews that the training provided by the RADA Program offered them relevant skills and knowledge that they used in their parliamentary outreach work. Staff in particular cited training on interaction with constituents and social media training, including cybersecurity, as the most relevant to their work. Members and staff who participated in an exchange program to experience constituent work by parliamentary deputies in Germany also gave that program high marks and said it provided examples that they use in their own constituency work. With few exceptions, staff gave RADA Program trainers high marks for how they delivered the programs. In all, 28 staff, three MPs and five journalists stated that RADA Program training was useful to them.

European Information and Research Center

The European Information and Research Center (EIRC) re-opened in May 2015 with the support of the RADA Program, according to program reports. The Center had originally been launched in 2011 but became inactive under the previous parliament controlled by the Party of Regions. According to the EIRC director, the organization is comprised of a director, office manager, and four researchers, and provides deputies and committees with information on request about comparative international legislation, with an eye toward EU integration. In 2½ years, the Center has responded to 200 requests for analysis from deputies, committees,

factions, and staff, and its research has been incorporated into 45 bills, five of which have been adopted. On its own initiative, the EIRC produced an additional 30 policy papers and seven memos on parliamentary reform topics.

MPs and staff who used the EIRC said that it filled a need for comparative international information that could not be found elsewhere in the parliament. Of the MPs and committee staff interviewed, six MPs and four staff stated that they use the EIRC in their work. For the most part, users found the products to be useful in their parliamentary work, and the Center's rapid turnaround time on requests (10 business days) enabled requesters to use the information in their legislative work. "They are useful and easy to digest," said one committee staffer. "We have no time to do this, so we appreciate someone doing it for us."

While most users stated in interviews that EIRC products were useful, there were a few criticisms. The quick turnaround time means that policy papers are relatively brief, and some users stated that more detailed research could be useful at times. A couple of committees indicated that they have access to specialized NGO expertise that was more useful for their purposes than information provided by the generalist researchers at the EIRC. Evaluators found that not all deputies and staff were aware of the EIRC and the research products that it could provide them, despite observed marketing efforts, such as a two-meter-high poster placed in a heavily trafficked passage between two parliamentary office buildings. Forty-five percent of MPs and 27 percent of parliamentary staff who responded to the survey reported via the EIRC.

OPORA Transparency Methodology

Evaluators found that stakeholders valued RADA Program efforts to increase transparency and openness in the Verkhovna Rada. However, no interest was generated by activities under Objective 1, related to the Open Government Partnership. "That's a very small part of our work," one implementing partner said. Instead, stakeholders cited transparency-promotion efforts by OPORA reported under an Objective 3 activity related to training on lawmaking.

The transparency initiative cited most often was OPORA's effort to have committees publish more information on their websites. According to OPORA, 21 of the 27 committees improved their transparency. The information included on committee websites includes membership, meeting agendas, contact information, reports on committee performance, and an opportunity to comment on bills. Four staffers and one MP cited the relevance of this activity; journalists and local officials spoke to its effectiveness, as discussed in Evaluation Question 3.

RADA Program documents and interviews with parliamentary staff demonstrated that other RADA Program activities contributed to parliamentary openness. For example, parliamentary staff training under the Model District initiative included information on social media and cybersecurity, enabling staff to disseminate information about a deputy's activities to constituents while safeguarding the account from unwanted intrusion.

Civic Platform NGO Register

The evaluation team found that the NGO Register was not perceived as useful by intended users. Of eight committees interviewed, only two committees reported that they used the

register to find new NGOs that were useful to their work. The other committees reported that they either did not use the register or did not find new NGOs in their field when they used the register. The RADA Program reported that 18 of 27 committees subscribed to the NGO database. The evaluation team scheduled a focus group with representatives of seven participating NGOs recommended by RADA Program staff, but all of the NGOs declined the opportunity to discuss their involvement with the register, indicating the low value that CSOs placed on the register.

E-Petitions

Evaluators found that the E-Petitions platform on the parliamentary website was not valued by stakeholders in parliament. Only three of 850 online petitions gathered the 25,000 signatures required for them to be considered by parliament. Two of the propositions were included in the relevant bills, and the third proposition was addressed in the 2018 budget.

While parliamentary stakeholders did not perceive the E-Petitions platform as beneficial, USAID officials said the initiative improved citizen engagement. An official from the Computerized Systems Department of the Verkhovna Rada said 722 of the petitions were treated as formal citizen appeals, and 647 of those appeals were provided official responses as required by law. A USAID official stated, “We believe that with proper regulation this e-tool could be efficient in citizen engagement into legislative process.”

Citizens-Rada Legislative Discussion E-Platform

A similar platform, designed to permit public comments on draft legislation, failed to gain support from parliamentary users. (This initiative was reported under Objective 2.) Only two bills were placed on the Citizen E-Platform, according to a November 2017 interview with officials of the Interns League, an NGO comprised of former parliamentary interns, which is the RADA Program’s implementing partner for the Citizen E-Platform. Those bills received more than 750 comments, according to an Interns League official. USAID noted that by February 2018 there were five bills on the Citizen E-Platform, which generated 1,041 comments from 969 users. More than 860 of those comments addressed a single gun-rights bill. Three of the five bills on the platform received 10 or fewer comments.

“We tested the system for 30 days and got 10 comments,” said a senior staffer of the Committee on Legal Policy and Justice. “I think it was one person who had different accounts. The argumentation was poor. It wasn’t a good experience.”

USAID stated that more time is needed for E-Parliament initiatives like the Citizen E-Platform, which began in 2016, to gain traction. “Introduction does not mean immediate results,” a USAID official said. The official noted that an awareness campaign and legal regulatory framework are needed for proper utilization and effective functioning.

CONCLUSIONS

The Model District initiative is the signature activity of the RADA Program. The Model District activity is viewed by stakeholders as the most relevant RADA Program activity aimed at strengthening public representation in the legislative process. Parliamentary respondents

recognized that there is a need to improve representation that is addressed by the RADA Program. Model District activities provided local officials and citizens with opportunities to offer their input to deputies on issues of local concern that could be addressed in parliament.

The European Information Research Center is perceived by MPs and staff as filling a need for comparative international information on legislation and how European parliaments operate, with a level of responsiveness that enables them to use the information and analysis in their legislative work.

Stakeholders valued the RADA Program's initiatives to increase transparency and openness in the Verkhovna Rada, which they saw as necessary for the new parliament to gain legitimacy in the wake of the Euromaidan Revolution and the elections of 2014.

QUESTION 2: WHICH RADA PROGRAM ACTIVITIES DO RADA PROGRAM STAKEHOLDERS PERCEIVE TO HAVE BEEN THE MOST BENEFICIAL FOR STRENGTHENING INDEPENDENT OVERSIGHT OF THE LEGISLATURE OVER THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH AND WHY?

In general, RADA Program activities aimed at strengthening legislative oversight were included under Objective 3 (Role of legislature in providing independent oversight of the executive branch strengthened). However, evaluators found that some activities under Objective 1 contributed to strengthening oversight. As a result, the relevance of all oversight activities is considered in this section, regardless of where they are found in the reporting framework.

FINDINGS

Model District MP Offices

While aimed at improving public representation in legislation, the Model District initiative included many activities that contained an oversight component, according to RADA Program reports. MPs, staff, and local officials reported in interviews that much of the interaction between MPs and constituents focused on the implementation of existing legislation, rather than discussion of pending legislation, on topics like solid-waste disposal and youth centers. Six parliamentary staff, two MPs, one implementer, nine journalists, five civil society representatives, 15 local officials, and one USAID official told the evaluation team about Model District activities that had an oversight component.

MPs and staff said in interviews that visits to Model Districts provided MPs with information about the implementation of laws, programs and agencies, which they took back to Kyiv to inform further oversight activities. Deputies and their aides cited instances of Model District events that halted construction of an oil refinery next to a village or led to a decision on a local solid-waste plant that was acceptable to local residents. "The principal task is to increase communication between the deputy and his constituents," one district aide said. "They don't always want to change legislation. That's not a priority for them...We can identify problems, advocate for them, and solve the problems."

In addition to information gained from local officials at forums, roundtables, and other public events, deputies said in interviews that they heard directly from citizens about their concerns about government. In some cases, they translated these informal encounters into formal

oversight actions, such as appeals to government ministers. For example, one deputy representing Luhansk Oblast presented a minister with 21 formal appeals that she had collected during a visit to the region, according to a RADA Program report and the MP.

RADA Program reports stated that the program organized media tours for outside journalists to Model Districts to learn more about local issues, such as implementation of local government legislation in Volyn Oblast or government operations in Luhansk Oblast. These tours generated news reports around the country on those issues and raised public awareness of the laws or agencies involved, according to RADA Program reports and interviews with journalists. According to the RADA Program FY 2017 annual report, the press tour to Luhansk Oblast resulted in 70 media reports about problems faced by citizens in the conflict zone. (Media tours to Model Districts are a separate activity from media tours to parliament in Kyiv.)

Local self-government

While reported under Objective I, many activities aimed at strengthening cooperation between deputies and local governments had an oversight component, according to descriptions of activities in RADA Program reports. In addition to its work with the Model District initiative, the RADA Program established a partnership with the Committee on State Building, Regional Policy and Local Self-Government. The program organized field visits, meetings, and hearings for that committee in locations around the country, enabling the committee to hear first-hand about the issues facing local communities as they implemented laws on decentralization and local self-government. These meetings took place outside of Model Districts in oblasts like Poltava, Vinnytsia, and Khmelnytskyi. The RADA Program facilitated reports at committee meetings in Kyiv by local government associations representing cities, rayons, oblasts, and villages, with topics including “urgent problems that self-government bodies faced at regional and district levels while implementing the current legislation,” according to the RADA Program FY 2017 annual report.

The RADA Program organized field hearings for the Committee on Corruption Prevention and Counteraction. In a meeting with seven committee staff, they cited the support of the program, including its manuals, as essential to the success of those meetings in Luhansk and Kyiv oblasts. The RADA Program also held field meetings for the Committee on Privatization, the Committee on the Budget, and the Committee on European Integration, according to RADA Program reports.

The RADA Program’s support for oversight of decentralization legislation also extended to initiatives beyond parliamentary committee events. For example, the program helped to organize Municipal Forums that brought together deputies and local officials to discuss cooperation between localities and parliament, according to RADA Program reports. Twenty deputies and more than 400 participants took part in the forum in Lviv in March 2017, including a visit to an amalgamated community in a Model District in Volyn Oblast, according to RADA Program reports and an interview with officials of that amalgamated community.

European Information and Research Center

While the European Information and Research Center (EIRC) was conceived as supporting the legislative process, the Center also provided support to parliamentary oversight, according to RADA Program reports and the Center's director. For example, the RADA Program organized an EIRC event to discuss the oversight powers of German parliamentarians, and the Center distributed an informational brief on the oversight function of parliamentary committees. Several policy papers addressed problems with current legislation or regulations, such as traffic safety and the rights of the disabled. The Center also addressed the role of the opposition and the distribution of committee positions, both of which impact willingness of committees to conduct oversight of the ministries they oversee, as deputies are generally less enthusiastic about oversight of their own party.³

Shadow Reports

The evaluation team found that shadow reports were of limited utility to parliamentary committees. According to the RADA Program website, "Shadow reports are a method whereby NGOs present alternative information to the periodic government reports concerning the implementation of government programs." ALI prepared the reports in FY 2017 and presented them at public hearings of six parliamentary committees. (Somewhat confusingly, the RADA Program referred to the documents as "pre-prepaid shadow reports.")

Of those six committees, only one committee staffer stated that the shadow report assisted the committee in its oversight role. She added that some ideas from that ALI shadow report were incorporated into a bill on the civil service. Deputies and staff of the other five committees stated either that the ALI shadow reports were not useful or that they were unfamiliar with the shadow reports. Most noteworthy was an interview with the acting chairman of a committee who said he did not know what a shadow report was, despite having presided over a committee meeting 10 months earlier where the report was presented. The chair of another committee said, "Such reports are a tool for the future. They are not very effective now."

Experts on Ukrainian public policy on the evaluation team found the reports well-researched, well-written, and informative, and the team heard no criticisms of their quality. However, the team found no evidence that the NGO reports improved committees' abilities to prepare their own oversight reports.

Other oversight activities

While the RADA Program established a fruitful relationship with the Committee on Corruption Prevention and Counteraction, interviewees did not cite activities under Expected Result 3.1

³ World Bank Institute and Global Parliamentarians Against Corruption, "Improving Democratic Accountability Globally," November 2013. http://gopacnetwork.org/Docs/CO_Handbook_EN.pdf

(Anti-corruption efforts strengthened, including parliamentary budget oversight) as having been beneficial for strengthening independent oversight. These included:

- No deputies or staff reported using the RADA Program’s video manual on the budget process;
- Promotion of an anti-corruption website was suspended because the site was not operational, according to a RADA Program report;
- The RADA Program stated in a report that it “observes no willingness among factions to introduce changes” in parliament’s rules of procedure, despite work by ALI in FY 2016 to develop a committee oversight manual and to recommend changes to the rules of procedure;
- Proposed methodological recommendations for parliament to use reports of the Accounting Chamber (Ukraine’s supreme audit institution) failed to advance because the leadership of the chamber has not been elected after a failed first attempt at voting, which has stalled European Union and GIZ plans to assist the Chamber in developing a strategic development plan and a methodology for performance auditing, according to RADA Program and EU officials;
- Development of a parliamentary code of ethics does not have the support of deputies, according to the then-chairman of the Committee on Corruption Prevention and Counteraction.

The Cox report cited several of these initiatives as necessary for strengthening the Verkhovna Rada, most notably the need for parliamentary follow-up to Accounting Chamber reports; revision of the rules of procedure; and development of a code of ethics. While that report found the above initiatives to be relevant to the needs of the Verkhovna Rada, deputies themselves told evaluators that the activities were not relevant to the current political situation. For example, the then-chairman of the Committee on Corruption Prevention and Counteraction said that establishment of an outside ethics board, similar to the Office of Congressional Ethics in the U.S. Congress, would be a more feasible and effective tool than the proposed code of ethics promoted by the RADA Program. “We are not enthusiastic about establishing a code of ethics. We think it is too early,” he said.

The Cox report also recommended concrete steps to improve oversight, such as mandating annual committee oversight plans. RADA Program staff said that committees nominally produce plans for each semi-annual session, but fail to include dates. Furthermore, “It is not committee practice to have oversight hearings,” one deputy said. “That’s usually done in the plenary. We can hold oversight hearings, but there is no tradition.”

A 2015 USAID study of 30 legislative strengthening programs found: “A successful committee component is the most important indicator of whether a legislative strengthening program will improve oversight.”⁴ That study found seven programs that failed to improve oversight. Those seven programs all lacked a committee strengthening component, as does the RADA Program.

⁴ John Lis and Gabrielle Plotkin, Legislative Strengthening Evaluations and Their Implications for Future Programs, (Washington: USAID, September 2015), p. 13.

CONCLUSIONS

Few of the RADA Program's activities to strengthen oversight were seen as relevant by stakeholders. Many of the oversight activities cited most often by stakeholders were designed to promote public representation in the legislative process, such as the Model District program, cooperation between deputies, local governments, and the EIRC.

The positive contribution of representational activities to the goal of strengthening oversight appears to be an accidental benefit of the RADA Program, but it should not come as a surprise. Most citizens do not analyze pending legislation and attempt to offer legislative changes; rather, citizens report to their deputies when a government program or agency is failing them. Representation often leads first to oversight; i.e., an effort to identify problems in the implementation of a law or of an authority delegated to the executive. In many cases, new legislation is the outcome when oversight uncovers the need for a legislative remedy. It is not unexpected that activities aimed at increasing public representation in the legislative process would strengthen oversight.

While several activities reported under Objective 3 directly corresponded to recommendations of the Cox report, they had little support among the intended beneficiaries. In many cases, these activities had goals that were not shared by deputies, particularly by the deputy in charge of the given objective. Objective 3 activities were disconnected from one another and, in some cases, bore little relation to the parliamentary oversight function. The failure of many Objective 3 activities to gain traction is due in part to Objective 3 being treated as a catchall for a host of free-standing initiatives, some unrelated to oversight. A more coherent and interconnected oversight component centered on committees may have been able to promote changes in practices, such as committee oversight planning and hearings.

QUESTION 3: WHAT CHANGES IN PUBLIC REPRESENTATION IN THE LEGISLATIVE PROCESS DO RADA PROGRAM STAKEHOLDERS PERCEIVE TO BE THE RESULT, IN WHOLE OR IN PART, OF THE RADA PROGRAM'S WORK?

FINDINGS

Increased Constituent Interaction

Stakeholders in Kyiv and in the districts said that the Model District initiative increased deputies' contact with voters through a series of public events, including town hall meetings, forums, hearings, and roundtables. This finding on the effectiveness of the Model District program was shared by 14 staff, seven MPs, and five implementers. Thirteen local officials cited these activities as useful for them to present their views to the deputy, and they positively contrasted their frequent contact with a Model District deputy against a lack of contact from other deputies in their region.

Twelve journalists reported that Model District activities increased their interaction with deputies, both at press events organized with the support of the RADA Program and in covering deputies' other public events. For example, one journalist whose circulation area covers two deputies' districts contrasted the accessibility of the Model District deputy to the

inaccessibility of the other deputy. Six civil society activists in the Model Districts also reported greater contact with the deputy participating in the program relative to other deputies, as well as greater responsiveness to the needs of those on whose behalf they advocated. “He bridged the gap between us and the authorities in Kyiv,” said an activist in Volyn, explaining how the deputy helped to obtain resources to educate disabled children.

A related Model District activity was the deputy’s public report, where a member delivered an account of his or her parliamentary activities for the previous year, including a discussion of legislative activity. Stakeholders in the districts said in interviews that they learned from deputies’ public reports how constituent input had been applied at the parliamentary level.

MPs participating in the program said that they would have prioritized constituent outreach without the RADA Program, but said that they were able to conduct more activities and reach more constituents thanks to the support of the program. Aides reported that the support of the program was essential for their initial outreach work. They stated that they were now able to organize activities without guidance from the program. OPORA found that the two deputies from single-mandate districts ranked “in the top 10” in its rankings of the most-active MPs.

Interest in Constituent Outreach Activities

The effectiveness of the Model District activity is illustrated by the interest in expanding the activity to include additional deputies. The RADA Program considered 37 applications for the activity before selecting seven deputies to participate. (An eighth deputy was originally selected but soon dropped due to an ethics issue.) “Other deputies would like to join the program,” a senior implementing official said. Expansion of the program was advocated by participating deputies, their aides, and parliamentary leadership, but they indicated that continued outside support would be necessary to help new deputies to establish their own Model Districts.

Even without formal expansion of the initiative, additional deputies are participating in Model District activities or carrying out similar activities outside of the RADA Program. For example, 10 deputies accompanied a Model District deputy to Luhansk and Donetsk oblasts; two additional deputies participated in a Model District activity in Kharkiv; a deputy and local officials from Nizhyn participated in training in neighboring Chernihiv; a deputy from Mykolaiv conducted a town hall meeting with RADA Program support; and training on deputies’ public reports was held for aides for 60 deputies from 14 oblasts. An IRI official reported that a deputy in Mariupol used the Model District example to organize similar events in his district.

Constituent Outreach by Party-List MPs

Of the seven deputies participating in the Model District initiative, two are from single-mandate districts and five were elected from national party lists. Those party-list deputies either selected an oblast to represent or were assigned an oblast by their parties. RADA Program officials said that they sought a geographical, party, and gender balance among the MPs, and they selected

deputies who appeared most likely to be committed to constituent outreach. While the two single-mandate district deputies were reported to be the most active in RADA Program reports, those reports stated that several party-list deputies were also active.

The RADA Program included party-list deputies in the Model District initiative, but it did not work with the parties' parliamentary factions. Linking party and parliamentary work more closely was a recommendation of the 2012 USAID governance assessment. The political party activities of IRI and NDI and the parliamentary support activities of the RADA Program operated separately. Internationally, constituent outreach programs for deputies elected from party lists often cooperate with party factions in parliament and rely on local party offices to provide support to deputies.⁵

A senior parliamentary leader said, "It would be more sustainable for the Model District program if it were more connected to political faction branches. Not just the person, but the institution could benefit." She added that parliament was unlikely to fund constituent outreach, but parties might be more willing to do so. One Model District deputy said, "Parties could provide coordination and connection to local party representatives." However, another party-list deputy said that he avoided contact with the local party office because he was not a party member, despite having been on the party's candidate list.

A 2015 USAID study found that constituent outreach components are least successful in mixed electoral systems like Ukraine's, where some deputies are selected from single-mandate districts and others are elected from party lists. Surprisingly, the most effective constituent outreach components are found in countries where deputies are elected from multi-member districts, possibly because there are fewer electoral districts to support. Legislation has been introduced in the Verkhovna Rada to change the electoral system; if passed, the bill would abolish single-mandate districts and shift to an open-list proportional representation system based on oblasts. International experience suggests that such a system could prove more conducive to promoting constituent outreach than the current system.⁶

Improved Parliamentary Research and Analysis

MPs and staff familiar with the EIRC attribute its re-establishment in 2015 to the RADA Program. Those stakeholders who utilize the EIRC found its products to be an effective and timely resource for their legislative and oversight activities. "This center provides effective support to MPs and staff," one department head said. "They have started creating their own

⁵ For information on the faction-based NDI constituent outreach program in Kyrgyzstan, see <https://www.usaid.gov/kyrgyz-republic/fact-sheets/kyrgyzstan-political-process-program-ndi>. See also John Lis and Aida Alymbaeva, *Parliamentary Sector Assessment in the Kyrgyz Republic* (Bishkek: USAID, November 2014), pp. 17, 26. For information on the faction-based NDI constituent outreach program in Iraq, see Hal Lippman and John Lis, *Outcome-Based Evaluation of DRL Programs In Iraq* (Washington: Department of State, May 2014), pp. 31-32.

⁶ Lis and Plotkin, p. 18.

Ukrainian way of doing analysis that is used in bills. Its highest value is related to the EU Association Agreement and harmonization process.” In other words, demand for EIRC analyses is also related to the Cox recommendations.

Deputies and senior staff recognize the need for a parliamentary research service within the Verkhovna Rada secretariat. One longtime department head said the most likely path was for the EIRC, which is outside of the secretariat, to serve as a “model for the next research service,” which would be established inside the Secretariat. One potential obstacle is the Institute on Legislation, a parliamentary body with more than 100 staff that conducts academic research about the legislature, in contrast to the policy research and analysis provided by the EIRC. While some informants suggested a need to shrink or eliminate the Institute in order to free resources to support the EIRC, there is no evidence that such a change has the necessary support or political will from parliamentary factions.

The EIRC was originally established in 2011 by USAID’s Parliamentary Development Program (PDP), the predecessor to the RADA Program, and was re-established by the RADA Program after having been closed under the previous parliamentary leadership. The EIRC is the second U.S. government effort to develop a research service in the Verkhovna Rada; the Library of Congress in 1996 supported the creation of a Department of Library and Information, with a Reference Room in the main Rada building that provided comparative international legislative information along the lines of the current EIRC.⁷ That Reference Room was closed soon thereafter, and the Informational Department was moved to a peripheral building (11 Velyka Zhytomyrska St.), more than two kilometers from parliament. USAID had similar experiences in countries such as Mongolia⁸ and Peru⁹, where newly elected parliamentary leaders closed nascent parliamentary research services that had been established with USAID assistance.

Transparency and Openness

Stakeholders credited the RADA Program with much of the progress toward greater transparency and openness in the Verkhovna Rada. Among specific activities in this area are the installation of Wi-Fi networks in five parliamentary office buildings, which facilitated streaming broadcasts of parliamentary meetings; recommendations on expanding the information committees publish on their websites; training for parliamentary staff on how to use social media; and training on public outreach for MPs and their aides. “Because of the RADA Program, this parliament has become more open,” said a journalist in Chernihiv, expressing a view held by a total of six journalists.

Committee staff, however, identified concerns with the use of committee websites to facilitate communication with citizens. During a focus group discussion, staff stated that they were unsure of how they should regard citizen comments that are submitted electronically. They said that it would be impossibly time consuming if they were required to respond to every

⁷ William H. Robinson and Raymond Gastelum, eds., Parliamentary Libraries and Research Services in Central and Eastern Europe (Munich: K.G. Saur, 1998), p. 212.

⁸ House Democracy Partnership, Mongolia Assessment Report, unpublished manuscript, May 2006, p. 8.

⁹ House Democracy Partnership, Peru Assessment Report, unpublished manuscript, February 2009, p. 10. In the case of Peru, the research service had not been incorporated into the legislature’s permanent structure.

electronic comment in the same way that they reply to formal letters. Staff added that analyzing every citizen comment on pending legislation would also be too time consuming and would require them to provide the same attention to possibly uninformed comments as they do to expert advice. “There is no problem with the platform itself: it is a good IT solution for communication between the Verkhovna Rada and the public,” said one committee staffer. “The main problem is the legal basis for using the platform.”

Staff also praised the e-parliament initiatives of the RADA Program, particularly the move to paperless circulation of documents. Staff found this to be particularly practical when holding committee meetings in a different building from committee offices, as it reduced the need to physically transport documents.

CONCLUSIONS

Stakeholders credit the RADA Program with increasing the contact of deputies with constituents. RADA Program training and its organizational and financial support to Model Districts resulted in more representational activities. Aides in the Model Districts say they can organize future representational events.

There is demand for expansion of the Model District program. Some deputies outside of the program have participated in activities with Model District colleagues or have initiated their own constituent outreach programs. Model District deputies and aides say they are prepared to mentor colleagues, but they say RADA Program support would be needed for a program expansion. The Verkhovna Rada is not prepared to fund and administer the current Model District program or to expand it.

While a majority of Model District deputies are elected from party lists, the RADA Program did not engage party factions in the Verkhovna Rada or cooperate in this area with USAID-funded political party programs. Local party offices could provide resources and support for party-list MPs participating in the program in the future, along the lines of similar constituent outreach programs internationally. Such cooperation could enable sustainable expansion of the Model District initiative in the future.

Parliamentary research services are essential for the legislature to have its own independent source of information and analysis, and the re-established EIRC provides a good foundation for a research service that is useful to deputies and staff in their legislative and oversight work. The Verkhovna Rada is not prepared to manage and fund the EIRC during the current parliamentary term. Past experience in Ukraine and internationally shows that elections and the installation of new parliamentary leadership can be a fateful time for new research services, as new leadership unfamiliar with the research service may redirect resources from policy analysis to other priorities, leaving the research service to wither without outside support.

Initiatives to increase parliamentary transparency and openness have been successful. These initiatives appear to be sustainable by the parliament itself, given the demonstrated level of aptitude for working with information technology.

QUESTION 4: WHAT CHANGES IN INDEPENDENT OVERSIGHT OF THE LEGISLATURE OVER THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH DO RADA PROGRAM STAKEHOLDERS PERCEIVE TO BE THE RESULT, IN WHOLE OR IN PART, OF THE RADA PROGRAM'S WORK?

FINDINGS

Key informants from inside and outside the parliament agreed that the oversight function in the Verkhovna Rada is weak and there has been little improvement in parliamentary oversight since the RADA Program began its work. “It is our weakest function in parliament,” an MP said. “The bottom line is political will. ... The RADA Program cannot change political will.” Even RADA Program officials had difficulty finding contributions to improved oversight; one senior official, when asked, could not cite a single achievement in this area.

Stakeholders pointed to individual achievements of the program, rather than systemic improvements in parliamentary oversight. “The RADA Program is like an umbrella for many small initiatives,” one implementing partner said. Much of the program’s limited success in oversight arose from activities under Objective I, which aimed to improve public representation in the legislative process.

Stakeholders credited the RADA Program with raising awareness of existing legislation on decentralization and local self-government through program activities aimed at increasing cooperation between deputies and local governments. Many of these activities were linked to the Model District program. Journalists cited media tours to districts where they observed how the law on voluntary amalgamation of territorial communities was being implemented, which resulted in greater national awareness of the amalgamation and decentralization process. Local officials credited the RADA Program with ensuring that deputies heard their concerns on the implementation of legislation.

Similarly, deputies and staff of the Committee on State Building, Regional Policy and Local Self-Government and deputies and staff of the Committee on Corruption Prevention and Counteraction credited the RADA Program with facilitating field hearings, meetings and visits of the committees to oversee implementation of relevant legislation. Committee staff said that they did not have the budget or capacity to organize such events on their own and that the events would not have occurred without the support of the RADA Program.

In addition to supporting oversight of decentralization, the RADA Program was credited with improving deputies’ and committees’ communication with the executive branch. Deputies and staff credited the RADA Program with assisting them to improve the quality of deputies’ inquiries to the executive thanks to increased information from EIRC and ALI policy papers and trainings. By providing deputies with information about the implementation of laws and programs in their districts, the Model District program contributed to an increase in the number of deputies’ inquiries.

CONCLUSIONS

The RADA Program contributed little to improving parliamentary oversight. The main achievements in oversight were related to the Model District initiative and similar activities promoting cooperation between local officials and parliament, particularly with regard to

decentralization and local self-government, in cooperation with the Committee on State Building, Regional Policy and Local Self-Government. The program also improved the oversight capabilities of the Committee on Corruption Prevention and Counteraction.

QUESTION 5: HOW WELL DID THE RADA PROGRAM RESPOND TO OPPORTUNITIES TO LEVERAGE RESOURCES AND ADVANCE RELEVANT PARLIAMENTARY REFORMS THROUGH COLLABORATION WITH OTHER USAID AND NON-USAID DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS?

FINDINGS

USAID Democracy and Governance Programs

The RADA Program operated cooperatively with several other programs of the Office of Democracy and Governance at USAID/Ukraine, according to officials of USAID/Ukraine, the RADA Program, and other program implementers. Key informants told evaluators that the RADA Program maintained regular contact with those programs, collaborated on joint events, and avoided duplication with their activities. The RADA Program and other programs generally did not integrate their work, however.

NDI and IRI implement USAID/Ukraine's political party programming, with NDI focusing on national parties and IRI working with local parties and local government. A USAID official described their work as "complementary" to the RADA Program, with good information sharing. One exception to the lack of integration was the use of an NDI-created constituent contact database by deputies' offices in the Model District program. Deputies' aides said the tool was customized to their needs and was useful in tracking constituent communications. NDI also provides technical assistance to the parliamentary Equal Opportunities Caucus and Euro-Optimist Caucus, and NDI implements an EU initiative, the Jean Monnet Dialog, which seeks to build consensus among parliamentary factions on parliamentary reforms recommended by the Cox report.

IFES supports the Central Election Commission, campaign finance issues, the Donbas peace process, and legal reform of the electoral law. An IFES official said his program works "every day, one way or another" with the RADA Program regarding "a heavy legislative agenda on our side." He said, "They have gone out of their way to find ways to collaborate. They are extra receptive to our outreach, and we are pleased with how they implement."

The RADA Program leveraged USAID's decentralization and local self-government programming, particularly the Policy for Ukraine Local Self-Governance (PULSE) program. As noted above, much of the RADA Program's success came in its efforts to support representation, legislation and oversight related to decentralization and local self-government. "The RADA Program helped deputies understand the legislation that PULSE was seeking to pass," a USAID official said. "PULSE doesn't have the capacity to assist with oversight of local self-government legislation." The relationship between the programs was so close that the PULSE implementer, the Association of Ukrainian Cities, hired the RADA Program local governance expert to be its new chief of party.

An official of the Decentralization Offering Better Results and Efficiency (DOBRE) program noted that that program does not address decentralization legislation, so it has fewer

opportunities to interact with the RADA Program. During a visit to Volyn Oblast, an evaluator found that the RADA Program was viewed as USAID's local self-government program because DOBRE does not operate in Volyn. Similarly, evaluators observed a Model District event in Brovary that was devoted to discussion of decentralization; however, neither the PULSE nor DOBRE programs were present.

A USAID official said the RADA Program is the "window" to Verkhovna Rada committees for the New Justice Program and said collaboration was "perfect" between the two programs. While the New Justice Program states that it has its own access to the national parliament, it finds coordination meetings with the RADA Program and other international donors and information fairs quite useful.

Cooperation between the RADA Program and USAID/Ukraine human rights and labor programs was less frequent. This was limited to the annual information fairs organized by the RADA Program and the Verkhovna Rada, where international assistance programs operated stands to inform parliament of their work. "The RADA Program could be more proactive in learning how other programs work and could connect them to the relevant parliamentary committees," a USAID/Ukraine official said.

Other USAID Programs

Evaluators found no collaboration between the RADA Program and programs administered by the Office of Economic Growth and the Office of Health, though those two offices oversee programs that have legislative and policy agendas. Officials from those offices declined requests for interviews with the evaluation team. According to an official in the USAID/Ukraine Program Office, there was no regular collaboration between those offices and the RADA Program, which he characterized as "missed opportunities" for those offices to seek support for their agendas in the Verkhovna Rada.

Non-USAID Parliamentary Strengthening Programs

The RADA Program did not report funding from any donor other than USAID. The RADA Program did leverage non-USAID programs through joint sponsorship of various activities, according to RADA Program reports and interviews with RADA Program and international donor representatives. These activities ranged from one-off activities to extended cooperation over several years. The RADA Program did not report the dollar value of such joint sponsorship arrangements.

The Interns League, a local implementing partner of the RADA Program, did secure outside funding for interns' stipends from five donors: the German aid agency GIZ, two intern program alumni, and two Ukrainian foundations. That funding in 2017 totaled 410,385 hryvnia (\$14,392) and funded 31 stipends, matching the USAID contribution.

Other donors chose to fund their own legislative strengthening programs rather than provide funding to the RADA Program. The United Nations Development Program and the Westminster Foundation for Democracy (WFD) operate the other two main parliamentary strengthening programs in the Verkhovna Rada. UNDP receives most of its funding from the

European Union, which initiated the program in the wake of the Cox Report. UNDP's work addresses streamlining of the legislative process, building capacity of the Secretariat, and transparency and openness.

WFD is largely funded by GIZ and is working on parliamentary procedure, fiscal oversight and support for administration and research. International donors and implementers interviewed for the evaluation said that the RADA Program has generally cooperated with their programs effectively.

In addition to EU funding of the UNDP project, the Delegation of the European Union to Ukraine plans to collaborate with the RADA Program in support related to the Accounting Chamber. The EU plans to assist the Chamber in developing a performance audit capability, while the RADA Program will provide recommendations to parliamentary committees on how to review Chamber reports. However, these plans are stalled pending the election of new leadership of the Chamber.

Other co-sponsorship arrangements include roundtable discussions on local governance in partnership with the Council of Europe and a Swiss decentralization project and discussions related to the Open Government Partnership in partnership with Transparency International.

While other implementers appreciated the International Parliamentary Technical Assistance Coordination meetings hosted by the RADA Program, one did complain that the meetings too often focused on the RADA Program's priorities, rather than allowing all implementers to share their work and their priorities.

CONCLUSIONS

The RADA Program collaborated effectively with other parliamentary strengthening programs and with some USAID democracy and governance programs. The programs successfully coordinated their activities, jointly sponsored programs, and avoided duplication of programming. The donor coordination efforts of the RADA Program ensured that all donors and implementers were aware of one another's activities. Several other USAID DG programs viewed the RADA Program as their "window on parliament."

The decisions of the EU and GIZ, the other major donors, to fund their own parliamentary strengthening programs limited the ability of the RADA Program to leverage outside funding. Collaboration with other donors' programs was limited to joint organization of various programs and coordination of activities through the IPTAC, rather than other donors' funding the RADA Program.

While coordination was effective and implementers respected one another's autonomy, implementers dutifully stayed in their lanes, rather than exploring opportunities to integrate their activities. Among the areas in which such integration could have been effective was the Model District initiative; while the program worked with five party-list MPs, there was no effort to cooperate with NDI and IRI political party activities in promoting constituent outreach. The RADA Program successfully supported decentralization and local self-government oversight activities.

QUESTION 6: HOW RELEVANT WAS THE RADA PROGRAM IN ADVANCING PARLIAMENTARY REFORM IN UKRAINE?

FINDINGS

Overall Relevance

The RADA Program was highly relevant to Ukraine's reform program initiated after the Euromaidan Revolution. Parliamentary reform remains central to the country's democratization and Europeanization. Key informants who were interviewed said that the RADA Program was instrumental in promoting parliamentary reform overall and that USAID was taking the lead of all international donors in supporting reforms of the Verkhovna Rada. The RADA Program included many projects that are fundamentally important and relevant to the creation of a professional and European parliament.

The RADA Program was designed in 2013, when the Ukrainian political scene looked very different from today, and its first year of operation saw a revolution and new parliamentary elections. As a result, the program had to delay implementation of its program until the new parliament took office after November 2014. Faced with a resultant delay in selecting Model District deputies, the program in FY 2015 moved ahead with regional trainings for deputies' aides in six oblasts, despite delays elsewhere.

There was a need to revisit the program design in reaction to major political changes. For example, decentralization legislation was adopted in 2015, and the RADA Program quickly developed a seminar series to inform local communities about the new initiatives. An important new development with ramifications for the program was the March 2016 Cox Report, which also focused on parliamentary reform. The RADA Program worked to align its activities with the Cox Report recommendations.

The success rate of its programs should be monitored during the program cycle. With limited resources, it is important to focus them on activities that are working. All of the RADA Program's many activities were relevant to the creation of a professional and European parliament, but not all received support from parliamentary leaders and factions. The civil society registry, for example, received little interest. The Rules of Procedure and Code of Ethics received little public support from parliamentary factions, with interviewees saying "it was too early" or "the time was not yet right." In other cases, such as shadow reports, there was little knowledge among MPs and parliamentary staffers about their purpose and usefulness of increasing parliamentary oversight. Some RADA activities, such as the European Information and Research Center (EIRC), successfully responded to the concerns of MPs. According to the EIRC website, the center director, and parliamentary users, demand for EIRC papers were often a result of demand for knowledge about topical issues of the day, such as national minority rights, illegal crossing of Ukraine's border, anti-corruption courts, open-list national party election laws, judicial, pension and health care reforms.

Cox Report and Roadmap on Internal Reform and Capacity-Building for the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine

Although the Cox Report's 52 recommendations were relevant to parliamentary reform, their implementation was dependent upon many factors, including political will of the parliamentary speaker and the interest of MPs in reform of parliament and improving their professionalism. The team heard from a number of interviewees that parliament functioned more efficiently and was more interested in oversight when Volodymyr Groysman was its chairperson. Groysman moved from parliamentary chairman to prime minister in April 2016, only a month after the Cox Report was launched.

The RADA Program initiated 10 public discussions on the Cox report recommendations directed at civil society NGOs, MPs and parliamentary staffers. The EU believes implementation of the recommendations has been slow, according to UNDP officials. The RADA Program also worked on parliamentary oversight of the executive branch of the government (Cox report recommendations 14, 15, 16, and 17), as well as engagement of civil society and citizens in legislative development and public discussion of local government within the Model District project. The RADA Program continued to work on the Rules of Procedure (Cox report recommendations 1, 2, 3, and 4) and Code of Ethics (Cox report recommendation 52), but there was little support within parliament for these two reforms. The RADA Program worked on the introduction and functioning of a range of e-parliamentary instruments (E-Petitions, Public Platform for Commentary on Draft Laws, E-Plenary, and E-Committee, Cox report recommendations 22 and 23) that are still in their early stages of use. Of the 52 Cox report recommendations, 15 have been partly implemented and are partly working while five still require changes to legislation, four require changes to the Rules of Procedure, and one requires a constitutional change.¹⁰ While the RADA Program linked its activities to Cox report recommendations, it did not overhaul its agenda in response to that report.

Representation

Improving representation is relevant and important for Ukraine's democratic consolidation. In a late 2016 poll by the Razumkov Center for Economic and Political Studies think tank, 90 percent of Ukrainians lack trust in parliament. The same percentage does not trust political parties, which are essential to a parliamentary democracy¹¹ but are very weak in Ukraine.

The objectives of a range of RADA activities were very relevant towards improving representation. The seven Model Districts included a large cohort of pro-European reformers, five of whom were elected from party lists (rather than single-mandate districts), as they came from civil society and the media. They therefore did not possess financial resources to run in a district. The RADA Program advanced parliamentary representation through Model Districts because the visits narrowed the gap between voters and their elected representatives. The visits

¹⁰ Roman Malko, 'Upgrading the Rada,' *The Ukrainian Week*, October 2017, p.17.

http://i.tyzhden.ua/content/photoalbum/2017/10_2017/18/uw/Book10.pdf

¹¹ *National Security and Defence*, nos.1-2, 2017, p.16.

http://razumkov.org.ua/uploads/journal/eng/NSD169-170_2017_eng.pdf

led to the resolution of outstanding local issues, such as local opposition to construction of an oil refinery near Brovary and completion of unbuilt construction projects in Transcarpathia.

Town hall meetings were introduced by the RADA Program and have become a popular tool to improve parliamentary representation. Town hall meetings were opportune occasions for MPs to present reports to voters and for citizens to meet their elected representatives face to face.

The RADA Program provided assistance in taking parliamentary committees to Ukraine's regions. Two committees expressed the greatest interest in meetings outside Kyiv that were organized by the RADA Program: 1. State Building, Regional Policy and Local Self-Government; and 2. Preventing and Countering Corruption.

Oversight

RADA activities directed towards parliamentary oversight were very relevant in Ukraine's context, but at the same time overly ambitious. Some RADA activities were directly relevant in supporting various means to increase parliament's oversight of the government, such as technical assistance for government ministers to report to hearings and committees.

Interviewees who were familiar with the EIRC said it played a relevant role in oversight. EIRC publications and shadow reports are relevant in playing a role in parliamentary oversight, although with limited usage by MPs and parliamentary staffers the latter's influence was limited. Parliament cannot implement the Cox report and programs of internal donors, such as the RADA Program, without an understanding of how Europe works. Parliament needs a modern research service geared towards providing policy analysis. The EIRC could fill this need, but that would require parliament to resolve the fate of the Institute of Legislation.

Parliamentary Internship Program

The Parliamentary Internship Program is highly relevant to parliamentary reform, as internships prepare a new generation of parliamentary staff and politicians and thereby improve professionalism and capabilities of those who work within parliament. At least half of its participants go on to become parliamentary staff and some of these become MPs, such as Model District MP Ivan Krulko. The Internship Program and trainings were relevant in channeling the energy of young people who following the Euromaidan Revolution wished to participate in Ukraine's democratization and European integration. Despite its value in familiarizing young Ukrainians with the workings of parliament, the internship program did not directly improve parliamentary oversight.

During the last 17 years the Interns Program has been funded by USAID through PDP and the RADA Program. On December 7, 2017, the Verkhovna Rada adopted a resolution to amend

article 48 of the law “On State Service” to provide parliamentary funding for 30 stipends for the League of Interns Parliamentary Internship Program.¹²

Rules of Procedure and Code of Ethics

The relevance of modernizing the Rules of Procedure was clear, as they were adopted in 2000, nearly two decades ago. Modernization of Rules of Procedure is one of the Cox recommendations and an important component of parliamentary reform and the “Europeanization” of this institution. The reason there has been no progress on adopting new Rules of Procedure is the same as why there is little support for a Code of Ethics: political will is required for either to progress. The RADA Program’s support for Rules of Procedure and Ethics Code was highly relevant within the context of parliamentary reform and Ukraine’s European integration. Nevertheless, these two areas had limited support in parliament.

CONCLUSIONS

The RADA Program was highly relevant to the Ukrainian context following the Euromaidan Revolution and even more so following the institutionalization of the goal of European integration. USAID was the biggest international donor towards reform of the Verkhovna Rada. Many RADA Program projects were relevant within the context of developments in Ukraine from 2014 analyzed earlier in in Evaluation Questions 1-5. The RADA Program undertook a large number of projects that promoted parliamentary reform towards the goal of creating a professional and European Verkhovna Rada. The RADA Program’s support for new Rules of Procedure and a Code of Ethics was relevant to the advance of parliamentary representation and oversight, but those initiatives failed to find support within the Verkhovna Rada due to a lack of political will.

The overall relevance of the RADA Program can be understood in four ways. First, projects were geared towards the need for deputies to reach out to voters, in order to reduce distrust of parliament and to engage citizens in the democratic process. Second, trainings under the RADA Program were relevant for the new program of reforms and European integration. Third, informational products supplied by the EIRC and ALI broadened the horizons of deputies who, while professing support for European integration, knew little about how European democracies functioned. Finally, RADA Program projects were intended to be aligned with the 52 recommendations of the European Parliament’s Cox Report, as working towards the common goal of European integration.

¹² http://w1.c1.rada.gov.ua/pls/zweb2/webproc4_2?id=&pf3516=6596&skl=9

QUESTION 7: HOW EFFECTIVE WAS THE RADA PROGRAM IN ADVANCING PARLIAMENTARY REFORM IN UKRAINE?

FINDINGS

Overall Effectiveness

The RADA Program was effective in advancing parliamentary reform overall. But, certain projects, such as the Civil Society Registry, Rules of Procedure and Code of Ethics, did not receive support within parliament, while the shadow reports were not used by many MPs and staffers. These projects were relevant to parliamentary reform but not effective in advancing parliamentary representation and oversight. The RADA Program is associated with interns and trainings that brought young and eager people committed to European integration into parliament and which improved their professionalism.

The RADA Program was praised by many interviewees who described it as the largest and most effective internationally-funded program involved in reforming parliament. One interviewee said the RADA Program had “become an independent and stand-alone institution.” The majority of RADA Program projects were not duplicated by other international donors, such as WFD and UNDP.

Internships and Trainings

All key informants praised the internship program and said they believed it had been effective. Since 2014, there is greater prestige working in parliament and many interns seek employment in parliament after their internship is concluded. Four MPs and numerous aides and staffers emerged from the intern program. One Model District MP was an intern just after the Orange Revolution. Many of those interviewed by the team were enthusiastic about parliament taking over the interns’ program in 2018. Trainings provided by the RADA Program were highly popular. A total of 28 staff, three MPs and five journalists said that the trainings were useful to them in their work.

Rules of Procedure and Code of Ethics

There has been limited effectiveness in the RADA Program’s effort to modernize parliament’s Rules of Procedure. Similar to the Code of Ethics, it is still not prioritized by MPs. The effectiveness of the RADA Program’s work in these two areas was therefore affected by limited support it received from parliament’s leaders and MPs. ALI officials told evaluators that 200 deputies supported the adoption of a Code of Ethics, but this view was not shared by MPs who were interviewed by the team. The then-chairman of the Committee on Preventing and Countering Corruption stated in an interview that only 40 to 60 deputies supported a Code of Ethics and its adoption was more likely to receive support in the next parliamentary term.

Oversight

The oversight component of the RADA Program made an overall contribution to an improvement in oversight of the government and parliament itself. Most survey respondents said

that oversight had not improved significantly in the Verkhovna Rada. Sixty percent of civil society activists, 50 percent of journalists, and 67 percent of MPs said oversight had not improved or had improved little. However, 61 percent of staff said oversight had improved. The same percentage of staff and 33 percent of MPs said improvement in oversight was attributable to the RADA Program. (Journalists and civil society respondents declined to answer this question.) These survey results are reflected in interviews.

The RADA Program contributed effectively to oversight through individual stand-alone activities within the Model Districts, improving cooperation between MPs and local self-government, and increasing information available to committees and MPs. There was greater openness to input from civil society experts and the public, and there has been an increase in appeals (*zvernennya*) from citizens and questions (*zapyty*) sent by committees and deputies to the government, which is required to reply within a fixed time period.

Representation

A majority of stakeholders stated that the RADA Program had increased the effectiveness of public representation in the legislative process. This is reflected in surveys undertaken by the team. Eighty percent of MPs, 93 percent of staff, 93 percent of journalists and 77 percent of civil society representatives said that public representation has improved some or a lot. Eighty-six percent of MPs, 64 percent of staff, 58 percent of journalists and 50 percent of civil society said this was due somewhat or a lot to the RADA Program.

As noted in Evaluation Questions 3 and 4, 49 interviewees stated that public representation had improved and credited the RADA Program with improved public representation. The team's interviews and surveys show that respondents understood the need to improve public representation and were working towards this goal.

Many parliamentary deputies understood the need for the first time to be more responsive to voters. Pavlo Rizanenko's high level of activity in his Model District is reflected in the levels of trust he receives from local councilors in the city of Brovary and neighboring rayons. This was clearly evident during a visit to a seminar attended by 40-50 councilors, aides and staffers in Brovary that dealt with decentralization. Councilors detailed how visits by Pavlo Rizanenko to villages to discuss the location of a new oil refinery had literally brought out a full house of everybody who lived there because this was the first time they had actually seen their MP.

CONCLUSIONS

The Euromaidan Revolution, three elections, Russia's military aggression, and an engaged EU backing reforms and integration, coupled with initial management difficulties, meant the effectiveness of the RADA Program that was launched in November 2013 did not reach full capacity until late 2015-early January 2016. These factors should be taken into account in evaluating the overall effectiveness of the RADA Program during its current cycle. In light of this, the effectiveness of the RADA Program has been high when its projects have received support within parliament.

Model Districts, Town Hall Meetings, visits of parliamentary committees to regions, and EIRC publications proved to be effective projects undertaken by the RADA Program. The RADA Program was faced with a number of obstacles. Choosing Model Districts in Kharkiv and Luhansk Oblast was ambitious and was faced by indifference from local fiefdoms controlled by oligarchs.

The RADA Program was less effective at promoting parliamentary oversight of the executive. While relevant to promoting oversight, shadow reports, Rules of Procedure and Code of Ethics were less effective projects undertaken by the RADA Program. The relative lack of effectiveness in Objective 3 activities was due in part to a lack of coherence among activities and to the component being somewhat of a catch-all for activities not directly related to oversight, such as the interns program, Rules of Procedure, Code of Ethics, and training on lawmaking.

QUESTION 8: HOW WELL DID THE RADA PROGRAM PROMOTE GENDER EQUALITY IN ITS PROGRAMMING, IN THE VERKHOVNA RADA, AND IN PUBLIC POLICY IN UKRAINE?

FINDINGS

Activities to promote gender equality were put in place at a time when gender issues could no longer remain a marginal concern of deputies. The Euromaidan Revolution, a more politically mature civil society and population, rising middle class and support (for the first time) in Brussels for Ukraine's European integration meant that gender questions had to become part of the mainstream policy making process. This did not mean that there would be roadblocks and difficulties but that a threshold had been crossed and RADA Program activities were successfully adapted to this more tolerant environment. In the survey, 73 percent of MPs and 55 percent of staffers responded that gender quality had improved either a lot or somewhat. Although gender equality became part of the mainstream, there was still much work to do.

The RADA Program undertook a range of policies promoting gender equality. Key informants, such as the gender consultant to the RADA Program and coordinator of the Equal Opportunities Caucus, said that the gender question had moved "from the margins to the mainstream." Nearly three quarters of Ukrainians support the creation of and the agenda of the Equal Opportunities Caucus (supported by NDI) in parliament.¹³ The Equal Opportunities Caucus has a membership of 53 that includes 40 of the 52 women MPs and 13 male MPs.

The transitioning of gender issues to the mainstream of is reflected in a 2016 NDI poll on public attitudes to women's participation in politics.¹⁴ Nearly half of Ukrainians believe there are insufficient numbers of women in parliament and local government, meaning opposition to gender quotas is not high, and the poll showed that political parties who introduced gender quotas would gain votes in future elections. Additionally, Ukrainians believe women are more equipped to

¹³ <https://www.ndi.org/sites/default/files/NDI%20Gender%20Research%20FEB%202016%20-%20ENG%20vf.pdf>

¹⁴ <https://www.ndi.org/sites/default/files/NDI%20Gender%20Research%20FEB%202016%20-%20ENG%20vf.pdf>

manage certain policy areas and are better managers. Women are perceived by Ukrainians to be less prone to corruption and less interested in entering politics for personal gain. Thereby, including women in party lists could improve confidence in parliament and raise public trust in the legislature.

The movement of gender issues to the mainstream of public policy is testimony to the work of the RADA Program as well as the determination of many actors working at different levels in this field. A RADA Program gender consultant said this is the outgrowth of the emergence of a new middle class with post-Soviet values which was first witnessed in the Orange Revolution and had again shown itself in the Euromaidan Revolution. RADA Program gender consultant described this as a transition to the “gender maturity of Ukrainian society.”

The RADA Program strove to promote gender equality in its programming in three ways:

1. The RADA Program assisted parliament to build its capacity for gender analysis of legislation. Three bodies analyzed legislation for its compatibility with the constitution, existing laws and international obligations (Committee on Legal Policy and Judiciary), corruption (Committee on Corruption Prevention and Counteraction) and compatibility with Ukrainian laws and international obligations towards the promotion of gender equality (Equal Opportunities Caucus). Participants improved their analytical skills thanks to the provision of information about the history and development of the women’s movement, analysis of discriminatory policies against women, and Ukraine’s obligations to promote gender equality under international laws and rights.
2. The RADA Program provided a wide range of trainings to women and men aides and staffers. For the first ever time, trainings on gender issues were undertaken in a professional manner combining theoretical knowledge with practical tools of gender issues.. Trainings increased expertise in gender issues, such as the steps needed to legislate and institutionalize equal rights and expanded expertise in promoting gender tolerance. In FY 2016, the RADA Program trained 76 men and 120 women, and in FY 2017 it trained 108 men and 149 women.
3. RADA Program, Model Districts and town hall meetings mobilized young women, established networks with civil society organizations and experts in local areas, who brainstormed gender questions and developed ideas for new activities in round-tables and working groups. In Kharkiv and Luhansk, two Model Districts run by women MPs, gender balance was evident in the working groups, which worked on a range of local themes that were of interest to voters.

CONCLUSIONS

The RADA Program promoted gender equality in its training activities. The program trained more women than men in the most recent two years, and it trained both women and men on gender issues. The RADA Program also helped young women in parliament to develop networks with civil society organizations and local experts. Taken together, trainings promoted a more gender-sensitive parliament and a greater willingness of MPs to focus on gender equality.

The greatest accomplishment of the RADA Program in this area is the development of capacity for parliamentary staff to undertake gender analysis of legislation and policy issues. However, because gender analysis is not required for legislation, this capacity is underutilized.

LESSONS LEARNED

Flexibility is essential in legislative strengthening: The relevance of RADA Program activities is dependent on the Ukrainian political context, and the political environment changed dramatically as a result of the Euromaidan Revolution in 2013-2014. The RADA Program was designed in early 2013, when the Ukrainian political scene looked very different from today, and its first year of operation witnessed a revolution and new parliamentary elections. As a result, the RADA Program had to delay implementation of its program until the new parliament took office in November-December 2014. Faced with a resultant delay in selecting Model District deputies, the RADA Program in FY 2015 moved ahead with regional trainings for deputies' aides in six oblasts and training in spite of delays elsewhere. This flexibility in programming enabled the program to record achievements at a time that parliament was in flux.

Revisit program design in case of major political changes: The revolution of 2014 led to new parliamentary elections and significant political changes in 2015, bringing a newfound relevance to topics like decentralization and local governance that had limited significance when the program was designed in 2013. Decentralization legislation was passed in 2015, and the RADA Program quickly developed a seminar series and the EIRC policy papers to inform MPs and local communities about the initiatives.

Consult with beneficiaries during program design: The weaknesses of Objective 3 activities were due in part to a lack of support from key parliamentary officials for the goals of the RADA Program. While the RADA Program initially conducted a survey of MPs, key committee chairs told evaluators that RADA Program activities did not correspond to what they believed was important or feasible. Some told evaluators that they saw some activities as RADA Program “deliverables” for USAID, such as the work on revising the rules of procedure or developing an ethics code. In designing the oversight component, RADA Program officials could have consulted more with key committees to provide support that was relevant to the needs of those committees.

Program activities need to be focused: Objective 3 was a catch-all for various activities that made sense individually, but did not together constitute a coherent oversight program. The RADA Program may have been more successful if it had attempted fewer activities and concentrated its resources on objectives that were achievable.

Double-down on what is working: The success of the Model District initiative provided an opportunity for the RADA Program to expand those activities to include other MPs, thereby increasing the reach of efforts to improve representation and building internal parliamentary support for representational activities.

Transition activities to parliament when it is ready: USAID's 17 years of support for the intern program demonstrated that a beneficiary can rely on a donor beyond the time needed to establish a sustainable program, with the internship program transferred to parliament in 2018.

Conversely, evaluators found that parliament is not prepared to fully fund the Model District initiative or EIRC, so continued funding will be needed after the end of the RADA Program to ensure their viability. Future work on activities like the Model District initiative or the EIRC should provide support to ensure the initiatives become well-established, but should aim to transition those activities to parliament when it is ready to support them.

Consider work with factions. Political party factions in parliament are an important aggregator of public policy preferences, but the RADA Program did not have a component that worked with factions. Such cooperation is particularly important when working with party-list MPs on constituent outreach: such MPs do not have their own districts, and local offices of political parties can provide support to their MPs' constituent outreach activities. Factions can also serve a representative role, aggregating their supporters' preferences and translating them into legislative initiatives.

Representative democracy needs representatives. Several RADA Program activities, notably E-Petitions and the Citizen E-Platform, sought to enable citizens to directly influence the legislative process by directly proposing legislation or directly commenting on existing legislation. Such initiatives bypassed the role of the MP as the intermediary between the people and the government and led to confusion among committee staff as to how to respond to such comments on pending legislation. While tools that facilitate communication between citizens and MPs are to be welcomed, more thought is needed as to how committees and other parliamentary bodies should consider such initiatives.

Citizens have problems, not amendments. Most citizen interaction with MPs does not concern pending legislation. Rather, citizens approach their MPs when they have a problem with a government program or service. This constituent outreach can help MPs to identify shortcomings in a law or agency that may be a topic for legislative oversight and, ultimately, legislation to resolve the program. Likewise, field hearings are often most useful to uncover shortcomings in existing legislation rather than to solicit comments on pending legislation.

Effective collaboration can advance other democracy and governance goals: The focus of the RADA Program on decentralization and local self-governance provided welcome support to the mission's other programs in this area. The support provided by the RADA Program to the mission objective of promoting decentralization and local self-governance could have been extended to other USAID programs.

Interviews are more valuable than surveys for parliamentary strengthening evaluations. The evaluation team found that face-to-face interviews and focus group discussions yielded more valuable information than the web-based surveys. Evaluators were able to tailor conversations to each informant's knowledge and expertise, and evaluators were able to elicit more nuanced and in-depth responses. It is easy for potential respondents to avoid responding to electronic surveys and to open-ended questions embedded in surveys, which generates less useful data. Personal follow-up to surveys can increase response rates, but evaluation team time is better utilized in organizing and conducting interviews.

ANNEX A: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY IN UKRAINIAN

РЕЗЮМЕ ЗВІТУ З ОЦІНКИ

МЕТА ОЦІНКИ І ПИТАННЯ

Мета цієї оцінки ефективності роботи – визначити **актуальність** та **ефективність** Програми РАДА у просуванні парламентської реформи в Україні та, зокрема, у посиленні участі громадськості у законодавчому процесі та у зміцненні незалежного нагляду з боку законодавчого органу за виконавчою гілкою влади. Питання для проведення оцінки:

1. Які програмні заходи Програми РАДА, на думку стейкхолдерів Програми РАДА, найбільше сприяли посиленню участі громадськості у законодавчому процесі і чому?
2. Які програмні заходи Програми РАДА, на думку стейкхолдерів Програми РАДА, найбільше сприяли посиленню незалежного нагляду з боку законодавчого органу за виконавчою гілкою влади і чому?
3. Які зміни щодо участі громадськості у законодавчому процесі, на думку стейкхолдерів Програми РАДА, є результатом діяльності Програми РАДА, повністю або частково?
4. Які зміни щодо незалежного нагляду з боку законодавчого органу за виконавчою гілкою влади, на думку стейкхолдерів Програми РАДА, є результатом діяльності Програми РАДА, повністю або частково?
5. Наскільки ефективно Програма РАДА використовувала можливості максимально раціонального використання ресурсів та просування відповідних парламентських реформ шляхом співпраці з іншими програмами допомоги, які підтримуються USAID та іншими організаціями, окрім USAID?
6. Наскільки актуальними були заходи Програми РАДА у просуванні парламентської реформи в Україні?
7. Наскільки ефективними були заходи Програми РАДА у просуванні парламентської реформи в Україні?
8. Наскільки успішно Програма РАДА сприяла гендерній рівності у своїх програмах, у діяльності Верховної Ради та у державній політиці в Україні?

ІСТОРІЯ ТА КОНТЕКСТ

Опозиція, яка прийшла до влади після Революції гідності, або Євромайдану, визначила своїм пріоритетом повернення України до системи, у якій парламент є більш впливовим. Цей період ознаменувався проведенням президентських та парламентських виборів у 2014 році та місцевих виборів, проведених роком пізніше. До Верховної Ради України обирають 450 депутатів на термін п'ять років за допомогою змішаної системи мажоритарних одномандатних округів та загальнодержавних партійних списків.

До початку теперішньої Програми, USAID фінансував Програму розвитку парламенту з 1994 по 2013 роки. Програма РАДА була спершу розроблена на

початку 2013 року і стартувала у листопаді того ж року. Реалізація Програми РАДА була відкладена через Революцію Євромайдану, вибори та перезавантаження відносин між Україною та Євросоюзом. На внутрішньому рівні труднощі в управлінні та зміни у керівництві парламенту тривали до листопада 2015 року.

Програма РАДА має виконати три завдання:

1. Посилення участі громадськості у законодавчому процесі;
2. Збільшення ролі громадян у моніторингу роботи парламенту;
3. Зміцнення ролі законодавчого органу у здійсненні незалежного нагляду за виконавчою гілкою влади.

МЕТОДИ ПРОВЕДЕННЯ ОЦІНКИ ТА ОБМЕЖЕННЯ

Ця оцінка проведена на основі використання підходу змішаних методів, який спирався як на якісні дані (зібрані головним чином з програмних документів та за допомогою інтерв'ю з ключовими інформантами та обговорення у фокус-групах), так і на кількісні дані (перш за все дані моніторингу і результати міні-опитувань в Інтернеті). Команда з проведення оцінки DI збирала дані з різних джерел, серед яких - огляд документів, інтерв'ю з ключовими інформантами, обговорення у фокус-групах та міні-опитування, з метою створити більш широку вибірку народних депутатів, працівників апарату Верховної Ради, працівників місцевих органів влади, організацій громадянського суспільства (ОГС) та журналістів, які брали участь у діяльності Програми РАДА. Для аналізу свідчень з інтерв'ю, огляду документів та веб-опитувань був проведений паралельний аналіз.

Команда провела 71 інтерв'ю з ключовими інформантами, кількість яких становила 151, у Києві, Володимир-Волинському, Харкові, Броварах і Чернігові, а також провела 4 фокус-групи з 21 особою у Києві. Загалом було проведено опитування 172 осіб. Було отримано менше, ніж очікувалося, відповідей на міні-опитування. Незважаючи на те, що ці дані опитувань були недостатніми для того, щоб сформулювати незалежні висновки, вони підтвердили висновки, зроблені на основі інтерв'ю, фокус-груп та огляду документів.

Команда з проведення оцінки зіткнулася з помилками пам'яті, систематичними помилками у відповідях і упередженням відбору. Найбільш ефективний підхід до подолання упереджень – це використання множинних джерел інформації для триангуляції даних з питань, які розглядалися у ході оцінки. Поєднуючи інформацію, знайдену в документах або отриману за допомогою інтерв'ю з декількох джерел, ми забезпечили, що жодний елемент упереджених даних не спотворив аналізу.

ВИСНОВКИ ОЦІНКИ

ПИТАННЯ ОЦІНКИ I: АКТУАЛЬНІСТЬ ЗАХОДІВ З ПОСИЛЕННЯ УЧАСТІ ГРОМАДСЬКОСТІ У ЗАКОНОДАВЧОМУ ПРОЦЕСІ

Команда з оцінки дійшла висновку, що ініціатива «Модельний округ» була найбільш відомою з усіх програмних заходів Програми РАДА. Стейкхолдери розглядали її як

таку, яка забезпечує потребу Верховної Ради у посиленні співпраці між народними депутатами і виборцями, яких вони представляють. Результатом реалізації проекту «Модельний округ» стало те, що коментарі громадськості щодо законодавства були включені до законодавства. Програма «Модельний округ» також слугувала інструментом Програми РАДА для посилення співпраці між народними депутатами та органами місцевої влади. Тренінг, проведений у рамках діяльності Програми РАДА, надав можливість народним депутатам і працівникам парламенту виробити відповідні навички та отримати знання, які вони могли використовувати в подальшому в рамках парламентської інформаційно-просвітницької роботи.

Народні депутати і працівники Верховної Ради, які використовували ресурси Європейського інформаційно-дослідницького центру, повідомили, що Центр задовольняє потребу в отриманні порівняльної міжнародної інформації, яку неможливо знайти в інших місцях у парламенті. Здебільшого користувачі зазначали, що продукти Центру були корисними для їхньої роботи у парламенті, а висока швидкість виконання Центром інформаційних запитів дозволила тим, хто звертався до Центру з такими запитами, використати цю інформацію належним чином у їхній законодавчій роботі.

Стейкхолдери оцінили зусилля Програми РАДА щодо підвищення прозорості і відкритості, зокрема зусилля, здійснені у рамках програми ОПОРА з метою підвищення прозорості. Ініціатива щодо підвищення прозорості, яку згадували найчастіше, - це заохочення комітетів публікувати більше інформації на своїх веб-сайтах. Реєстр громадських об'єднань, сервіс електронних петицій та громадські електронні платформи не були зазначені як такі, що сприймаються стейкхолдерами у парламенті як найбільш сприятливі для посилення участі громадськості у роботі законодавчого органу.

ПИТАННЯ ОЦІНКИ 2: АКТУАЛЬНІСТЬ ЗАХОДІВ З НАГЛЯДУ

Незважаючи на те, що ініціатива «Модельний округ» орієнтована на посилення участі громадськості у роботі законодавчого органу, вона охоплювала багато заходів, які містили компонент нагляду. Відвідування народними депутатами своїх округів дало їм можливість отримати інформацію про виконання законів, про діяльність програм та установ, яку вони брали з собою до Києва та використовували у подальшому під час виконання функції нагляду.

Багато заходів, орієнтованих на посилення співпраці між народними депутатами і органами місцевої влади, містили компонент нагляду. Програма РАДА встановила партнерські відносини з Комітетом з питань державного будівництва, регіональної політики та місцевого самоврядування та з Комітетом з питань запобігання і протидії корупції. Програма організувала візити на місця, зустрічі та слухання для цих Комітетів. Підтримка Програмою РАДА нагляду за законодавством про децентралізацію також поширювалася на інші ініціативи за рамками заходів за участі парламентських комітетів.

Європейський інформаційно-дослідницький центр (ЄІДЦ) надавав підтримку у здійсненні наглядової функції парламенту за допомогою підготовки аналітичних досліджень (policy papers), коротких інформаційних повідомлень (info briefs) та дискусій щодо нагляду на міжнародному рівні. Незалежні доповіді громадських експертів, підготовані «Лабораторією законодавчих ініціатив» - організацією-партнером у виконанні Програми РАДА, мали обмежену користь для парламентських комітетів. Інші ініціативи з виконання наглядової функції не змогли отримати підтримку.

ПИТАННЯ ОЦІНКИ 3: ЕФЕКТИВНІСТЬ ЗАХОДІВ ЩОДО ПОСИЛЕННЯ УЧАСТІ ГРОМАДСЬКОСТІ

Народні депутати, працівники апарату Верховної Ради та інші стейкхолдери за межами парламенту найчастіше пов'язували з Програмою РАДА ініціативу «Модельний округ». «Люди знають про Програму РАДА завдяки програмі «Модельний округ», як зазначив один із народних депутатів. Стейкхолдери у Києві та в округах зазначали, що ініціатива «Модельний округ» сприяла зміцненню контактів народних депутатів з виборцями за допомогою низки публічних заходів, у тому числі консультацій з громадськістю у форматі town hall meetings, форумів, слухань та круглих столів. Про ефективність проекту «Модельний округ» свідчить інтерес до розширення цього проекту з побажанням включення до нього інших народних депутатів, а також бажання інших народних депутатів брати участь у заходах у рамках проекту «Модельний округ», або ж в інших подібних заходах за рамками Програми РАДА. Програма РАДА залучала до ініціативи «Модельний округ» народних депутатів, обраних за партійними списками, проте не містила компоненту, який передбачав би роботу з парламентськими фракціями.

Народні депутати та працівники апарату Верховної Ради, знайомі з діяльністю ЄІДЦ, пов'язують відновлення його діяльності у 2015 році з Програмою РАДА. Ті стейкхолдери, які використовують ЄІДЦ у своїй роботі, охарактеризували його продукти як ефективний та своєчасно наданий ресурс, який допомагає їм у здійсненні законодавчої діяльності та виконанні контрольно-наглядової функції. Стейкхолдери відзначили, що великою мірою своїм прогресом у забезпеченні більшої прозорості і відкритості Верховна Рада завдячує Програмі РАДА.

ПИТАННЯ ОЦІНКИ 4: ЕФЕКТИВНІСТЬ ЗАХОДІВ З НАГЛЯДУ

Ключові інформанти всередині та поза межами парламенту погодилися з тим, що функція нагляду у Верховній Раді є слабкою і що парламентський нагляд в цілому не поліпшився з того часу, як Програма РАДА розпочала свою роботу.

Стейкхолдери вказали на окремі досягнення Програми, але не на системне вдосконалення функції парламентського нагляду. Стейкхолдери відзначали, що завдяки Програмі РАДА відбулося збільшення поінформованості громадськості щодо актуального законодавства з децентралізації та місцевого самоврядування. Народні депутати – члени двох парламентських комітетів та працівники комітетів відзначали, що завдяки зусиллям Програми РАДА були проведені виїзні слухання, зустрічі та візити представників комітетів з метою нагляду за виконанням відповідного законодавства. Окрім підтримки виконання функції нагляду за

децентралізацією, до досягнень Програми можна зарахувати поліпшення комунікації народних депутатів та комітетів з виконавчою гілкою влади.

ПИТАННЯ ОЦІНКИ 5: СПІВПРАЦЯ З ІНШИМИ ПРОГРАМАМИ

Програма РАДА співпрацювала з низкою інших програм Офісу демократії та врядування USAID/Україна; проте Програма РАДА та інші програми в цілому не об'єднували свої зусилля. Програма РАДА задіяла ресурси у рамках програми підтримки децентралізації і місцевого самоврядування USAID. Співпраця між Програмою РАДА та програмами з прав людини і охорони праці USAID/Україна була менш інтенсивною, при цьому оцінювачі не отримали доказів співпраці між Програмою РАДА і програмами, що адмініструються Офісом економічного зростання та Офісом охорони здоров'я. Міжнародні донори і виконавці програм повідомили, що Програма РАДА ефективно співпрацювала з їхніми програмами.

ПИТАННЯ ОЦІНКИ 6: ЗАГАЛЬНА АКТУАЛЬНІСТЬ У ПРОСУВАННІ ПАРЛАМЕНТСЬКОЇ РЕФОРМИ

Програма РАДА була розроблена у 2013 році, але перший рік її реалізації ознаменувався революцією та новими парламентськими виборами. Як наслідок, реалізацію програми довелося відкласти до присяги нового парламенту у листопаді 2014 року. Місія оцінки потреб Верховної Ради на чолі з Петом Коксом, що була проведена у період з вересня 2015 року по лютий 2016 року, отримала завдання запланувати інтерв'ю і групові зустрічі та зібрати дані про діяльність Верховної Ради за допомогою експертів Програми РАДА. Місія, очолювана Коксом, провела інтерв'ю з двома керівниками та заступником керівника Верховної Ради. Аналітичні та моніторингові звіти Програми РАДА були надані Місії з оцінки потреб Верховної Ради, очолюваної Коксом. Звіт за результатами оцінки і дорожня карта Кокса, що були опубліковані у березні 2016 року, були представлені на конференції USAID/РАДА «Створюємо ефективний, підзвітний, відповідальний парламент» 15 квітня 2016 року. Програма РАДА включила деякі з 52 рекомендацій, вміщених у звіті, до свого робочого плану. Проте звіт Кокса, який був випущений посередині циклу реалізації Програми РАДА, не був повністю інтегрований до структури Програми.

Посилення участі громадськості у роботі законодавчого органу є актуальним і важливим для демократичної консолідації України, при цьому ціла низка заходів, проведених у рамках Програми РАДА, були актуальними щодо поліпшення участі громадськості. Проте діяльність Програми РАДА, орієнтована на нагляд, була надто амбіційною. Незважаючи на це, деякі види діяльності Програми РАДА були безпосередньо пов'язаними з цим, оскільки були спрямовані на підтримку різних інструментів посилення парламентського нагляду за урядом, зокрема, технічну допомогу міністрам уряду у підготовці доповідей для виступів на громадських слуханнях та перед комітетами.

ПИТАННЯ ОЦІНКИ 7: ЗАГАЛЬНА ЕФЕКТИВНІСТЬ У ПРОСУВАННІ ПАРЛАМЕНТСЬКОЇ РЕФОРМИ

Програма РАДА отримала високу оцінку багатьох з опитаних командою, які описували її як найбільш активну програму з тих, що фінансуються на міжнародному рівні та які займаються реформуванням парламенту. Програму також пов'язували з програмою стажування у парламенті та тренінгами, які вдосконалюють професіоналізм молодих та амбіційних людей, відданих справі європейської інтеграції. Ефективними виявилися ініціативи, які сприяють більшій прозорості та підтримці двох парламентських комітетів.

Більшість стейкхолдерів зазначили, що участь громадськості у законодавчому процесі посилилася, частково завдяки Програмі РАДА. Втім, наглядовий компонент Програми не сприяв систематичному поліпшенню функції нагляду. Там, де Програма РАДА ефективно сприяла нагляду, цього було досягнуто за допомогою індивідуальних окремих заходів. Більшість респондентів, які взяли участь в опитуванні, відзначили, що функція нагляду суттєво не покращилася у Верховній Раді з 2014 року.

ПИТАННЯ ОЦІНКИ 8: ҐЕНДЕРНА РІВНІСТЬ

Програма РАДА реалізувала цілу низку заходів, орієнтованих на забезпечення ґендерної рівності. Включення ґендерних питань у мейнстрім державної політики є свідченням роботи Програми РАДА, а також сталося завдяки відданим зусиллям багатьох інших діячів, які працюють на різних рівнях у цій галузі. Програма РАДА допомагала парламенту у розбудові свого потенціалу для проведення ґендерного аналізу законодавства. Тренінги з ґендерних питань проводилися професійно, на основі поєднання теоретичних знань з практичними інструментами. Програма РАДА мобілізувала молодих жінок і встановила мережеві контакти з організаціями громадянського суспільства та експертами.

ВИСНОВКИ ЗА РЕЗУЛЬТАТАМИ ОЦІНКИ

1. «Модельний округ» - це найбільш актуальний вид діяльності для посилення участі громадськості у законодавчому процесі. ЄІДЦ задовольняє потребу в отриманні порівняльної міжнародної інформації про законодавство і законодавців, а народні депутати і працівники апарату Верховної Ради використовують цю інформацію та аналіз, виконаний Центром, у своїй законодавчій роботі. Стейкхолдери високо оцінили діяльність ініціативи, спрямовану на підвищення прозорості та відкритості.
2. Небагато заходів у рамках діяльності Програми РАДА щодо посилення функції нагляду були актуальними. Найбільш успішні заходи, орієнтовані на посилення функції нагляду, були спрямовані на пропагування участі громадськості у законодавчому процесі. Більшість громадян не пропонують законодавчих змін; натомість, громадяни звертаються до своїх народних депутатів, коли уряд не дотримується законів. Незважаючи на те, що декілька заходів, про які інформанти повідомили у рамках завдання 3,

відповідають рекомендаціям із звіту Кокса, вони не отримали великої підтримки.

3. Ініціатива «Модельний округ» є «візитною карткою» діяльності Програми РАДА. Стейкхолдери визначають як здобуток Програми РАДА посилення контактів народних депутатів із округами. У майбутньому місцеві офіси партій зможуть надавати ресурси і підтримку для народних депутатів, обраних за партійними списками, які беруть участь у цій діяльності. Парламентські інформаційно-дослідницькі служби відіграють важливу роль у забезпеченні доступу законодавчого органу до власного незалежного джерела інформації та аналізу, а ЄІДЦ, який поновив свою діяльність, слугує надійним постачальником інформаційно-дослідницьких послуг. Ініціативи, спрямовані на підвищення прозорості, були ефективними.
4. Програма РАДА мало сприяла покращенню парламентського нагляду. Основні досягнення у царині парламентського нагляду були пов'язані з ініціативою «Модельний округ» та подібними заходами, що сприяють співпраці між місцевими посадовцями і парламентом.
5. Програма РАДА ефективно співпрацювала з іншими програмами зміцнення парламенту та з деякими програмами USAID у царині демократії та врядування. Програма ефективно підтримувала заходи, спрямовані на нагляд за децентралізацію та діяльністю органів місцевої влади.
6. Різні компоненти Програми РАДА були актуальним у контексті розвитку ситуації в Україні у період між 2013 та 2015 роками.
7. Революція Євромайдану, вибори 2014 та 2015 років, військова агресія з боку Росії та нова ера співпраці між ЄС та Україною, а також реформи, які підтримує ЄС, суттєво вплинули на перші два роки діяльності Програми РАДА. До цього можна додати внутрішні труднощі в управлінні протягом того самого періоду. Попри такий розвиток ситуації, Програма РАДА на своєму ранньому етапі підтримала роботу Конституційної комісії та Ради з питань судової реформи при Адміністрації Президента, яка відповідала за розробку ключового законодавства з децентралізації та судової реформи. Протягом усього періоду реалізації Програми, яка оцінюється, Програма РАДА успішно реалізувала численні ініціативи.
8. Тренінги сприяли створенню більш ґендерно-чутливого парламенту та більшій готовності народних депутатів зосередитися на питаннях ґендерної рівності. Найбільше досягнення Програми РАДА, пов'язане з питаннями ґендеру, - це розбудова спроможності працівників парламенту проводити ґендерний аналіз законодавства і питань політики.

ОТРИМАНІ УРОКИ

- Гнучкість має важливе значення для кращого функціонування законодавчого органу.

- Переглядайте структуру Програми у випадку суттєвих політичних змін.
- Консультуйтеся з бенефіціарами під час розробки Програми.
- Програмні заходи повинні бути сфокусовані на досягненні мети.
- Подвоюйте зусилля там, де є успіх.
- Переносьте програмні заходи до парламенту, коли він буде до цього готовий.
- Представницькій демократії не обійтися без представників.
- Розгляньте можливість роботи з фракціями.
- Громадяни стикаються з проблемами, а не думають про поправки до законів.
- Ефективна співпраця може сприяти досягненню інших цілей у царині демократії та врядування.
- Інтерв'ю є більш цінними, ніж опитування, для оцінки діяльності, спрямованої на зміцнення парламенту.

ANNEX B: EVALUATION SOW

STATEMENT OF WORK PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

RESPONSIBLE ACCOUNTABLE DEMOCRATIC ASSEMBLY PROGRAM

I. Introduction

This is a Statement of Work (SOW) for a final performance evaluation of the USAID funded Responsible Accountable Democratic Assembly (RADA) Program, implemented by the East Europe Foundation (EEF), <http://eef.org.ua> under the Cooperative Agreement No. AID-121-A-14-00001. The program runs from November 25, 2013 through November 24, 2018, with a total estimated cost of \$4,500,000. The award is administered by the Office of Democracy and Governance (ODG). The current Agreement Officer's Representative (AOR) is Mr. Oleksandr Piskun; the Alternate AOR (A/AOR) is Mr. Marat Kyurchevsky.

II. Evaluation Purpose

The purpose of the RADA Program final performance evaluation is to assess the relevance and effectiveness of the RADA Program in advancing parliamentary reform in Ukraine and, more specifically, improving public representation in the legislative process and strengthening independent oversight of the legislature over the executive branch.

III. Use of Evaluation Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations

The Mission will use performance evaluation findings and conclusions to understand what the RADA Program has achieved, how it is perceived and valued, what opportunities for collaboration were available and utilized. Other stakeholders with an interest in the evaluation findings and conclusions include Ukraine's legislative and executive branches, political parties, and civil society organizations (CSOs); USAID/Washington; the U.S. Embassy in Ukraine; and other donors and implementing partners. The EEF and their partners will have an opportunity to learn about their strengths and areas for improvement.

IV. Background Information

USAID/Ukraine has provided assistance to the Ukraine's parliament since 1994. It was largely offered a series of cooperative agreements collectively referred to as the Parliamentary Development Program (PDP) and focused on five distinct stages of assistance to the Ukrainian legislature, including: 1) providing the Verkhova Rada of Ukraine (VRU) with comparative information on democratic governance and legislation of world democracies (1994-1997); 2) assisting the establishment of democratic procedures: budget, committee hearings, and information exchange (1997-2000); 3) facilitating the passage of reform legislation (2000-2003); 4) strengthening internal management systems; and improving legislative-executive relations and citizen access to the parliament (2003-2008); and 5) improving the capacity for legislative and policy formulation within government institutions at the national and regional levels – including the VRU and the regional Verkhovna Rada of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea (VR ARC), as well as the Cabinet of Ministers and the Presidential Administration (2008-2012).

The current [RADA Program](#) is the USAID/Ukraine parliamentary reform activity, which, for the first time, is implemented by a local organization, the [EEF](#), working in conjunction with an alliance of three Ukrainian CSOs: [Internews-Ukraine](#), [OPORA](#) and [Agency for Legislative Initiative \(ALI\)](#). That offers the RADA Program as USAID's primary vehicle for achieving one of the three USAID/Ukraine Mission Development Objectives: "More Participatory, Transparent, and Accountable Governance Processes."

In addition to building on the successes from previous programs, the RADA Program's partners are implementing innovative programmatic tools based on their vast experience of previous work in the Ukrainian context with government agencies both at the national and the local level, plus a variety of emerging local CSOs.

The RADA Program's partners assist it in providing support to VRU members (also called Members of the Parliament, or MPs), especially those elected in single-mandate districts (SMDs), to build effective constituent relations, and improve their representative function via increased and more efficient use of information and communication technologies (ICT), among other activities.

The RADA Program design was based on the assumption that it will ultimately institutionalize successful elements, such as the parliamentary internship program, citizen monitoring of the legislative process, and the new MP and MP assistant training programs with Ukrainian CSOs and select VRU's units (the VRU Rules Committee, VRU Secretariat, and VRU Institute of Legislation). In summation, the RADA Program partners' local experience and expertise paired with the global experience of their international partners, i.e. other foreign technical assistance organizations working in the parliamentary reform and related areas, will help RADA Program effectively progress towards achievement of the USAID/Ukraine Mission Development Objective: "More Participatory, Transparent, and Accountable Governance Processes."

The purpose of the RADA Program is to strengthen the legislature to become more accountable, representative, and independent and to improve civic engagement in the legislative process. The program pursues three main objectives:

Objective 1: Improved public representation in the legislative process.

Objective 2: Expanded role of citizens in monitoring the work of Parliament.

Objective 3: Role of legislature in providing independent oversight of the Executive branch strengthened.

Intended RADA Program beneficiaries are the VRU Secretariat, VR Committees staff, other VR staff, VRU members, and citizens.

Operational environment

The Ukrainian parliament suffers from the absence of a stable political coalition. The successful voting in the VRU often is achieved by mobilizing ad hoc majority that usually includes votes of unaffiliated and opposition MPs. According to the VRU Speaker Parubiy, there are 228 members in the coalition at present, in particular 140 members of the Petro Poroshenko Bloc faction, 81 members of the People's Front faction, as well as seven unaffiliated MPs, including the VRU Speaker and the VRU Vice-Speaker. De facto, any attempts to agree on adopting specific reforms by consensus among all factions of the Ukrainian parliament proved to be challenging.

One of those major reforms that have been initiated, was the internal reform of the Ukrainian parliament. In March 2016, RADA Program contributed to adoption of the Implementation Plan of the **Roadmap on Reform and Institutional Capacity Building of the VRU¹⁵ (the VRU Roadmap)**. The VRU Roadmap was developed by the European Parliament's (EP) Needs Assessment Mission to the VRU in a format of a VRU resolution ([#4219](#)) with expert support from the RADA Program.

The [VRU Reform Roadmap](#) included 52 recommendations proposed by the EP's mission to strengthen the institutional capacity of the VRU. Its implementation required strong political will, improved capacity and effective communication among the Ukrainian parliament, executive government, and society.

Parliamentary reform is a vital precondition for the legitimacy and quality of important economic and political reforms in the country. It enables decision making process to be in compliance with principles of democratic governance, because it increases transparency and accountability of the government and improves the governance' effectiveness and efficiency. Finally, it should restore the lost confidence in the Ukrainian parliament in the society.

Several important strategic documents were proposed by the international community to reform Ukraine's political system; simultaneously, the President of Ukraine and the Parliamentary [Coalition](#) approved the Legislative Reform Plan developed by the Institute of Legislation and the Strategy for Reforms 2020 by the President of Ukraine and the Parliamentary Coalition. Unfortunately, those documents were not aligned with each other and, as a consequence, were not implemented.

¹⁵http://www.ua.undp.org/content/ukraine/uk/home/presscenter/articles/2016/04/15/-_.html

The VRU reform working group included representatives of both the VRU Secretariat and parliamentary factions but there was no clear agreement regarding the reform; nor there was a solid plan and communication strategy for a VRU reform. The group acted as a closed club and did not include external experts. The working group did not have any regular activities; issues selected for discussion were not systematic and far from the current political agenda. As a result, the group failed to reach consensus in the VRU, its bills were not supported by MPs, and the parliamentary reform was not promoted effectively.

RADA Program major interventions and deliverables

The beginning of the RADA Program implementation was complicated by the political and societal turmoil during the Revolution of Dignity (2013-2014) followed by pre-term presidential and parliamentary elections. In particular, its start was somewhat postponed by VRU reloading after pre-term parliamentary elections. Later in 2014, a number of major national reforms (decentralization, anti-corruption, judicial, etc.) were initiated making the environment more diverse and heavy loaded, adding additional areas for monitoring and support and making RADA Program operations more time pressed and labor intensive.

Over time, the RADA Program integrated its activities into the Parliamentary reform agenda. Starting two years prior to the introduction and approval of the Roadmap of the Parliamentary reform proposed by the EP's mission, the RADA Program re-designed all program components and activities to become parts of EP's Recommendations (around 75% of EP's VRU Reform Roadmap are covered by the RADA Program activities).

The RADA Program put significant efforts to introduce the EP Roadmap on Parliamentary Reform into the VRU agenda. The Parliamentary Reform Strategy has been refined and is under the oversight of the Speaker. Nevertheless, there is no unanimous agreement among factions to introduce changes, partially due to the lack of professional knowledge on modern parliamentary processes, weak communication among MPs and VRU staff, and the lack of necessary procedures.

To overcome these barriers, the RADA Program has initiated ten public discussions on key Parliamentary reform messages to raise awareness on the reform as the essential basis for all reforms run in Ukraine. The message about urgency of the Parliamentary Reform will be delivered to both: 1) civil society in order to improve citizens' awareness and willingness to demand transparency of Ukraine's Parliament as an institution; and 2) all beneficiaries inside Ukraine's Parliament through different experts/agents of change to set up effective and mandatory rules of VRU work. Upgraded training on rules of procedure, policy analysis, use of public expertise in the lawmaking, government oversight, and a tuned dialog with communities might help to strengthen the productivity of the Parliament and quality of the policy making.

To improve the public representation in legislation process (Objective 1), USAID RADA Program utilized many tools and mechanisms that facilitated communication between MPs and their constituencies. Such innovative mechanisms like [public reporting of MPs](#), [town hall meetings](#), [communication training for VR Secretariat staff](#), MPs and their teams, regional issue-based MPs' site visits with participation of mass media, cyber security and social media trainings were introduced through pilot [Model District](#) MP Offices.

In order to strengthen legislative capacity of VRU staff and ensure public inclusion into legislative process, the RADA Program has: 1) built a [register of civil society](#) and independent experts able to participate in drafting legislation through an [e-platform](#); 2) supported the work of the [European Information Research Center](#), prototype of Parliamentary research service, which provides invaluable expert support to MPs and VRU Secretariat in legislative work, consults MPs and the committees on best European practices, performs comparative analysis, monitors and reports on progress in reform; 3) held a series of common regional working groups on policy dialogue and policy analysis for lawmakers and regional governors to ensure reflection of regional needs and expectations in legislative process. The RADA Program combined activities on this objective with NDI, IRI, and IFES, as well as other international donors.

In the realm of objective 2, the RADA Program introduced a number of effective civic education and monitoring instruments that included: an interactive [map-based web portal](#) with information about MPs, workshops, [PSAs and videos on Parliament](#), its functions and activities for youth in universities and schools, civic education campaigns on voters' rights and responsibilities, press tours for regional journalists, [TV programs](#), [monitoring](#) tools for CSOs on budgets in constituencies and parliamentary legislative initiatives.

To ensure independent parliamentary oversight over the executive branch (Objective 3), the RADA Program closely cooperated with the VRU Anti-Corruption Committee, analyzed and encouraged changes on the Rule of Procedure (part of the Parliamentary reform), monitored budget process and activities of the VRU Accounting Chamber, mentored the VRU Committees' mastering their first [shadow reports](#) on Ministries' activities.

In general, VRU leadership and staff demonstrated its cooperative attitude toward the RADA Program. The VRU Secretariat (staff) expressed its readiness to undertake internal restructuring (a part of VRU Reform Roadmap) and include training programs for newly elected MPs and their teams, training courses on policy cycle and policy analysis, on oversight function of the parliament activities of [the Accounting Chamber](#).

However, that required the systematic assistance and further mentoring from the RADA Program to enroot desired changes. Currently, the RADA Program also sets up systems, elaborated together with respective VRU units such as e-instruments developed and introduced together with VRU Chief Department of Computerized Systems; budget allocation for the VRU Internship Program that became part of VRU Secretariat Organizational Department; [regular VRU Speaker's press events](#); design and proper distribution of the civic education products along with the Parliament exhibition of technical assistance projects; "[InfoFair](#)" with the Informational Department of VRU Secretariat; and templates of [policy books](#), green books, [white books](#) with the Chief Legal Scientific Department of VRU Secretariat.

The RADA Program supported the reforms launched within the Parliament – changes in the Rules of Procedure (VRU Reform Roadmap Recommendations #1-4), the Code of Ethics (VRU Reform Roadmap Recommendation #52), Parliament's oversight of the executive branch (VRU Reform Roadmap Recommendations #14-17), involvement of the civil society and individual citizens in legislation development, and public discussions with participation of local governments within the Model District project.

The RADA Program works on the full introduction and effective functioning of E-Parliament instruments. (VRU Reform Roadmap Recommendations #22 & #23). The RADA Program also conducts numerous activities to raise the awareness of the VRU staff and MPs about the use of E-Parliament instruments including [E-Petitions](#), [Public Platform for Draft Laws Commentary](#), E-Plenary, E-Committee and [CSO Register](#).

Activities and programs that the RADA Program collaborated with

The Mission envisioned that the RADA Program will seek out and take advantage of linkages with other USAID and non-USAID programs and sectors, including:

- Collaboration with ODG-administered political party programs to strengthen ties between MPs, political parties and their constituents;
- Collaboration with ODG-administered the FAIR Justice program and the Access to Justice and Legal Empowerment Program (LEP), which target improvements in the judiciary;
- Collaboration with ODG-administered local governance program(s) to promote decentralization, with its civil society program(s) to spur civil society participation in the legislative process, and with its media program(s) to increase public access to the legislative process;
- Coordination with those programs, which are administered by the Office of Economic Growth (OEG) and the Office of Health and have legislative agendas, such as the Commercial Law Center (OEG) and the Local Investment and National Competitiveness (OEG) program;
- Coordination with other USG programs, including those implemented by International Narcotics and Law Enforcement and Public Affairs Sections of the US Embassy.

The RADA Program set up regular bi-annual coordinating meetings between international technical assistance projects and the VRU (VRU Committees and VRU Secretariat); regularly conducted monthly International Parliamentary Technical Assistance Coordination ([IPTAC](#)) meetings on Parliamentary business; and coordinated foreign technical assistance activities on related issues (for example, EU/UNDP's "RADA za Evropu Program" and Venice Commission on [Parliamentary Reform](#); USAID's Policy for Ukraine Local Self-Governance (PULSE) activity and Decentralization Offering Better Results and Efficiency ([DOBRE](#)) activity - on decentralization; EU Delegation's Public Finance Management and Budget Transparency – on public funding and the Accounting Chamber; USAID Political Processes activity – on voter education and MPs communication instruments; [Transparency International](#) – on Open Government Partnership Initiative; [USAID Fair Justice](#) and New Justice Programs – on judicial reform). The RADA Program also coordinated activities of the Parliamentary Reform Working Group that included VRU Secretariat, VRU Speaker's Office and international assistance projects.

Significant changes in activity implementation

The major change in RADA Program's implementation was associated with re-directing the efforts planned to promote cooperation and communication between the VRU and the VR ARC under Objective 1. The change was caused by the illegal annexation of Crimea by Russia in February-April 2014. The planned level of efforts was not significant and the planned cooperation and

communication assistance was replaced with peer-to-peer work exchanges with parliaments of neighboring countries.

Past evaluations of USAID's parliamentary support activities

Mission's parliamentary support activities in Ukraine have been reviewed multiple times for their relevance and effectiveness. The Mission conducted several internal and external evaluations of its parliamentary support activities contracted few assessments that helped to identify the needs and make programmatic adjustments. In 1999, for example, it conducted an assessment of the PDP; in 2002, it contracted the Rule of Law (ROL) assessment that included an assessment of the parliament development needs; in early 2008 and late 2010, it conducted internal reviews of PDP's performance; in 2010, it contracted with ARD, Inc. to carry out a Democracy and Governance Assessment, which specifically examined the legislative and governance sector in Ukraine. Lastly, it contracted an independent evaluation, the Assessment of Ukraine's Legislative Strengthening/Good Governance Program, conducted by Democracy International, Inc. (DI) team in May 2012.

V. Scope of Work

The Contractor will assess the relevance and effectiveness of the RADA Program in advancing parliamentary reform in Ukraine and, more specifically, improving public representation in the legislative process (Objective 1) and strengthening independent oversight of the legislature over the executive branch (Objective 3). In particular, the Contractor will answer the following questions (numbers do not reflect the priority):

1. Which RADA Program activities do RADA Program stakeholders perceive to have been the most beneficial for improving public representation in the legislative process and why?
2. Which RADA Program activities do RADA Program stakeholders perceive to have been the most beneficial for strengthening independent oversight of the legislature over the executive branch and why?
3. What changes in public representation in the legislative process do RADA Program stakeholders perceive to be the result, in whole or in part, of the RADA Program's work?
4. What changes in independent oversight of the legislature over the executive branch do RADA Program stakeholders perceive to be the result, in whole or in part, of the RADA Program's work?
5. How well did the RADA Program respond to opportunities to leverage resources and advance relevant parliamentary reforms through collaboration with other USAID and non-USAID development assistance programs?

The Contractor will ensure that the evaluation of above mentioned activity is consistent with USAID ADS (Chapters 201, 320, and 578 as well as relevant mandatory references) and USAID's Evaluation Policy (2011, updated in 2016) requirements and recommendations.

In answering evaluation questions, the evaluation team (ET) should highlight gender specific approaches promoted by the RADA Program and practiced by its partners and related outcomes,

as appropriate. For the evaluation purposes, “relevance” is a measure of the ability of a particular program intervention being pertinent to program objectives; and “effectiveness” is a measure of the ability of a particular program intervention to produce a planned effect or result that can be qualitatively measured.

The Contractor should plan to conduct field work in October-November 2017 and submit draft Evaluation Report (ER) no later than December 31, 2017.

VI. Evaluation Design & Methodology

It is anticipated that a mix of evaluation methodological approaches will be required to meet the requirements outlined in the *Scope of Work* section above. Suggested data sources include: (a) secondary data/background documents, (b) RADA Program plans, outputs, and reports, (c) relevant GOU legislation and policy documents, (d) key informant interviews (KIIs), (e) focus group discussions (FGDs), (f) survey(s) of activity stakeholders and beneficiaries, and (g) direct observations.

When planning and conducting RADA Program evaluation, the ET will make every effort to reflect opinions and suggestions of all key activity stakeholders from Ukraine’s legislative and executive branches, civil society, mass media, private sector organizations, other donors and implementing partners. Emphasis will be on collection of reliable empirical data and/or objectively verifiable evidence, as opposed to anecdotal evidence. Where surveys or interviews are used, appropriate sampling and questioning techniques will be utilized to ensure representative results; where references are made to the data generated by RADA Program and/or their partners, they will be complemented by references to independent data sources and any significant data differences must be explained.

Illustrative methodological approaches are discussed below.

To assess the relevance and effectiveness of RADA Program Objectives I and II activities and answer the specific evaluation questions listed in Section V. Scope of Work, the ET will: (1) review RADA Program plans, reports, publications and other outputs, as well as secondary data/background documents, including those that describe/assess activities of the RADA Program partners and beneficiaries; (2) conduct FGDs with the RADA Program stakeholders; (3) conduct surveys of the RADA Program stakeholders including organizations that might serve as a comparison; (4) conduct KIIs with the RADA Program partners and other stakeholders using structured or semi-structured interview protocols. Direct observations and case studies may also be informative.

Evaluation design, methodology, data collection, analysis and report should adequately capture the situations and experiences of both males and females participating in and/or benefitting from the RADA Program activities. The ET should consider methods that are capable of identifying both positive and negative unintended consequences for women. The ET should also consider factors that might influence the likelihood that disproportionate numbers of males and females will participate in data collection for the evaluation. Evaluation data collection instruments and protocols should reflect an understanding of gender roles and constraints in a particular cultural context as well reflect local contexts and norms concerning the conditions under which women (or

men) feel empowered to speak freely. Where possible, FGDs and KIIs would be designed to reflect the perspective of both RADA Program partners and beneficiaries. While direct attribution will not be possible to measure, the ET should strive to make causal linkages wherever possible, taking into account the development actors and circumstances.

VII. Evaluation Team Qualifications and Composition

ET Leader: The Contractor must designate one ET member to serve as the ET Leader. The ET Leader must have sufficient experience in designing and/or conducting performance evaluations of international development projects and good knowledge of USAID Evaluation Policy and evaluation reporting requirements. Excellent communication, both verbal and written, skills and experience in managing performance evaluations of similar size USAID activities are desirable. Experience in designing and conducting performance evaluations of similar size USAID activities in Ukraine or the Eastern Europe/CIS region is desirable.

Evaluation Specialist: The Contractor must assign at least one Evaluation Specialist with strong understanding of data collection and analysis methodologies and substantial international experience in designing and conducting evaluations of international development activities. Evaluation Specialist(s) must have good knowledge of USAID Evaluation Policy and evaluation reporting requirements. Experience in designing and conducting performance evaluations of USAID governance activities is desirable. Knowledge of Eastern Europe/CIS region governance issues is desirable.

The ET will use international expertise, **International Governance Consultant(s)**, individual(s) and/or organization(s), who have substantial knowledge of (1) effective governance, (2) effective and sustainable policies and/or legislation that support legislative strengthening, (3) governance issues in the Eastern Europe/CIS region and (4) political processes, local legislature and civil society development, and public governance activities in the Eastern Europe/CIS region. International Governance Consultant(s) should have substantial experience in designing and/or conducting performance evaluations of similar size governance activities. Experience in conducting performance evaluations of USAID activities is desirable. Knowledge of Ukraine's political processes, local legislature and civil society development, and public governance issues is desirable. International Governance Consultant(s) should have substantial experience in designing and/or conducting performance evaluations of similar size governance activities. Experience in successful management of similar size activities is desirable. Previous work experience in the region and knowledge of Ukrainian and/or Russian is desirable.

The ET is expected to use local expertise, a **Local Governance Consultant(s)**, individual(s) and/or organization(s) with detailed knowledge of Ukraine's governance issues and parliament operations. Local Governance Consultant(s) should have detailed knowledge of the development context, the political context, key stakeholders and actors, and other information relevant to the success of the RADA Program evaluation. Experience in designing and conducting performance evaluations of democracy and governance programs in Ukraine or the Eastern Europe/CIS region is desirable.

***Note:** One individual may act as both the ET Leader and an Evaluation Specialist or International Governance Consultant if all qualifications requirements are met.*

USAID asks that gender be considered in formation of the ET. One or more team members should have experience in engendered evaluation methods and knowledge of gender issues in the public governance sector. The ET should also include one or more members with local cultural expertise, including an awareness of gender norms, how gender interacts with other identity elements, and which sub-groups of women may be at risk for exclusion from the project or evaluation.

The ET Leader, Evaluation Specialist(s), International Governance Consultant(s), and Local Governance Consultant(s) will be key personnel under this Purchase Order. Proposed personnel are expected to be the people on the job. Any substitutes to the proposed team must be vetted and approved by the Evaluation COR before they begin work.

VIII. Evaluation Management

The Mission will appoint an Evaluation COR to provide technical guidance and administrative oversight of the RADA Program evaluation, to review the Evaluation Work Plan, and to review and accept the draft and final Evaluation Report(s) (ER). The Mission will also appoint an Alternate COR (A/COR). The Mission may delegate one or more USAID staff members to work full-time with the ET and/or participate in the field data collection. The Evaluation COR will inform the Contractor about any full-time/part-time Mission delegates no later than three working days after the submission of a draft Evaluation Work Plan (EWP). All costs associated with the participation of full-time/part-time Mission delegates in the evaluation will be covered by the Mission.

To facilitate evaluation planning, the COR will make available to the Contractor the following RADA Program documents within one working day of the award effective date (as warranted, the Contractor will receive additional project-related documentation): the Program Description, four Annual Work Plans, one Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Plan, 11 Quarterly Reports and three Annual Reports, as well as the lists of RADA counterparts.

To keep the Mission informed about the status of RADA Program evaluation, the Contractor will submit an electronic version of a draft RADA Program EWP to the Evaluation COR within 15 working days following the award and at least 10 working days prior to the proposed ET's departure for the field data collection. The submitted EWP should be fully consistent with the Scope of Work requirements and Contractor's proposal (if the latter is fully or partially incorporated into the PO).

The EWP should highlight all evaluation milestones and include: (1) a preliminary list of interviewees, (2) a preliminary list of survey participants (when survey is planned), (3) a preliminary schedule of the ET interviews/meetings, surveys, and focus group discussions (FGDs) (when planned), (4) all draft evaluation questionnaire(s), survey(s), FGD guides, etc., which the ET may use for evaluation, (5) locations and dates for piloting draft evaluation questionnaires and survey(s), (6) the proposed evaluation methodology including selection criteria for comparison groups (if applicable), and (7) an ER outline (if it will be different from the attached template (Attachment 1)). The Contractor will update the submitted EWP (first of all, the lists of interviewees, the lists of survey participants, the schedule of interviews/meetings/surveys/FGDs, etc.) and submit the updated version to the COR on a weekly basis. The Contractor may prepare EWP as a Google-based document to facilitate USAID staff access.

The ET will conduct weekly briefings for the Evaluation COR/Activity Managers, and other relevant Mission personnel in order to keep them informed of the progress of the RADA Program evaluation and any issues that may arise/have arisen. The ET shall be prepared to conduct a briefing for the Evaluation COR, Activity Managers, and other relevant Mission personnel within two working days after their arrival for the field data collection.

The ET will invite the Evaluation COR and other relevant Mission personnel to participate in all meetings, group discussions, site visits and other activities planned in conjunction with the RADA Program evaluation as soon as those events are included in the EWP. The ET shall be prepared to have USAID staff and other activity stakeholders invited by the Evaluation COR to any meeting, site visit, or other activity planned in conjunction with the evaluation as observers.

The ET will discuss any evaluation barriers/constraints and significant deviations from the original/updated EWP with the Evaluation COR and seek USAID's guidance on those matters. All modifications to the required elements of the Evaluation SOW, whether evaluation questions, evaluation team composition, or timeline, need to be agreed upon in writing by the COR. Any revisions should be updated in the SOW that is included as an annex to the ER.

IX. Logistical Support

The Contractor will be responsible for all logistical support of the evaluation activities, including translation/interpretation, transportation, accommodation, meeting and site visit arrangements, office space, equipment, supplies, insurance and other contingency planning. The Contractor must not expect any substantial involvement of the Mission staff in either planning or conducting the evaluation (except for full-time/part-time Mission delegates discussed above). Upon request, the Mission will provide the Contractor with introductory letters to facilitate meeting arrangements. USAID requests that any forthcoming American and Ukrainian holidays be considered in scheduling evaluation meetings, group discussions, surveys, and site visits in the United States and Ukraine.

X. Deliverables

To document the final performance evaluation of the RADA Program, the Contractor will submit a clear, informative, and credible ER (up to 30 pages, excluding annexes and references) that reflects all relevant ET findings and conclusions made in conjunction with the final performance evaluation of the RADA Program. The ER must describe in detail the RADA Program evaluation design and the methods used to collect and process information requested in the *Evaluation Purpose*, *Scope of Work*, and *Evaluation Design & Methodology* sections. It must disclose any limitations to the evaluation and, particularly, those associated with the evaluation methodology (selection bias, recall bias, unobservable differences between groups, etc.). The ER Executive Summary Section should be three-five pages long and reflect the purpose of the evaluation, evaluation methodology and its limitations, key evaluation findings and conclusions.

The ER must be in line with relevant USAID ADS (Chapters 201, 320, and 578 as well as relevant mandatory references) and USAID Evaluation Policy requirements and recommendations. In particular, ER should represent thoughtful and well-organized efforts that include sufficient local and global contextual information so the external validity and relevance of each activity evaluation

can be assessed. Evaluation findings should be based on facts, evidence, and data. The findings should be specific, concise and supported by reliable quantitative and qualitative evidence [i.e. there should not be words like “some”, “many”, “most” in the report and frequency of responses and absolute number of interviewed respondents should be given, e.g. five out of 11 experts agreed that ...; 30 per cent of survey respondents reported that ...]. Evaluation conclusions should be supported by a specific set of findings. The Contractor shall ensure that conclusions are based on data that are accurate, objective, and reliable.

In the annexes, the ER should include the Executive Summary section in Ukrainian; the Evaluation SOW; description of the ET and its member qualifications; the final version of the EWP; the conflict of interest (COI) statements, either attesting to a lack of COI or describing existing COI, signed by all members of the ET; the tools (in English and Ukrainian used for conducting the evaluation such as questionnaires, checklists, and discussion guides; in-depth analyses of specific issues; properly identified sources of information; and statement(s) of differences regarding significant unresolved difference (if any) of opinion reported by either ET members or the Mission or the implementer(s) of the RADA Program.

The ER will be written in English and submitted in electronic form readable in MS Word 2010 based on MS Word Times New Roman 12 or other legible font of similar size. Any data used to prepare those reports (except for the data protected by any formal agreements between the Contractor and interviewees and survey/focus group participants) will be presented in the MS Office compatible format suitable for re-analysis and submitted either by e-mail or on a CD or a flash drive to the COR.

The data should be fully documented and well organized for use by those not fully familiar with the evaluated activities or the evaluations. All quantitative data collected by the ET must be provided in machine-readable, non-proprietary formats at www.usaid.gov/data as required by USAID’s Open Data policy, at www.usaid.gov/data (see ADS 579). The data should be organized and fully documented for use by those not fully familiar with the project or the evaluation. USAID will retain ownership of the survey and all datasets developed, copies of which are provided to the COR.

The ET will present their major evaluation findings and preliminary conclusions in either MS PowerPoint or Google Slides format at two separate pre-departure briefings for the Mission and RADA Program stakeholders.

Draft ER will be due 15 working days after a corresponding pre-departure briefing for the Mission. The draft ER must include all relevant ET findings and conclusions made in conjunction with the evaluation of the RADA Program. The draft ER shall be prepared in line with general requirements (clarity, credibility, length, font size, etc.) set for the final ER. It may include the feedback received from the Mission and RADA Program stakeholders at the pre-departure briefing(s). The Mission will have 15 working days to review the draft ER and provide comments to the Contractor. The Mission will decide whether RADA Program stakeholders will be invited to comment on a draft ER.

The final ER will be due ten working days following the receipt of the Mission’s comments on a draft ER. The Contractor will use either a cover memorandum or similar format to explain how

comments provided by the Mission and RADA Program stakeholders (when solicited) were addressed in the final ER if the final ER differs substantially from the draft one.

Both the Mission and the Contractor will have a right to initiate an extension of the ER review or preparation/completion time for up to ten working days at no additional cost.

Attachment 1: Evaluation Report Outline Template

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- Evaluation purpose and questions
- Background and context
- Evaluation methods and limitations
- Evaluation findings
- Evaluation conclusions
- Lessons learned (if applicable)

1.0 EVALUATION PURPOSE & QUESTIONS

2.0 EVALUATION TEAM MEMBERS

3.0 PROJECT BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

4.0 EVALUATION METHODS AND LIMITATIONS

5.0 FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

5.1 RELEVANCE OF RADA PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

- 5.1.1 Findings
- 5.1.2 Conclusions

5.2 EFFECTIVENESS OF RADA PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

- 5.2.1 Findings
- 5.2.2 Conclusions

5.3 EVALUATION QUESTION 1

- 5.3.1 Findings
- 5.3.2 Conclusions

5.4 EVALUATION QUESTION 2

- 5.4.1 Findings
- 5.4.2 Conclusions

5.5 EVALUATION QUESTION 3

- 5.5.1 Findings
- 5.5.2 Conclusions

5.6 EVALUATION QUESTION 4

- 5.6.1 Findings
- 5.6.2 Conclusions

5.7 EVALUATION QUESTION 5

5.7.1 Findings

5.7.2 Conclusions

6.0 LESSONS LEARNED

ANNEXES

Annex A: Executive Summary in Ukrainian

Annex B: Evaluation Statement of Work

Annex C: Description of the Evaluation Team and Member Qualifications

Annex D: Conflict of Interest Statements

Annex E: Final Evaluation Work Plan

Annex F: List of Documents Reviewed

Annex G: Lists of Key Informants, Focus Group Discussants (if applicable), and Survey Respondents (if applicable)

Annex H: Data Collection Tools

Annex I: Focus Group Summaries (if applicable)

Annex K: Survey Results (if applicable)

Annex L: Table of Evaluation Findings and Conclusions

Annex M: MS PowerPoint (or Google Slides) based Presentation of Evaluation Design, Findings, and Conclusions

ANNEX C: EVALUATION TEAM

JOHN LIS, TEAM LEADER

John Lis is a democracy and governance consultant with two decades of experience in the U.S. Congress and international parliamentary bodies. He led the 2015 meta-evaluation of 30 USAID legislative strengthening programs, and he has conducted evaluations and assessments of USAID and State Department programs in Iraq, Lebanon, Kyrgyzstan, Bangladesh, Burma, Kenya, and the Middle East and North Africa. From 2003 to 2013, he was a Professional Staff Member for the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, including eight years as Staff Director of the House Democracy Partnership, the peer-to-peer legislative strengthening initiative of the U.S. House of Representatives, which worked in 17 countries including Ukraine. He worked in Brussels from 1999 through 2002 as Director of the Defense and Security Committee of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly. A former journalist, he has worked at the Congressional Budget Office and Senate Foreign Relations Committee. He holds a bachelor's degree in history from Stanford University, a master's degree in international affairs from Columbia University, and the Certificate of the Institute on East Central Europe at Columbia.

TARAS KUZIO, INTERNATIONAL GOVERNANCE EXPERT

Taras Kuzio is a British scholar and leading international expert on contemporary Ukrainian and post-communist politics, nationalism and European integration at the Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies of the University of Alberta and the Center for Transatlantic Relations at Johns Hopkins University. Taras Kuzio has been a political consultant to governments and legal and business consultant to the private sector on legal and economic questions. He has been a visiting professor or fellow at Hokkaido University, George Washington University, University of Birmingham, and Carleton University. Dr. Kuzio has also served as Head of Mission of the NATO Information and Documentation Centre in Kyiv, a member of the Editorial Advisory Board of *Geopolitics, History, and International Relations and Demokratizatsiya*, and the author and editor of fifteen books, including *Putin's War Against Ukraine: Revolution, Nationalism, and Crime* (2017), and five monographs. Taras Kuzio received a BA in Economics from the University of Sussex, an MA in Soviet and Eastern European Studies from the University of London and a PhD in Political Science from the University of Birmingham. He was a Post-doctoral Fellow at Yale University.

ANDRIY MELESHEVYCH, LOCAL GOVERNANCE EXPERT

Andriy Meleshevych has served as President of the National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy since 2014 and Professor of Law since 2005. He received an MA degree in Law from Kyiv University and holds a Ph.D. from the Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs at Syracuse University. He was awarded a visiting fellowship at Stanford University in 2010, and served as visiting professor at Groningen University (Netherlands), Heidelberg University (Germany), Dusseldorf University (Germany), Syracuse University (US), and Yerevan University (Armenia). He has widely published internationally in the fields of European human rights law, institution-building in the post-Soviet transitional countries including current EU members, political consequences of electoral laws and executive-legislative arrangements, political parties, comparative constitutional law and constitutionalism, and philosophy of law.

ANNEX D: EVALUATION WORK PLAN

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION: RESPONSIBLE ACCOUNTABLE DEMOCRATIC ASSEMBLY (RADA) PROGRAM EVALUATION WORK PLAN

PO NO. AID-I21-O-17-00040

DISCLAIMER:

THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EVALUATION. THE VIEWS EXPRESSED IN THIS DOCUMENT ARE THE AUTHORS' AND DO NOT NECESSARILY REFLECT THE VIEWS OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT OR THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

Submitted to:
USAID/Ukraine

Prepared by:
John Lis, Evaluation Team Leader

Contractor:
Democracy International, Inc.
7600 Wisconsin Avenue, Suite 1010
Bethesda, MD 20814
Tel: 301-961-1660
www.democracyinternational.com

PURPOSE AND APPROACH

EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

The United States Agency for International Development (USAID)/Ukraine has engaged Democracy International (DI) to conduct a final performance evaluation of USAID's Responsible Accountable Democratic Assembly (RADA) Program, implemented by the East Europe Foundation in Ukraine.

The objective of this final performance evaluation is to assess the **relevance** and **effectiveness** of the RADA Program in advancing parliamentary reform in Ukraine and, more specifically, improving public representation in the legislative process and strengthening independent legislative oversight of the executive branch

The Mission will use performance evaluation findings and conclusions to understand what the RADA Program has achieved, how it is perceived and valued, and what opportunities for collaboration were available and utilized. Other stakeholders with an interest in the evaluation findings and conclusions include the legislative and executive branches in Ukraine, political parties, civil society organizations (CSOs), USAID/Washington, U.S. Embassy in Ukraine, and other donors and implementing partners. The EEF and their partners will have an opportunity to learn about their strengths and areas for improvement.

EVALUATION MATRIX

DI will apply specific data sources and data collection methodology to respond to each of the core Evaluation Questions, to ensure a rigorous and streamlined process. The Evaluation Matrix is an effective vehicle for capturing that process in a concise and logical manner, and will serve as a key guiding document for the evaluation. Each Evaluation Question posed by USAID has been defined to indicate how it relates to the overall objectives of this evaluation, namely, an assessment of the relevance and effectiveness of the RADA Program and the degree to which it leveraged other funds and collaborated with other USAID and non-USAID developmental assistance programs.

Evaluation Question	Definition	Data Sources	Data Collection Methods
I. Which RADA Program activities do RADA Program stakeholders perceive to have been the most beneficial for improving public representation in the legislative process and why?	<p>Evaluate relevance of Objective I activities of RADA Program.</p> <p>The question refers to stakeholders' perceptions, which may differ from evidence collected from program or</p>	<p>Literature review of academic, journalistic and donor-funded reports on the legislature in Ukraine</p> <p>RADA Program documents and records</p> <p>Key Informant Interviews</p>	<p>Document Review of RADA quarterly and annual reports; M&E plan and work plans.</p> <p>Key informant interviews with MPs, parliamentary staff, local and regional officials, USAID, U.S. Embassy,</p>

	other relevant documents	Focus Groups Online Mini-Survey	international partners, RADA implementers. Focus group discussions with Model District staff, CSOs and journalists. Web-based surveys of MPs, parliamentary staff, local and regional officials, CSOs and journalists.
2. Which RADA Program activities do RADA Program stakeholders perceive to have been the most beneficial for strengthening independent oversight of the legislature over the executive branch and why?	Evaluate relevance of Objective 3 activities of RADA Program The question refers to stakeholders' perceptions, which may differ from evidence collected from program or other relevant documents	Literature review of academic, journalistic and donor-funded reports on the Legislature in Ukraine RADA Program documents and records Key Informant Interviews Focus Groups Online Mini-Survey	Document review, including RADA annual and quarterly reports; M&E plan and work plans. Key informant interviews with MPs, parliamentary staff, executive branch officials, USAID, U.S. Embassy, international partners, RADA implementers. Focus group discussions with parliamentary staff, CSOs and journalists. Web-based surveys of MPs, parliamentary staff, CSOs and journalists.

<p>3. What changes in public representation in the legislative process do RADA Program stakeholders perceive to be the result, in whole or in part, of the RADA Program's work?</p>	<p>Evaluate effectiveness of Objective 1 activities of RADA Program.</p> <p>The question refers to stakeholders' perceptions, which may differ from evidence collected from program or other relevant documents</p>	<p>RADA Program documents and records</p> <p>Key Informant Interviews</p> <p>Focus Groups</p> <p>Online Mini-Survey</p>	<p>Document review, including RADA annual and quarterly reports; M&E plan and work plans.</p> <p>Key informant interviews with MPs, parliamentary staff, local and regional officials, USAID, U.S. Embassy, international partners, RADA implementers.</p> <p>Focus group discussions with Model District staff, CSOs and journalists.</p> <p>Web-based surveys of MPs, parliamentary staff, local and regional officials, CSOs and journalists.</p>
<p>4. What changes in independent oversight of the legislature over the executive branch do RADA Program stakeholders perceive to be the result, in whole or in part, of the RADA Program's work?</p>	<p>Evaluate effectiveness of Objective 3 activities of RADA Program.</p> <p>The question refers to stakeholders' perceptions, which may differ from evidence collected from program or other relevant documents</p>	<p>RADA Program documents and records</p> <p>Key Information Interviews</p> <p>Focus Groups</p> <p>Online Mini-Survey</p>	<p>Document review, including RADA annual and quarterly reports; M&E plan and work plans. Key informant interviews with MPs, parliamentary staff, executive branch officials, USAID, U.S. Embassy, international partners, RADA implementers.</p>

			<p>Focus group discussions with parliamentary staff, CSOs and journalists.</p> <p>Web-based surveys of MPs, parliamentary staff, CSOs and journalists.</p>
5. How well did the RADA Program respond to opportunities to leverage resources and advance relevant parliamentary reforms through collaboration with other USAID and non-USAID development assistance programs?	Evaluate degree to which the RADA Program sought out and took advantage of linkages with other USAID and non-USAID programs and sectors, and the degree to which RADA Program served as a resource for other USAID programs	<p>RADA Program documents and records</p> <p>Non-USAID development assistance program documents</p> <p>Key Informant Interviews</p>	<p>Document review, including RADA annual and quarterly reports; M&E plan and work plans.</p> <p>Key informant interviews with USAID, U.S. Embassy, international partners, RADA implementers, other program implementers.</p>
6. How relevant was the RADA Program in advancing parliamentary reform in Ukraine?	Evaluate overall relevance of RADA Program in general	<p>RADA Program documents and records</p> <p>Key Information Interviews</p> <p>Focus Groups</p> <p>Online Mini-Survey</p>	<p>Document review, including RADA annual and quarterly reports; M&E plan and work plans.</p> <p>Key informant interviews with MPs, parliamentary staff, executive branch officials, USAID, U.S. Embassy, international</p>

			<p>partners, RADA implementers.</p> <p>Focus group discussions with parliamentary staff, CSOs and journalists.</p> <p>Web-based surveys of MPs, parliamentary staff, CSOs and journalists.</p>
7. How effective was the RADA Program in advancing parliamentary reform in Ukraine?	Evaluate overall effectiveness of RADA Program in general.	<p>RADA Program documents and records</p> <p>Key Information Interviews</p> <p>Focus Groups</p> <p>Online Mini-Survey</p>	<p>Document review, including RADA annual and quarterly reports; M&E plan and work plans.</p> <p>Key informant interviews with MPs, parliamentary staff, executive branch officials, USAID, U.S. Embassy, international partners, RADA implementers.</p> <p>Focus group discussions with parliamentary staff, CSOs and journalists.</p> <p>Web-based surveys of MPs, parliamentary staff, CSOs and journalists.</p>
8. How well did the RADA Program promote gender equality in its	Evaluate relevance and effectiveness of gender specific approaches	RADA Program documents and records	Document review, including RADA annual and quarterly

programming, in the Verkhovna Rada, and in public policy in Ukraine?	promoted by RADA Program.	Key Information Interviews Focus Groups Online Mini-Survey	reports; M&E plan and work plans. Key informant interviews with MPs, parliamentary staff, executive branch officials, USAID, U.S. Embassy, international partners, RADA implementers. Focus group discussions with parliamentary staff, CSOs and journalists. Web-based surveys of MPs, parliamentary staff, CSOs and journalists.
--	---------------------------	--	---

METHODOLOGY

OVERVIEW

DI's evaluation design and approach reflect principles outlined in USAID's 2017 Evaluation Policy. By analyzing program effectiveness, relevance and challenges to date, DI will provide USAID with objective information to inform evidence-based decision-making on future programming. DI will work closely with USAID and other key stakeholders to ensure that the evaluation responds to the evaluation questions articulated by USAID for this performance evaluation.

This evaluation will utilize a mixed-methods approach that relies on both quantitative data (primarily monitoring data and results of the online mini-survey) and qualitative data (primarily collected from program documents and through key informant interviews and focus group discussions). This design will allow the evaluation team to generate an in-depth, comprehensive description and understanding of the RADA Program as a whole and in its context. This approach actively promotes diverse ways of thinking about issues related to the program, including whether or not and why program's stakeholders perceive the program to have been effective and relevant in advancing parliamentary reforms in Ukraine.

By triangulating findings using multiple data collection methods and soliciting views from persons most knowledgeable about the program—a critical characteristic of a non-experimental design—DI will describe program outcomes more accurately and with a greater degree of nuance.

Data Sources and Instruments

As detailed in the Evaluation Matrix above, the DI evaluation team will collect data from a variety of sources, including document reviews, key informant interviews, focus group discussion sessions and a mini-survey to reach a broader sample of MPs, staff, local officials, CSOs and journalists who participated in RADA activities.

The selection of informants will be purposive, and will be informed by suggestions from USAID, participant lists from project activities, desk research, and recommendations by experts. Although the East Europe Foundation, the program implementer, will be asked for suggestions and contact information to facilitate the process of arranging meetings, the final decision on informants will in all cases be made by the DI Team in collaboration with USAID. They will contact informants directly to request appointments.

The selection of informants, focus group participants and survey respondents will take into account such factors as direct relationship to the program, type of assistance received (technical assistance or training), and geographic location. Please see Annex B for a full list of proposed actors and institutional officials to be interviewed.

DI will conduct five mini-surveys using a web-based tool such as Survey Monkey™, to ensure a confidential, easily accessible, and fast methodology of collecting and analyzing data. The survey will be used to complement the findings collected through desk reviews, interviews and focus group discussions and in no way will attempt to be representative of program stakeholders.

The semi-structured interview protocols will be finalized by the team after discussions with USAID personnel and implementer staff. Each protocol will differ depending on the key informant's role and "causal distance" from activities, as well as the extent of the key informant's involvement in parliament-related activities and the time available for interviewing; the questions will address not just knowledge and general perceptions, but more importantly probe for specific examples of attitude and behavior change. For a draft of proposed questions please refer to Annex C.

The survey questionnaire was finalized after discussions with USAID. The survey protocols will be based closely on related interview protocol questions. Surveys will be e-mailed to all RADA Program participants whose e-mail addresses are provided on contact lists that will be provided by the East Europe Foundation for the following groups:

- Members of Parliament (All MPs, plus additional questions for RADA Program participants)
- Verkhovna Rada staff
- Local officials
- Civil Society Organizations (both Kyiv and Model Districts)

- Journalists

Ukrainian members of the evaluation team will follow up by telephone to ensure a high response rate.

Ideally, each individual interview will last between 45 minutes and 1 hour. These interviews will enable the team to gather detailed inputs on the topics covered by the evaluation questions, based on the informant's unique perspective.

The team also proposes to conduct five focus group discussion sessions with a homogeneous group of stakeholders who benefitted from program activities, for example, representatives of CSOs, parliamentary staff, journalists, etc. Each discussion will last approximately 1.5 hours. These facilitated discussions will allow for exchange and discussion of experiences and viewpoints, and enable the team to probe for perceptions of relevance and effectiveness as well as to identify lessons learned and recommendations for any future activity.

ANALYTICAL APPROACH

Parallel analysis will be used to analyze the evidence from interviews, document review, and web-based surveys. In this analytical approach, each type of data for an activity is analyzed in parallel, and then across data type. For example, the team would develop preliminary findings by first analyzing interviews with trainees and with supervisors or other leadership of those trainees; then, develop complementary preliminary findings from the survey questions; then, develop additional complementary preliminary findings from the key documents and other secondary materials; and finally, analyze preliminary findings across the types of data to develop activity-level findings.

BIASES AND OTHER LIMITATIONS

As with any evaluation, there are biases and other limitations that must be addressed through methodological or analytical methods. An evaluation of parliament-related activities is subject to many of these issues:

- First, recall bias may be present, such as parliament staff responding to team questions with answers related to one parliament-related program or another, or those of another donor. A similar problem is that participants in multiple training activities may be blending their experiences into a composite memory or response, e.g., staff have received training on several topics both before and during the evaluation period and subsequently do not distinguish between them as separate activities in their responses. The evaluation team will provide basic information on the RADA Program prior to asking questions, to assist interviewees in remembering RADA Program activities accurately.
- Second, response bias is a common problem for program evaluations, particularly for highly technical DRG subsectors such as parliamentary strengthening. For example, MPs may give the interviewer positive remarks about an activity like exchange trips because s/he would like to go on more such trips in the future. This bias is less likely with this evaluation because the evaluation team will not be making recommendations about future programming and this fact will be explained to interviewees.

- Third, selection bias in the form of contacts provided by the implementers can mean that the team only hears from people with positive experiences; again, this is particularly a problem for parliamentary strengthening.

The most effective approach to combating bias is to use multiple sources of data to triangulate on an evaluation issue, as is often accomplished through qualitative reliability matrices. By combining information found in documents or interviews from multiple sources, any one piece of biased data would not skew the analysis. Another approach that pertains specifically to interviews is the inclusion of key informants from organizations that do not directly benefit from the assessed program(s), and the use of questions about specific examples of knowledge use.

The team's biggest concern is about the availability of contacts. We anticipate that interviews with MPs or senior staff may be difficult to schedule because of existing demands on their time or the need to accommodate last-minute scheduling changes. To work around their constraints, the team will schedule MP interviews for days when they are not in plenary session and will leave several days at the end of field work for scheduling make-up and follow-on interviews. To address the risk of low response rates for the surveys the team will reach out to larger numbers of potential respondents, to increase the chances of obtaining a statistically significant sample size. Finally, the possibility of protests outside of parliament may interfere with the evaluation team's efforts to meet with key informants. The team will identify a location outside of parliament, such as a hotel meeting room, where interviews can be conducted if the parliament building is inaccessible.

PHASE I: PREPARATION, DOCUMENT REVIEW, AND KICKOFF CALL

Document Review

Members of the evaluation team began to review relevant documents on October 17, 2017, in order to prepare for the kickoff call and to develop the evaluation work plan. The documents were provided by USAID to DI and made available to evaluators through the Dropbox web-sharing application.

Kickoff Call

The team leader, international governance consultant, and DI headquarters staff participated in a kickoff call with USAID/Ukraine on October 17. During that call, participants discussed the mission's expectations for the evaluation, including the timetable, methodology and location of interviews.

PHASE II: FIELDWORK

In-brief and consultations with the Mission

The in-brief with USAID/Ukraine took place on November 8. The team will submit weekly updates to the work plan to the COR while in-country.

Evaluation Interviews

The evaluation team plans for a robust set of key informant interviews and focus group discussions during the three weeks of field work. A list of proposed interviews is included as an annex to this work plan. The team commenced scheduling of interviews two weeks before the start of field work and began interviews immediately after the team planning meeting. The evaluation team anticipates interviewing about 50 individuals.

The team plans several site visits to interview local officials, parliamentary staff, CSOs and journalists who participated in Model District activities outside of Kyiv city. The team anticipates meetings in Volyn, Kharkiv, Chernihiv and Kyiv oblasts. The visit to Brovary, in Kyiv Oblast, will include observation of a Model District event. Visits to Luhansk and Transcarpathia oblasts have been ruled out due to logistical complications.

The team plans five focus group discussions in Kyiv: three with parliamentary staff and one each with CSOs and journalists. Each focus group will include about six to 10 participants. The team plans to e-mail mini-surveys to all MPs and to all participating parliamentary staff, local officials, CSO representatives and journalists whose e-mail addresses are provided by the implementer.

Team Discussions and Program Analysis

Field work commenced on November 6 with a team planning meeting. The evaluation team is working a six-day week while field work is underway. The team anticipates using its Saturdays for discussions of findings and preliminary conclusions. The team will conduct data analysis on Saturday, November 18, in anticipation of the out-brief presentation the following week.

Mission Debrief

Due to the Thanksgiving Day holiday, the mission debrief and a stakeholders' debrief have been scheduled for Wednesday, November 22. The team anticipates submission of a Powerpoint presentation prior to the briefing and presentation of preliminary findings and conclusions.

PHASE III: REPORT WRITING

Draft Report

Final data analysis and the writing of the draft report will take place between November 27 and December 15. The report will be drafted in accord with the template and format requested by the mission.

Final Report

The evaluation team requests that the mission provide DI with comments to the draft report no later than January 5, 2018. The team will revise the report in accord with those comments, and DI will submit the final report no later than January 19, 2018.

DELIVERABLES

For the final evaluation, DI will submit the following deliverables:

1. A draft report will be submitted to USAID/Ukraine on December 15, after returning home from the field. It will be no more than 30 pages, excluding annexes and references and a three to five-page executive summary. An executive summary in Ukrainian will be provided. USAID/Ukraine will provide comments within 15 business days (by January 5, 2018) to the draft report.
2. Final Evaluation Report. The authors will revise the draft evaluation report into a final evaluation report that reflects USAID's comments and suggestions. The final report will be submitted to USAID/Ukraine by January 19, 2018. Both the Mission and the Contractor have a right to initiate an extension of the ER review or preparation/ completion time for up to 10 working days at no additional cost.

Kickoff telephone call: Tuesday, Oct. 17, 2017

Draft work plan submitted to USAID: Monday, Oct. 23

In-brief at USAID/Ukraine: Wednesday, Nov. 8

Out-briefs for USAID and stakeholders: Wednesday, Nov. 22

Draft report submitted to USAID: Friday, Dec. 15

Comments received from USAID: Friday, Jan. 5, 2018

Final report submitted to USAID: Friday, Jan. 19

ANNEX A: EVALUATION TIMELINE

PREPARATION AND PRELIMINARY DESK REVIEW

Week 1: October 16-20, 2017

Begin document review

Kickoff call

Draft work plan

Hire local contractors

Week 2: October 23-27

Continue document review

Begin logistical planning

Begin interview scheduling

Week 3: October 30-November 3

Continue document review

Continue logistical planning

Continue interview scheduling

FIELDWORK AND DATA COLLECTION

Week 4: November 6-11

Team Planning Meeting

In-brief at mission

Pilot draft evaluation questions and surveys in Kyiv

Begin KIs and FGDs

E-mail mini-surveys to respondents

Week 5: November 13-18

Field visits to Volyn and Kharkiv

Continue KIs and FGDs

Preliminary data analysis

Week 6: November 20-25

Field visits to Chernihiv and Brovary

Continue KIIs and FGDs

Out-briefs with mission and with stakeholders

ANALYSIS AND PREPARATION OF REPORT**Week 7: November 27-December 1**

Data analysis

Write report

Week 8: December 4-8

Data analysis

Write report

Week 9: December 11-15

Write report

Submit draft report

Week 10: December 18-22

Mission review of draft report

Week 11: December 26-29

Mission review of draft report

Week 12: January 2-5, 2018

Mission review of draft report

Mission provides comments to DI

Week 13: January 8-12, 2018

Revise report

Week 14: January 15-19, 2018

Submit final report

ANNEX B: LIST OF ACTORS AND INSTITUTIONS FOR INTERVIEWS

International donors and implementers

USG

USAID RADA COR

Decentralization/local government program CORs: PULSE and DOBRE

CORs for political party, judicial reform and/or civil society activities

Directors and/or deputy directors of USAID/Ukraine technical offices

International Partners

International donors

- WFD
- UNDP
- EU
- Council of Europe
- GIZ

CEPPS partners: NDI, IRI, IFES

Other USAID implementing partners

RADA implementers

RADA Program

COP and DCOP

Objective 1 staff

Objective 3 staff

Gender expert

RADA Ukrainian partners

Internews Ukraine

Agency for Legislative Initiatives

OPORA

Interns League

Parliament

Parliamentary leadership

Speaker's chief of staff and senior advisor

Secretary General

Working Group on Parliamentary Reform

Working Group on Cooperation with Chamber of Accounts

Equal Opportunities Caucus leadership

Committee chairs and secretariat heads (Note: Committees that worked directly with RADA)

Anti-Corruption

Rules

Local Self-Governance

Legal Policy and Justice

IT and Communications

Human Rights

Science and Education

Model Districts

MP Ihor Huz (Single Member District, Volyn Oblast/Volodymyr-Volynsky)

MP Pavlo Rizanenko (Single Member District, Kyiv Oblast/Brovary)

MP Oleksandr Chernenko (Party List, assigned to Chernihiv Oblast)

MP Ivan Krulko (Party List, Transcarpathia Oblast)

MP Yehor Sobolyev (Party List, Kyiv City)

MP Olena Sotnyk (Party List, assigned to Kharkiv Oblast)

MP Svitlana Zalishchuk (Party List, assigned to Luhansk Oblast)

Focus Group Discussion of Model District staff (one from each MP)

Department chiefs

European Information Research Center

Department of Computerized Systems

Organizational Department

Informational Department

Legal Scientific Department

Chamber of Accounts

Staff

Focus Group Discussion of VR staff who participated in RADA training activities

Focus Group Discussion of VR staff who participated in gender training

Government of Ukraine

Cabinet of Ministers – director of parliamentary relations

President’s Office – director of parliamentary relations and head of domestic affairs department

Volodymyr Bondarenko, State Secretary of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine

Tymur Tashtanov, First Deputy Head of the Office of the Prime Minister of Ukraine

Nataliya Oksha, Deputy Director, Head of Public Relations Department

Oleksandr Yarema, Deputy Minister of Youth and Sport

Other stakeholders

Civil society

Focus Group Discussion with CSO Registry participants

Journalists

Focus Group Discussion with parliamentary journalists

Field visits to Lutsk, Kharkiv, Chernihiv and Brovary

Local officials who participated in RADA meetings with MPs

Civic activists who participated in RADA meetings with MPs

Regional journalists who covered RADA events and participated in press tours

MP aides in district

Web-based surveys

Note: A list of participants will be added to this work plan after the evaluation team has received a list of RADA Program participants from the program implementers.

Members of Parliament

Web-based mini-surveys (of all MPs, 11 questions for RADA participants and 8 questions for non-participants)

Verkhovna Rada staff

Web-based mini-survey (10 questions) of VR staff who participated in RADA activities

Local officials

Web-based mini-survey (10 questions) of oblast/raion/municipal officials who participated in activities

Civil Society Organizations (both Kyiv and Model Districts)

Web-based mini-survey (10 questions) of CSOs participating in RADA activities

Journalists

Web-based mini-survey (10 questions) of journalists who participated in RADA activities

ANNEX C: ILLUSTRATIVE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Participants

1. We are conducting an evaluation of the RADA Program, funded by USAID and implemented by the East Europe Foundation. Could you please tell us about your participation in RADA activities since the program began in 2014?
2. One objective of the RADA Program is to improve public representation in the legislative process. Which RADA Program activities do you believe were most beneficial for improving public representation?
3. What skills that you learned from the RADA Program have been most useful to you in supporting the representational function of parliament, and how have you used them in your work?
4. In what ways has parliament improved public representation in the legislative process since 2014? Is this attributable in any way to the RADA Program? What changes, in whole or in part, are due to the RADA Program?
5. Another objective of the RADA Program is to improve parliamentary oversight (control) of the government. Which RADA Program activities do you believe were most beneficial for improving parliamentary oversight?
6. What skills that you learned from the RADA Program have been most useful to you in supporting the oversight function of parliament, and how have you used them in your work?
7. In what ways has the parliament improved parliamentary oversight (control) since 2014? Is this attributable in any way to the RADA Program? What changes, in whole or in part, are due to the RADA Program?
8. Did the RADA Program treat men and women equally in its programming, and did men and women benefit equally from these programs?
9. In what ways has equality between men and women in the Verkhovna Rada improved since 2014? Is this attributable in any way to the RADA Program? What changes, in whole or in part, are due to the RADA Program?
10. In what ways has public policy in Ukraine promoted equality between men and women since 2014? Is this attributable in any way to the RADA Program? What changes, in whole or in part, are due to the RADA Program?

Non-Participant MPs

1. We are conducting an evaluation of the RADA Program, funded by USAID and implemented by the East Europe Foundation,. Could you please tell us about your experience with the RADA Program since it began in 2014?

2. One objective of the RADA Program is to improve public representation in the legislative process. Which RADA Program activities do you believe were most beneficial for improving public representation in the parliament?
3. In what ways has parliament improved public representation in the legislative process since 2014? Is this attributable in any way to the RADA Program? What changes, in whole or in part, are due to the RADA Program?
4. Another objective of the RADA Program is to improve parliamentary oversight (control) of the government. Which RADA Program activities do you believe were most beneficial for improving parliamentary oversight?
5. In what ways has the parliament improved parliamentary oversight (control) since 2014? Is this attributable in any way to the RADA Program? What changes, in whole or in part, are due to the RADA Program?
6. Did your staff participate in any RADA Program activities since 2014? Did their participation in the RADA Program improve their skills in any way? In what ways are they better able to support you and other MPs in your representative and oversight functions?
7. In what ways has equality between men and women in the Verkhovna Rada improved since 2014? Is this attributable in any way to the RADA Program? What changes, in whole or in part, are due to the RADA Program?
8. In what ways has public policy in Ukraine promoted equality between men and women since 2014? Is this attributable in any way to the RADA Program? What changes, in whole or in part, are due to the RADA Program?

Donors and Implementers

1. We are conducting an evaluation of the RADA Program, funded by USAID and implemented by the East Europe Foundation. Could you please tell us about your experience with the RADA Program since it began in 2014?
2. One objective of the RADA Program is to improve public representation in the legislative process. Which RADA Program activities do you believe were most beneficial for improving public representation in the parliament?
3. In what ways has parliament improved public representation in the legislative process since 2014? Is this attributable in any way to the RADA Program? What changes, in whole or in part, are due to the RADA Program?
4. One important element to improve representation is the Model District activity. How were MPs and districts selected for this activity? Why do a majority of Model District MPs come from those election by Proportional Representation, rather than Single Member Districts?

5. Another objective of the RADA Program is to improve parliamentary oversight of the government. Which RADA Program activities do you believe were most beneficial for improving parliamentary oversight?
6. In what ways has the parliament improved parliamentary oversight since 2014? Is this attributable in any way to the RADA Program? What changes, in whole or in part, are due to the RADA Program?
7. Did the RADA Program treat men and women equally in its programming, and did men and women benefit equally from these programs?
8. In what ways has equality between men and women in the Verkhovna Rada improved since 2014? Is this attributable in any way to the RADA Program? What changes, in whole or in part, are due to the RADA Program?
9. In what ways has public policy in Ukraine promoted equality between men and women since 2014? Is this attributable in any way to the RADA Program? What changes, in whole or in part, are due to the RADA Program?

Regional and Local Officials, CSOs and Journalists

1. We are conducting an evaluation of the RADA Program, funded by USAID and implemented by the East Europe Foundation. This program supports the Model District activity in XXX Oblast with MP XXX XXX. Could you please tell us about your experience with the RADA Program and MP XXX?
2. One objective of the RADA Program is to improve public representation in the legislative process through initiatives like the Model District activity. Do you believe the Model District is beneficial for improving public representation in the parliament? If yes, how?
3. Can you give an example of how the Model District activity helped you communicate a local concern to parliament? What was the outcome of this interaction?
4. In what ways has parliament improved public representation in the legislative process since 2014? Is this attributable in any way to the RADA Program? Are any of these changes, in whole or in part, are due to the RADA Program and the Model District activity?
5. Did the RADA Program treat men and women equally in its programming, and did men and women benefit equally from these programs?
6. In what ways has public policy in Ukraine promoted equality between men and women since 2014? Is this attributable in any way to the RADA Program? What changes, in whole or in part, are due to the RADA Program?

Government of Ukraine Officials

1. We are conducting an evaluation of the RADA Program, funded by USAID and implemented by the East Europe Foundation. Have you had any experience with the RADA Program since it began in 2014?

2. In what ways has parliament improved public representation in the legislative process since 2014? Is this attributable in any way to the RADA Program? What changes, in whole or in part, are due to the RADA Program?

3. Another objective of the RADA Program is to improve parliamentary oversight (control) of the government. Which RADA Program activities do you believe were most beneficial for improving parliamentary oversight?

5. In what ways has the parliament improved parliamentary oversight (control) since 2014? Is this attributable in any way to the RADA Program? What changes, in whole or in part, are due to the RADA Program?

6. From an executive-branch perspective, how have your interactions with parliament changed since 2014, particularly with regard to parliamentary oversight activities?

7. In what ways has public policy in Ukraine promoted equality between men and women since 2014? Is this attributable in any way to the RADA Program? What changes, in whole or in part, are due to the RADA Program?

Journalists, CSOs, Academics, Other Outside Observers

1. We are conducting an evaluation of the RADA Program, funded by USAID and implemented by the East Europe Foundation. Have you had any experience with the RADA Program since it began in 2014?

2. In what ways has parliament improved public representation in the legislative process since 2014? Is this attributable in any way to the RADA Program? What changes, in whole or in part, are due to the RADA Program?

3. Another objective of the RADA Program is to improve parliamentary oversight (control) of the government. Which RADA Program activities do you believe were most beneficial for improving parliamentary oversight?

4. In what ways has the parliament improved parliamentary oversight (control) since 2014? Is this attributable in any way to the RADA Program? What changes, in whole or in part, are due to the RADA Program?

5. Did the RADA Program treat men and women equally in its programming, and did men and women benefit equally from these programs?

6. In what ways has public policy in Ukraine promoted equality between men and women since 2014? Is this attributable in any way to the RADA Program? What changes, in whole or in part, are due to the RADA Program?

ANNEX D: WEB-BASED SURVEY QUESTIONS

Members of Parliament

1. We are conducting an evaluation of the Responsible Accountable Democratic Assembly (RADA) Program. Have you participated in any activities of the RADA Program? Yes/no

*** (Decision-point – direct to “yes” survey or “no” survey based on this question.)***

“Yes” survey

2. One objective of the RADA Program is to improve public representation in the legislative process. Has parliament improved public representation in the legislative process since 2014? Yes/no

3. If you answered “yes” to Question 2: Is improved public representation attributable in any way to the RADA Program? Yes/no

4. If you answered “yes” to Question 2: Which RADA Program activities have been the most beneficial for improving public representation? Open-ended

5. If you answered “yes” to Question 2: What improvements in public representation, in whole or in part, are due to the RADA Program? Open-ended

6. Has the parliament improved parliamentary oversight (control) since 2014? Yes/no

7. If you answered “yes” to Question 6: Is improved oversight attributable in any way to the RADA Program? Yes/no

8. If you answered “yes” to Question 6: Which RADA Program activities are have been the most beneficial for improving oversight? Open-ended

9. If you answered “yes” to Question 6: What improvements in oversight, in whole or in part, are due to the RADA Program? Open-ended

10. Have you requested information from the European Integration Research Center? Yes/no

11. Has equality between men and women in the Verkhovna Rada improved since 2014? Yes/no

“No” survey

2. Have you heard of the USAID-funded RADA Program, implemented by the East Europe Foundation? Yes/no

3. Have you participated in other legislative strengthening programs? Yes/no

4. If you answered yes to Question 3, in which programs did you participate? Check all that apply.

- A. Indiana University Parliamentary Strengthening Program
- B. National Democratic Institute (NDI)
- C. European Union (EU)
- D. United Nations Development Program (UNDP)
- E. Westminster Foundation for Democracy (WFD)
- F. Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ – German aid agency)
- G. Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE)
- H. Council of Europe/Venice Commission
- I. Other

5. If you answered yes to Question 3, what activities did you find most useful about that program. Open-ended

6. Has parliament improved public representation in the legislative process since 2014? Yes/no

7. Has the parliament improved parliamentary oversight (control) since 2014? Yes/no

8. Has equality between men and women in the Verkhovna Rada improved since 2014? Yes/no

Verkhovna Rada Staff Participants

1. We are conducting an evaluation of the RADA Program, funded by USAID and implemented by the East Europe Foundation. One objective of the RADA Program is to improve public representation in the legislative process. Has parliament improved public representation in the legislative process since 2014? Yes/no

2. If you answered “yes” to Question 1: Is improved public representation attributable in any way to the RADA Program? Yes/no

3. If you answered “yes” to Question 1: Which RADA Program activities have been the most beneficial for improving public representation? Open-ended

4. If you answered “yes” to Question 1: What improvements in public representation, in whole or in part, are due to the RADA Program? Open-ended

5. Has the parliament improved parliamentary oversight (control) since 2014? Yes/no
6. If you answered “yes” to Question 5: Is improved oversight attributable in any way to the RADA Program? Yes/no
7. If you answered “yes” to Question 5: Which RADA Program activities are have been the most beneficial for improving oversight? Open-ended
8. If you answered “yes” to Question 5: What improvements in oversight, in whole or in part, are due to the RADA Program? Open-ended
9. Have you requested information from the European Integration Research Center? Yes/no
10. Did men and women benefit equally from RADA Program activities? Yes/no
11. Has equality between men and women in the Verkhovna Rada improved since 2014? Yes/no

Local Officials

1. We are conducting an evaluation of the RADA Program, funded by USAID and implemented by the East Europe Foundation. This program supports the Model District activity in your oblast. One objective of the RADA Program is to improve public representation in the legislative process through initiatives like the Model District activity. Do you believe the Model District is beneficial for improving public representation in the parliament? Yes/no
2. If you answered yes to Question 1: How is the Model District activity beneficial for improving public representation in the parliament? Open-ended
3. Did you participate in a Town Hall event with a Member of Parliament?
4. Did the Model District activity help you communicate a local concern to parliament? Yes/no
5. If you answered yes to Question 3: What was the outcome of this interaction?
 - A. Problem was resolved
 - B. MP took action, but problem was not resolved
 - C. MP took no action
 - D. MP never responded to me
 - E. Other (explain)
6. Has parliament improved public representation in the legislative process since 2014? Yes/no
7. If you answered “yes” to Question 5: Is improved public representation attributable in any way to the RADA Program? Yes/no

8. If you answered “yes” to Question 5: Which RADA Program activities have been the most beneficial for improving public representation? Open-ended

9. If you answered “yes” to Question 5: What improvements in public representation, in whole or in part, are due to the RADA Program? Open-ended

10. Did men and women benefit equally from RADA Program activities? Yes/no

Civil Society Organizations (both Kyiv and Model Districts)

1. We are conducting an evaluation of the RADA Program, funded by USAID and implemented by the East Europe Foundation. One objective of the RADA Program is to improve public representation in the legislative process. Has parliament improved public representation in the legislative process since 2014? Yes/no

2. If you answered “yes” to Question 1: Is improved public representation attributable in any way to the RADA Program? Yes/no

3. If you answered “yes” to Question 1: Which RADA Program activities have been the most beneficial for improving public representation? Open-ended

4. If you answered “yes” to Question 1: What improvements in public representation, in whole or in part, are due to the RADA Program? Open-ended

5. Has the parliament improved parliamentary oversight (control) since 2014? Yes/no

6. If you answered “yes” to Question 5: Is improved oversight attributable in any way to the RADA Program? Yes/no

7. If you answered “yes” to Question 5: Which RADA Program activities are have been the most beneficial for improving oversight? Open-ended

8. If you answered “yes” to Question 5: What improvements in oversight, in whole or in part, are due to the RADA Program? Open-ended

9. Did you participate in a Town Hall event with a Member of Parliament?

10. Did men and women benefit equally from RADA Program activities? Yes/no

Journalists

1. We are conducting an evaluation of the RADA Program, funded by USAID and implemented by the East Europe Foundation. Did you participate in a RADA Program activity, such as a study visit to Kyiv, or cover a RADA Program activity for your news organization, such as a Town Hall meeting?

A. Participated in RADA Program activity

- B. Covered RADA Program activity
 - C. Both participated in an activity and covered an activity
 - D. Did not participate in and did not cover a RADA Program activity.
2. One objective of the RADA Program is to improve public representation in the legislative process. Has parliament improved public representation in the legislative process since 2014? Yes/no
 3. If you answered “yes” to Question 2: Is improved public representation attributable in any way to the RADA Program? Yes/no
 4. If you answered “yes” to Question 2: Which RADA Program activities have been the most beneficial for improving public representation? Open-ended
 5. If you answered “yes” to Question 2: What improvements in public representation, in whole or in part, are due to the RADA Program? Open-ended
 6. Has the parliament improved parliamentary oversight (control) since 2014? Yes/no
 7. If you answered “yes” to Question 6: Is improved oversight attributable in any way to the RADA Program? Yes/no
 8. If you answered “yes” to Question 6: Which RADA Program activities are have been the most beneficial for improving oversight? Open-ended
 9. If you answered “yes” to Question 6: What improvements in oversight, in whole or in part, are due to the RADA Program? Open-ended
 10. Did men and women benefit equally from RADA Program activities? Yes/no

ANNEX E: DESK REVIEW DOCUMENTS

RADA Program annual reports (FY2014, FY2015, FY2016)

RADA Program quarterly reports (November 2013-June 2017)

RADA Program annual work plans (FY2014, FY2015, FY2016, FY2017)

RADA Program Description

Implementation Memoranda with RADA alliance partners

2013-2018 RADA Program PMEP

Democracy International. Legislative Strengthening/Good Governance Program Assessment in Ukraine. Kyiv: USAID/Ukraine, July 2012.

Cox, Pat. Report and Roadmap: On Internal Reform and Capacity-Building for the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine. Brussels: European Parliament, February 2016.

Materials on RADA Program Website (<http://radaprogram.org/en/>), including:

- Guide on Anti-Corruption in Ukraine
- A Methodology aimed at discounting electoral districts “hand-feeding” practices and political corruption.
- The Concept of Comprehensive Amendments to the Rules of Procedure of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine
- The Ninth Survey of the Members of the Ukrainian Parliament
- The Basic Aspects of Lawmaking. (Handbook)
- Draft Law Design Rules and Main Legislative Techniques. (Guidelines)

Documents from RADA Program implementing partners ALI, OPORA and Internews-Ukraine

ANNEX F: REPORT OUTLINE

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Evaluation purpose and questions

Background and context

Evaluation methods and limitations

Evaluation findings

Evaluation conclusions

Lessons learned (if applicable)

1.0 EVALUATION PURPOSE & QUESTIONS

2.0 EVALUATION TEAM MEMBERS

3.0 PROGRAM BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

4.0 EVALUATION METHODS AND LIMITATIONS

5.0 FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

5.1 EVALUATION QUESTION 1

5.1.1 Findings

5.1.2 Conclusions

5.2 EVALUATION QUESTION 2

5.2.1 Findings

5.2.2 Conclusions

5.3 EVALUATION QUESTION 3

5.3.1 Findings

5.3.2 Conclusions

5.4 EVALUATION QUESTION 4

5.4.1 Findings

5.4.2 Conclusions

5.5 EVALUATION QUESTION 5

5.5.1 Findings

5.5.2 Conclusions

5.6 EVALUATION QUESTION 6

5.6.1 Findings

5.6.2 Conclusions

5.7 EVALUATION QUESTION 7

5.7.1 Findings

5.7.2 Conclusions

5.8 EVALUATION QUESTION 8

5.8.1 Findings

5.8.2 Conclusions

7.0 LESSONS LEARNED

ANNEXES

Annex A: Executive Summary in Ukrainian

Annex B: Evaluation Statement of Work

Annex C: Description of the Evaluation Team and Member Qualifications

Annex D: Conflict of Interest Statements

Annex E: Final Evaluation Work Plan

Annex F: List of Documents Reviewed

Annex G: Lists of Key Informants, Focus Group Discussants and Survey Respondents

Annex H: Data Collection Tools

Annex I: Focus Group Summaries

Annex K: Survey Results

Annex L: Table of Evaluation Findings and Conclusions

Annex M: MS PowerPoint Presentation of Evaluation Design, Findings and Conclusions

ANNEX G: SCHEDULE FOR FIELD WORK, NOVEMBER 2017

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
			1	2	3	4 TL departs DC
5 TL arrives in Ukraine	6 Int'l expert arrives Team Planning Meeting ALI KII	7 E. Europe Foundation KII CEPPS KII	8 USAID in-brief USG KII at mission and embassy NDI, CoE mtgs.	9 VR leadership KII	10 Implementing Partner KII Int'l donor KII	11 Journalists FGD Team meeting
12 Team 1: travel to Volyn Team 2: travel to Kharkiv	13 Team 1: Volyn meetings & return Team 2: Kharkiv meetings & return	14 VR Model District MP KII	15 VR Committee KII	16 VR Dept. Head KII	17 VR staff FGDs E. Europe Foundation KII	18 CSO FGD Team meeting: Data analysis Out-brief prep
19	20 Government KII	21 Team 1: Brovary KII & observation Team 2: Chernihiv KII	22 USAID out-brief Stakeholder out-brief	23 Thanksgiving TL departs Int'l and local expert: make-up meetings	24 Int'l expert: make-up meetings	25 Int'l expert: make-up meetings
26 Int'l expert departs	27 Data analysis, report drafting	28 Data analysis, report drafting	29 Data analysis, report drafting	30 Data analysis, report drafting		

ANNEX E: CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENTS

ANNEX F: LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

DESK REVIEW DOCUMENTS

RADA Program annual reports (FY2014, FY2015, FY2016)

RADA Program quarterly reports (November 2013-June 2017)

RADA Program annual work plans (FY2014, FY2015, FY2016, FY2017)

RADA Program Description

Implementation Memoranda with RADA alliance partners

2013-2018 RADA Program PMEP

Democracy International. Legislative Strengthening/Good Governance Program Assessment in Ukraine. Kyiv: USAID/Ukraine, July 2012.

Cox, Pat. Report and Roadmap: On Internal Reform and Capacity-Building for the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine. Brussels: European Parliament, February 2016.

Materials on RADA Program Website (<http://radaprogram.org/en/>), including:

- Guide on Anti-Corruption in Ukraine
- A Methodology aimed at discounting electoral districts “hand-feeding” practices and political corruption.
- The Concept of Comprehensive Amendments to the Rules of Procedure of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine
- The Ninth Survey of the Members of the Ukrainian Parliament
- The Basic Aspects of Lawmaking. (Handbook)
- Draft Law Design Rules and Main Legislative Techniques. (Guidelines)

Documents from RADA Program implementing partners ALI, OPORA and Internews-Ukraine Lis, John and Gabrielle Plotkin. Legislative Strengthening Evaluations and Their Implications for Future Programs. Washington: USAID, September 2015.

World Bank Institute and Global Parliamentarians Against Corruption. “Improving Democratic Accountability Globally.” November 2013. http://gopacnetwork.org/Docs/CO_Handbook_EN.pdf

Lis, John, and Aida Alymbaeva. Parliamentary Sector Assessment in the Kyrgyz Republic. Bishkek: USAID, November 2014.

Lippman, Hal, and John Lis, Outcome-Based Evaluation of DRL Programs In Iraq. Washington: Department of State, May 2014.

Robinson, William H., and Raymond Gastelum, eds. Parliamentary Libraries and Research Services in Central and Eastern Europe, Munich: K.G. Saur, 1998,

Malko, Roman, “Upgrading the Rada,” The Ukrainian Week, October 2017, p.17.
http://i.tyzhden.ua/content/photoalbum/2017/10_2017/18/uw/Book10.pdf

National Security and Defence, nos.1-2, 2017.
http://razumkov.org.ua/uploads/journal/eng/NSD169-170_2017_eng.pdf

ANNEX G: LISTS OF KEY INFORMANTS, FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSANTS AND SURVEY RESPONDENTS

East Europe Foundation, RADA Program

1. Kogut Igor, Chief of Party, RADA Program
2. BibikTetyana, Deputy Chief of Party, RADA Program
3. Rudenko Maryna, Former Program Coordinator,RADA Program, (now – Project Manager, United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women)
4. Nechyporenko Lesya, New Program Coordinator, RADA Program
5. Kryzhanivsky Volodymyr, Senior Consultant, RADA Program
6. Hurkivska Alyona, Senior parliamentary strengthening research assistant, RADA Program
7. Suslova Olena, Gender Expert, RADA Program
8. Kobets Roman, PhD in Philosophy, Director, European Information and Research Center
9. Liakh Victor, President, East Europe Foundation
10. Kopchuk Kateryna, Communications Manager, East Europe Foundation

MPs – model districts

1. Sotnyk Olena, MP, Faction of the Political Party “Samopomich” Union
2. Krulko Ivan, MP, Faction of the Political Party the All-Ukrainian Union “Batkivshchyna”
3. Chernenko Oleksandr, MP, Faction of the Party “Petro Poroshenko Bloc”
4. Sobolev Iegor, MP, Faction of the Political Party “Samopomich” Union, Head of Committee on Corruption Prevention and Counteraction
5. Rizanenko Pavlo, MP, Faction of the Party “Petro Poroshenko Bloc”
6. Huz Ihor, MP, Faction of the Political Party “People’s Front”
7. Zalishchuk Svitlana, MP, Faction of the Party “Petro Poroshenko Bloc”

MPs – heads of Parliament’s institutions

1. Syroid Oksana, MP, Faction of the Political Party “Samopomich” Union, Deputy Speaker of Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine

2. Spivakovsky Aleksander, Professor, MP, Faction of the Party “Petro Poroshenko Bloc”, First Deputy Head, Committee on Science and Education, Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine
3. Ryabchyn Oleksii, PhD in International Economics, MP, Faction of the Political Party the All-Ukrainian Union “Batkivshchyna”, Chairman of subcommittee on energy saving and energy efficiency, Committee on Fuel and Energy Complex, Nuclear Policy and Nuclear Safety, Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine
4. Pynzenyk Pavlo, MP, Faction of the Political Party “People’s Front”, First Deputy Chairman of the Committee on Rules of Parliamentary Procedure and Support to Work of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine

Parliamentary Staff

1. Podolska Tetyana, Head of the Secretariat of the Chairman of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine
2. Malyk Andriy, Advisor on the issues of the Parliament Reform to the Chairman of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine
3. Slyshynsky Volodymyr, Deputy Chair of the Secretariat of Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine
4. Krut’ Iryna, Leading Specialist, Department of the Parliament’s Reforms, Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine
5. Vashchenko Anastasia, Leading Specialist, Department of the Parliament’s Reforms, Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine
6. Starynets Oleksandr, Head, Secretariat of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine Committee for Informatization and Communications, Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine
7. Teplyuk Mykhailo, Head, Main Law Department, Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine
8. GoryachevSergii, Head, Informational Department, Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine
9. Sydorenko Oleksiy, Head, Department of Computerized Systems, Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine
10. Pyvovar Anatoliy, Deputy Head, Main Organizational Department, Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine
11. Ruzhytska Natalia, Main Organizational Department, Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine
12. Godovaniuk Viktoria, Senior specialist, Secretariat of the Committee on Fuel and Energy Complex, Nuclear Policy and Nuclear Safety, Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine
13. Venger Volodymyr, Head, Secretariat of the Committee on Legal Policy and Justice, Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine

14. Kyryliuk Tatiana, Chief Consultant, Secretariat of the Committee on Legal Policy and Justice, Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine
15. Horlova Olga, Chief Consultant, Secretariat of the Committee on Legal Policy and Justice, Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine
16. Tkachenko Olena, Secretariat of the Committee on Legal Policy and Justice, Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine
17. Nehotsa Mariya, Head, Secretariat of the Committee on Rules of Parliamentary Procedure and Support to Work of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine
18. Maliuha Anzhela, Head, Secretariat of the Committee on State Building, Regional Policy and Local Self-Government, Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine
19. Makovsky Oleksandr, Secretariat of the Committee on State Building, Regional Policy and Local Self-Government, Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine
20. Verteba Iana, Coordinator, Equal Opportunities Caucus, Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine
21. Smiyan Olena, Deputy Head, Department of Personnel, Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine
22. Leshchenko Mykola, Head of Department on Civil Service, Personnel Selection and Development, Department of Personnel, Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine\
23. Shevchuk Luibov, Department of Personnel, Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine
24. Karman Yuriy, Deputy Head, Secretariat of the Committee on Corruption Prevention and Counteraction, Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine
25. Vyshnevskaya Kateryna, Chief consultant, Secretariat of the Committee on Corruption Prevention and Counteraction, Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine
26. Zhelykh Natalia, Chief consultant, Secretariat of the Committee on Corruption Prevention and Counteraction, Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine
27. Khutor Teniana, Head of the Council of Public expertise, Secretariat of the Committee on Corruption Prevention and Counteraction, Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine
28. Basmat Olena, Expert of the Council of Public expertise, Secretariat of the Committee on Corruption Prevention and Counteraction, Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine
29. Shaikhaliyeva Yuna, Secretariat of the Committee on Science and Education, Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine

Parliament's Staff who participated in RADA Program gender activities:

1. Aronova Maria, Chief Consultant, Secretariat of Committee for Health Protection, Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine
2. Kornienko-Zenkova Natalia, Chief Consultant, Secretariat of Committee on Legal Policy and Justice, Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine
3. Voitovych Luidmyla, Consultant, Secretariat of Committee on Environmental Policy, Nature Management and Liquidation of the Consequences of the Chernobyl Disaster, Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine
4. Shumar Natalia, Deputy Head, Secretariat of Committee on Informatization and Communication, Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine
5. Tsaruk Oleksandr, Chief Consultant, Secretariat of Committee on Informatization and Communication, Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine

Parliament Staff who participated in RADA Program activities (cyber security, social networks)

1. Rudkovska Valentina, Deputy Head, Department for Relations with Local Authorities and Local Self-Government Bodies, Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine
2. Kovtun Valentyna, Senior Consultant, Committee on Health Care, Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine
3. Mykhailo Mihai, Senior Specialist, Committee on Corruption Prevention and Counteraction, Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine
4. Tereheilo Yurii, Specialist, Committee for Industrial Policy and Entrepreneurship, Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine
5. Tovstenko Volodymyr, Specialist, Committee on Family Matters, Youth Policy, Sports and Tourism, Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine

Aides of Model District MPs

1. Kuprianchyk Aliona, assistant-consultant of MP Olena Sotnyk,
2. Borysenko Iryna, assistant-consultant of MP Iegor Sobolev
3. Hasyuk Iryna, assistant-consultant of MP Pavlo Rizanenko
4. Lisova Iryna, assistant-consultant of MP Pavlo Rizanenko
5. Nepopenko Kateryna, assistant-consultant of MP Ivan Krulko
6. Ishchenko Halyna, assistant-consultant of MP Ivan Krulko

7. Klyhymchuk Viktoria, assistant-consultant of MP Igor Huz
8. Kaminsky Maksym, assistant-consultant of MP Oleksandr Chernenko

Staff of the Cabinet of Ministries and Administration of President

1. Pavlenko Rostyslav, Deputy Head of the Administration of President of Ukraine,
2. Yaremenko Oleksandr, Temporarily executing authority of Chief, Chamber of Accounts
3. Bondarenko Volodymyr, State Secretary of Cabinet of Ministries of Ukraine
4. Bochko Ivan, Director of Parliamentary Relations, Cabinet of Ministries of Ukraine
5. Tashtanov Tymur, Vice head of Prime Minister Secretariat, Cabinet of Ministries of Ukraine
6. Oksha Nataliya, Deputy Director, Head of Public Relations Department, Cabinet of Ministries of Ukraine
7. Yarema Oleksandr, Deputy Minister/ Ministry of Youth and Sport of Ukraine

Representatives of CSOs – implementing partners

1. Kvurt Kostiantyn, Chair of the Board, NGO “Internews Ukraine”
2. Kulakov Andriy, Program Director, NGO “Internews Ukraine”
3. Paryhina Kateryna, Project Manager, NGO “Internews Ukraine”
4. Matvienko Svitlana, Head of Council, CSO “Agency for Legislative Initiatives”
5. Chernykha Tetiana, Programme Coordinator, CSO “Agency for Legislative Initiatives”
6. Baklazhenko Viktoriia, Programme Coordinator, CSO “Agency for Legislative Initiatives”
7. Teleshova Yulia, Programme Assistant, NGO “Interns` League”
8. Geletey Maria, Member of Board, NGO “Interns` League”
9. Levytskyi Volodymyr, Program manager, NGO “Interns` League”
10. Doboni Mariana, Communication manager, NGO “Interns` League”
11. Aivazovska Olha, Chair of the Board, Civil Network OPORA
12. Bondarchuk Anatoliy, Project’s director, Civil Network OPORA

Representatives of CSOs

1. Koliushko Ihor, Head of the Board, NGO “Centre of Policy and Legal Reform” (CPLR)
2. Yurchyshyn Yaroslav, Chief Executive Officer, NGO “Transparency International Ukraine”

Former RADA Program staff

1. Shyshkina Elina
2. Rakhimkulov Eduard

Journalists (FGD in Kyiv)

1. Kurennaya Daria, journalist, Radio SVOBODA (now and at the moment of participation of RADA Program’s events)
2. Turchyn Olesia, now – TV Channel ICTV, informational producer for Program “Bilshenizpravda”, (journalist of ZIK – Western Informational Company at the moment of participation of RADA Program’s events)
3. Kateryna Zavada, journalist, ZIK – Western Informational Company, Program “Stezhkamyvijny”, (journalist of Informational Agency “UKRINFORM” at the moment of participation of RADA Program’s events)

Meetings in Kharkiv:

1. Belyavtseva Victoria, Director, Department for Improvement of Regional Competitiveness, Kharkiv Regional State Administration
2. Gretska-Myrgorodska Viktoria, Chair, Department of the investment development and image projects, Kharkiv city council
3. Kudriavtsev Kostyantyn, Vice Chair, Department of the investment development and image projects, Kharkiv city council
4. Sedykh Dariya, advisor of MP Olena Sotnyk
5. Minkina Kateryna, Coordinator of Civil Network OPORA in Kharkiv Region
6. Konovalov Artem, leader of Studia of Social activities “Studia 42”
7. Mezentsseva Maria, MP (deputy) of Krarkiv city council
8. Danko Taras, Professor of National Technical University “Kharkiv Politechnical Institute”, Co-founder of the media “Kharkiv Observer”, leader of civic initiative "Kharkiv going Global"
9. Dykan Filip, Chair of the press-center "Kharkiv Today"

10. Dumenko Vlada, Chair of NGO “IT sector” (civic media)
11. Krasnokutska Natalia, Docent of National Technical University “KharkivPolitechnical Institute”
12. Dotsenko Kristina, member of NGO “FRI” (Foundation for regional Initiatives <http://fri.com.ua/>)

Meetings in Volyn

1. Matviichuk Yaroslav, First Deputy Chief, Volodymyr-Volynsky city Council
2. Hromyk Oleksandr, Deputy Chief, Novovolynsk city Council
3. Yushchuk Roman, Chief, Luibomyl city Council
4. Stepuik Valentyna, Chair, NGO “Association of the local self-governing authorities “Pobuzhzhia”
5. Sapozhnyk Andriy, Chair, Pavlivsky village united territory community
6. Katolyk Viacheslav, Chair, Zymne village united territory community
7. Sushchuk Viktor, Chair, Vyshnivka village united territory community
9. Bokoch Andriy, assistant-consultant of MP Igor Huz
10. Loyko Oksana, assistant-consultant of MP Igor Huz
11. Karpus Borys, assistant-consultant of MP Igor Huz
12. Kyrychuk Oksana, assistant-consultant of MP Igor Huz
13. Maiuk Olena, assistant-consultant of MP Igor Huz
14. Omelyukh Olena, Chair, NGO “Creative Studio”
15. Azanova Anastasia, Deputy Chair, NGO “Creative Studio”
16. Kandyba Olena, Chair, NGO “Beregnadii”
17. Kostuik Olga, Project manager, NGO “UMO”
18. Medyna Pavlo, Chair, NGO “Youth resource center “Novi Kryla”
19. Poddybetska Daria, Correspondent, Informational web-portal of Western Volyn “BUG”, Volodymyr-Volynsky
20. Haiduchyk Ivanna, Chief editor, Informational Portal of Pobuzhzhia “KORDON”

21. Izotova Tetiana, Journalist of the local newspaper “Slovo Pravdy”
22. Bianov Oleksii, Journalist of Volodymyr-Volynsky city newspaper “Misto Vechirnie”

Meetings in Chernigiv

1. Lutchenko Aliona, volunteer assistant of MP OleksandrChernenko
2. Solomakha Oleksandr, volunteer assistant of MP OleksandrChernenko
3. Lobanovska Vira, journalist, “ChernigivVidomosti”
4. Kashka Bogdan, journalist, “ChystaPolityka” and Deputy Chairman of NGO “Council of the partner’s development”
5. Paperny Yuriy, “ChernigivskyVybir”
6. Stelmakh Oksana, “Chernigiv Monitor” - 050-954-83-54
7. Sula Luibov, Chernigiv oblast’s radio
8. Nykonenko Dmytro, Advisor of the Head of Chernigiv Oblast Council
9. Podlasyi Maksym, Chairman, NGO “Chernigivske KOLO”
10. Zakharchenko Maryna, member, NGO “EKO Varta”
11. Solomakha Iryna, Deputy Chairman of Secretariat, Chernigiv Oblast State Administration
12. Soronovych Olena, Deputy head of Educational Department, Chernigiv Oblast State Administration
13. Kurylenko Tetiana, Chairman of the Secretariat, Chernigiv Oblast State Administration
14. Astafieva Olga, Director of the Chernigiv Music School # 1 (communal enterprise)

Meetings in Brovary

1. Hordiyenko Vitalii, Deputy Chair, Barushivka Regional State Administraiton
2. Humeniuk Volodymyr, Chair, Baryshivka Regional Council
3. Vitaliy Lytvynenko, journalist, channel Civil Defense of Kyiv Oblast (Hromadsky Zahyst Kyivshchyny)
4. Daryna Mizina, journalist, regional web-site Tribune Brovary (Trybuna-Brovary)
5. Halyna Nehoda, Brovary City Council, Deputy

6. Mykola Kozhemyako, journalist, regional web-site Tribune Brovary
7. Natalya Vorona, Deputy Chief Editor, Baryshevka Herald (Baryshevsky Visnyk)

International implementers

1. Shevchuk Halyna, Westminster Foundation
2. Jikia Natia, Parliamentary Program Manager, National Democratic Institute (NDI)
3. Tkachenko Serhiy, Senior Project Officer, Venice Commission, Council of Europe Office in Ukraine,
4. Skurbaty Alan, Dr., Parliamentary Liason/ Civil Society Adviser, European Union Advisory Mission (EUAM)
5. Murphy Jonathan, Project ManagerSenior Advisor, Parliamentary Reform and Political Participation, International Team LeaderEU-UNDP Rada zaEvropu Project: Capacity-Building in Support of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine
6. Vatamaniuk Natalia, Open Parliament Initiative Coordinator, UNDP
7. Danylyuk Anna, Expert, UNDP
8. Kulikovska Olena, Parliamentary Development Expert, UNDP
9. Starostenko Natalia, Sector Manager, Public Finance Management and Budgetary Transparency, Delegation of the European Union to Ukraine,
10. Erben Peter, Country Director, IFES Senior Global Electoral Adviser, International Foundation for Electoral Systems
11. O'Hagan Mary, Country Director, NDI
12. Druckman Mike, Country Director, IRI
13. Vaughn David, Chief of Party, USAID New Justice Program
14. Nataly Petrova, Deputy Chief of Party, USAID New Justice Program
15. Olga Nikolaeva, Legal and Judicial Specialist, USAID New Justice Program

USAID

1. Pennell John, Deputy Mission Director, Regional Mission for Ukraine, Belarus and Moldova, USAID
2. Hatch David, Director, Office of Program Coordination and Strategy, Regional Mission for Ukraine, Belarus and Moldova, USAID

3. Piskun Oleksandr, Democracy Project Management Specialist, Office of Democracy and Governance, USAID
4. Glaser Stephen, Internal Unit Chief, Political Section, U.S. Embassy
5. Luzik Peter, Program Development Specialist, USAID, Office of Program Coordination and Strategy, USAID
6. Smolina Iryna, Project Management Specialist, Democracy, Right, and Governance Office of Democracy and Governance, USAID
7. Kyurchevsky Marat, Project Management Specialist, Local Governance, Decentralization and Parliamentary Development Office of Democracy and Governance, USAID
8. Rachkevych Victor, Local Governance Project Management Specialist, USAID Regional Mission to Ukraine, Belarus and Moldova

ANNEX H: DATA COLLECTION TOOLS

ILLUSTRATIVE INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Participants

1. We are conducting an evaluation of the RADA Program, funded by USAID and implemented by the East Europe Foundation. Could you please tell us about your participation in RADA activities since the program began in 2014?
2. One objective of the RADA Program is to improve public representation in the legislative process. Which RADA Program activities do you believe were most beneficial for improving public representation?
3. What skills that you learned from the RADA Program have been most useful to you in supporting the representational function of parliament, and how have you used them in your work?
4. In what ways has parliament improved public representation in the legislative process since 2014? Is this attributable in any way to the RADA Program? What changes, in whole or in part, are due to the RADA Program?
5. Another objective of the RADA Program is to improve parliamentary oversight (control) of the government. Which RADA Program activities do you believe were most beneficial for improving parliamentary oversight?
6. What skills that you learned from the RADA Program have been most useful to you in supporting the oversight function of parliament, and how have you used them in your work?
7. In what ways has the parliament improved parliamentary oversight (control) since 2014? Is this attributable in any way to the RADA Program? What changes, in whole or in part, are due to the RADA Program?
8. Did the RADA Program treat men and women equally in its programming, and did men and women benefit equally from these programs?
9. In what ways has equality between men and women in the Verkhovna Rada improved since 2014? Is this attributable in any way to the RADA Program? What changes, in whole or in part, are due to the RADA Program?
10. In what ways has public policy in Ukraine promoted equality between men and women since 2014? Is this attributable in any way to the RADA Program? What changes, in whole or in part, are due to the RADA Program?

Non-Participant MPs

1. We are conducting an evaluation of the RADA Program, funded by USAID and implemented by the East Europe Foundation,. Could you please tell us about your experience with the RADA Program since it began in 2014?
2. One objective of the RADA Program is to improve public representation in the legislative process. Which RADA Program activities do you believe were most beneficial for improving public representation in the parliament?
3. In what ways has parliament improved public representation in the legislative process since 2014? Is this attributable in any way to the RADA Program? What changes, in whole or in part, are due to the RADA Program?
4. Another objective of the RADA Program is to improve parliamentary oversight (control) of the government. Which RADA Program activities do you believe were most beneficial for improving parliamentary oversight?
5. In what ways has the parliament improved parliamentary oversight (control) since 2014? Is this attributable in any way to the RADA Program? What changes, in whole or in part, are due to the RADA Program?
6. Did your staff participate in any RADA Program activities since 2014? Did their participation in the RADA Program improve their skills in any way? In what ways are they better able to support you and other MPs in your representative and oversight functions?
7. In what ways has equality between men and women in the Verkhovna Rada improved since 2014? Is this attributable in any way to the RADA Program? What changes, in whole or in part, are due to the RADA Program?
8. In what ways has public policy in Ukraine promoted equality between men and women since 2014? ? Is this attributable in any way to the RADA Program? What changes, in whole or in part, are due to the RADA Program?

Donors and Implementers

1. We are conducting an evaluation of the RADA Program, funded by USAID and implemented by the East Europe Foundation. Could you please tell us about your experience with the RADA Program since it began in 2014?
2. One objective of the RADA Program is to improve public representation in the legislative process. Which RADA Program activities do you believe were most beneficial for improving public representation in the parliament?
3. In what ways has parliament improved public representation in the legislative process since 2014? Is this attributable in any way to the RADA Program? What changes, in whole or in part, are due to the RADA Program?

4. One important element to improve representation is the Model District activity. How were MPs and districts selected for this activity? Why do a majority of Model District MPs come from those election by Proportional Representation, rather than Single Member Districts?

5. Another objective of the RADA Program is to improve parliamentary oversight of the government. Which RADA Program activities do you believe were most beneficial for improving parliamentary oversight?

6. In what ways has the parliament improved parliamentary oversight since 2014? Is this attributable in any way to the RADA Program? What changes, in whole or in part, are due to the RADA Program?

7. Did the RADA Program treat men and women equally in its programming, and did men and women benefit equally from these programs?

8. In what ways has equality between men and women in the Verkhovna Rada improved since 2014? Is this attributable in any way to the RADA Program? What changes, in whole or in part, are due to the RADA Program?

9. In what ways has public policy in Ukraine promoted equality between men and women since 2014? ? Is this attributable in any way to the RADA Program? What changes, in whole or in part, are due to the RADA Program?

Regional and Local Officials, CSOs and Journalists

1. We are conducting an evaluation of the RADA Program, funded by USAID and implemented by the East Europe Foundation. This program supports the Model District activity in XXX Oblast with MP XXX XXX. Could you please tell us about your experience with the RADA Program and MP XXX?

2. One objective of the RADA Program is to improve public representation in the legislative process through initiatives like the Model District activity. Do you believe the Model District is beneficial for improving public representation in the parliament? If yes, how?

3. Can you give an example of how the Model District activity helped you communicate a local concern to parliament? What was the outcome of this interaction?

4. In what ways has parliament improved public representation in the legislative process since 2014? Is this attributable in any way to the RADA Program? Are any of these changes, in whole or in part, are due to the RADA Program and the Model District activity?

5. Did the RADA Program treat men and women equally in its programming, and did men and women benefit equally from these programs?

6. In what ways has public policy in Ukraine promoted equality between men and women since 2014? Is this attributable in any way to the RADA Program? What changes, in whole or in part, are due to the RADA Program?

Government of Ukraine Officials

1. We are conducting an evaluation of the RADA Program, funded by USAID and implemented by the East Europe Foundation. Have you had any experience with the RADA Program since it began in 2014?
2. In what ways has parliament improved public representation in the legislative process since 2014? Is this attributable in any way to the RADA Program? What changes, in whole or in part, are due to the RADA Program?
3. Another objective of the RADA Program is to improve parliamentary oversight (control) of the government. Which RADA Program activities do you believe were most beneficial for improving parliamentary oversight?
5. In what ways has the parliament improved parliamentary oversight (control) since 2014? Is this attributable in any way to the RADA Program? What changes, in whole or in part, are due to the RADA Program?
6. From an executive-branch perspective, how have your interactions with parliament changed since 2014, particularly with regard to parliamentary oversight activities?
7. In what ways has public policy in Ukraine promoted equality between men and women since 2014? Is this attributable in any way to the RADA Program? What changes, in whole or in part, are due to the RADA Program?

Journalists, CSOs, Academics, Other Outside Observers

1. We are conducting an evaluation of the RADA Program, funded by USAID and implemented by the East Europe Foundation. Have you had any experience with the RADA Program since it began in 2014?
2. In what ways has parliament improved public representation in the legislative process since 2014? Is this attributable in any way to the RADA Program? What changes, in whole or in part, are due to the RADA Program?
3. Another objective of the RADA Program is to improve parliamentary oversight (control) of the government. Which RADA Program activities do you believe were most beneficial for improving parliamentary oversight?
4. In what ways has the parliament improved parliamentary oversight (control) since 2014? Is this attributable in any way to the RADA Program? What changes, in whole or in part, are due to the RADA Program?
5. Did the RADA Program treat men and women equally in its programming, and did men and women benefit equally from these programs?

6. In what ways has public policy in Ukraine promoted equality between men and women since 2014? Is this attributable in any way to the RADA Program? What changes, in whole or in part, are due to the RADA Program?

WEB-BASED SURVEY QUESTIONS

Members of Parliament

1. We are conducting an evaluation of the Responsible Accountable Democratic Assembly (RADA) Program. Have you participated in any activities of the RADA Program? Yes/no

*** (Decision-point – direct to “yes” survey or “no” survey based on this question.) ***

“Yes” survey

2. One objective of the RADA Program is to improve public representation in the legislative process. Has parliament improved public representation in the legislative process since 2014? Yes/no

3. If you answered “yes” to Question 2: Is improved public representation attributable in any way to the RADA Program? Yes/no

4. If you answered “yes” to Question 2: Which RADA Program activities have been the most beneficial for improving public representation? Open-ended

5. If you answered “yes” to Question 2: What improvements in public representation, in whole or in part, are due to the RADA Program? Open-ended

6. Has the parliament improved parliamentary oversight (control) since 2014? Yes/no

7. If you answered “yes” to Question 6: Is improved oversight attributable in any way to the RADA Program? Yes/no

8. If you answered “yes” to Question 6: Which RADA Program activities are have been the most beneficial for improving oversight? Open-ended

9. If you answered “yes” to Question 6: What improvements in oversight, in whole or in part, are due to the RADA Program? Open-ended

10. Have you requested information from the European Integration Research Center? Yes/no

11. Has equality between men and women in the Verkhovna Rada improved since 2014? Yes/no

“No” survey

2. Have you heard of the USAID-funded RADA Program, implemented by the East Europe Foundation? Yes/no

3. Have you participated in other legislative strengthening programs? Yes/no

4. If you answered yes to Question 3, in which programs did you participate? Check all that apply.

- A. Indiana University Parliamentary Strengthening Program
- B. National Democratic Institute (NDI)
- C. European Union (EU)
- D. United Nations Development Program (UNDP)
- E. Westminster Foundation for Democracy (WFD)
- F. Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ – German aid agency)
- G. Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE)
- H. Council of Europe/Venice Commission
- I. Other

5. If you answered yes to Question 3, what activities did you find most useful about that program. Open-ended

6. Has parliament improved public representation in the legislative process since 2014? Yes/no

7. Has the parliament improved parliamentary oversight (control) since 2014? Yes/no

8. Has equality between men and women in the Verkhovna Rada improved since 2014? Yes/no

Verkhovna Rada Staff Participants

1. We are conducting an evaluation of the RADA Program, funded by USAID and implemented by the East Europe Foundation. One objective of the RADA Program is to improve public representation in the legislative process. Has parliament improved public representation in the legislative process since 2014? Yes/no

2. If you answered “yes” to Question 1: Is improved public representation attributable in any way to the RADA Program? Yes/no

3. If you answered “yes” to Question 1: Which RADA Program activities have been the most beneficial for improving public representation? Open-ended

4. If you answered “yes” to Question 1: What improvements in public representation, in whole or in part, are due to the RADA Program? Open-ended

5. Has the parliament improved parliamentary oversight (control) since 2014? Yes/no

6. If you answered “yes” to Question 5: Is improved oversight attributable in any way to the RADA Program? Yes/no
7. If you answered “yes” to Question 5: Which RADA Program activities are have been the most beneficial for improving oversight? Open-ended
8. If you answered “yes” to Question 5: What improvements in oversight, in whole or in part, are due to the RADA Program? Open-ended
9. Have you requested information from the European Integration Research Center? Yes/no
10. Did men and women benefit equally from RADA Program activities? Yes/no
11. Has equality between men and women in the Verkhovna Rada improved since 2014? Yes/no

Local Officials

1. We are conducting an evaluation of the RADA Program, funded by USAID and implemented by the East Europe Foundation. This program supports the Model District activity in your oblast. One objective of the RADA Program is to improve public representation in the legislative process through initiatives like the Model District activity. Do you believe the Model District is beneficial for improving public representation in the parliament? Yes/no
2. If you answered yes to Question 1: How is the Model District activity beneficial for improving public representation in the parliament? Open-ended
3. Did you participate in a Town Hall event with a Member of Parliament?
4. Did the Model District activity help you communicate a local concern to parliament? Yes/no
5. If you answered yes to Question 3: What was the outcome of this interaction?
- A. Problem was resolved
 - B. MP took action, but problem was not resolved
 - C. MP took no action
 - D. MP never responded to me
 - E. Other (explain)
6. Has parliament improved public representation in the legislative process since 2014? Yes/no
7. If you answered “yes” to Question 5: Is improved public representation attributable in any way to the RADA Program? Yes/no

8. If you answered “yes” to Question 5: Which RADA Program activities have been the most beneficial for improving public representation? Open-ended

9. If you answered “yes” to Question 5: What improvements in public representation, in whole or in part, are due to the RADA Program? Open-ended

10. Did men and women benefit equally from RADA Program activities? Yes/no

Civil Society Organizations (both Kiev and Model Districts)

1. We are conducting an evaluation of the RADA Program, funded by USAID and implemented by the East Europe Foundation. One objective of the RADA Program is to improve public representation in the legislative process. Has parliament improved public representation in the legislative process since 2014? Yes/no

2. If you answered “yes” to Question 1: Is improved public representation attributable in any way to the RADA Program? Yes/no

3. If you answered “yes” to Question 1: Which RADA Program activities have been the most beneficial for improving public representation? Open-ended

4. If you answered “yes” to Question 1: What improvements in public representation, in whole or in part, are due to the RADA Program? Open-ended

5. Has the parliament improved parliamentary oversight (control) since 2014? Yes/no

6. If you answered “yes” to Question 5: Is improved oversight attributable in any way to the RADA Program? Yes/no

7. If you answered “yes” to Question 5: Which RADA Program activities are have been the most beneficial for improving oversight? Open-ended

8. If you answered “yes” to Question 5: What improvements in oversight, in whole or in part, are due to the RADA Program? Open-ended

9. Did you participate in a Town Hall event with a Member of Parliament?

10. Did men and women benefit equally from RADA Program activities? Yes/no

Journalists

1. We are conducting an evaluation of the RADA Program, funded by USAID and implemented by the East Europe Foundation. Did you participate in a RADA Program activity, such as a study visit to Kyiv, or cover a RADA Program activity for your news organization, such as a Town Hall meeting?

A. Participated in RADA Program activity

- B. Covered RADA Program activity
 - C. Both participated in an activity and covered an activity
 - D. Did not participate in and did not cover a RADA Program activity.
2. One objective of the RADA Program is to improve public representation in the legislative process. Has parliament improved public representation in the legislative process since 2014? Yes/no
3. If you answered “yes” to Question 2: Is improved public representation attributable in any way to the RADA Program? Yes/no
4. If you answered “yes” to Question 2: Which RADA Program activities have been the most beneficial for improving public representation? Open-ended
5. If you answered “yes” to Question 2: What improvements in public representation, in whole or in part, are due to the RADA Program? Open-ended
6. Has the parliament improved parliamentary oversight (control) since 2014? Yes/no
7. If you answered “yes” to Question 6: Is improved oversight attributable in any way to the RADA Program? Yes/no
8. If you answered “yes” to Question 6: Which RADA Program activities are have been the most beneficial for improving oversight? Open-ended
9. If you answered “yes” to Question 6: What improvements in oversight, in whole or in part, are due to the RADA Program? Open-ended
10. Did men and women benefit equally from RADA Program activities? Yes/no

ANNEX I: SURVEY RESULTS

Опитування депутатів

1.

Чи брали Ви участь у будь-яких видах діяльності в рамках Програми RADA?

ТАК	66.67%	16
НІ	33.33%	8
відповіли		24
не відповіли		0

2.

Однією з цілей Програми RADA є сприяння посиленню впливу громадськості на законодавчий процес. Чи посилювався з 2014 року вплив громадськості на законодавчий процес в парламенті?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Ні, взагалі не посилювався	0.00%	0
Так, посилювався незначно	20.00%	3
Так, дещо посилювався	53.33%	8
Так, значно посилювався	26.67%	4
відповіли		15
не відповіли		9

3.

Наскільки таке посилення впливу громадськості на законодавчий процес відбулось завдяки діяльності Програми RADA?

Answer Choices	Responses	
взагалі не пов'язано з діяльністю Програми RADA	0.00%	0
незначною мірою пов'язано з діяльністю Програми RADA	14.29%	2
значною мірою пов'язано з діяльністю Програми RADA	85.71%	12
повністю пов'язано з діяльністю програми RADA	0.00%	0
відповіли		14
не відповіли		10

4.

Які напрями діяльності Програми RADA були найбільш дієвими для посилення впливу громадськості на законодавчий процес? Будь ласка, поясніть.

відповіли	9
не відповіли	15

5.

Які саме елементи посилення впливу громадськості на законодавчий процес відбулись повністю або частково завдяки діяльності Програми RADA? Будь ласка, поясніть.

відповіли	8
не відповіли	16

6.

Важливою метою Програми RADA є сприяння посиленню парламентського контролю за діяльністю уряду. Чи посилився з 2014 року парламентський контроль за діяльністю уряду?

Ні, взагалі не посилився	25.00%	3
Так, посилився незначно	41.67%	5
Так, дещо посилився	33.33%	4
Так, значно посилився	0.00%	0
відповіли		12
не відповіли		12

7.

Наскільки таке посилення парламентського контролю за діяльністю уряду відбулось завдяки діяльності Програми RADA?

взагалі не пов'язано з діяльністю Програми RADA	12.50%	1
незначною мірою пов'язано з діяльністю Програми RADA	50.00%	4
значною мірою пов'язано з діяльністю Програми RADA	37.50%	3
повністю пов'язано з діяльністю програми RADA	0.00%	0
відповіли		8
не відповіли		16

8.

Які напрями діяльності Програми RADA були найбільш дієвими для посилення парламентського контролю за діяльністю уряду? Будь ласка, поясніть.

відповіли	2
не відповіли	22

9.

Які саме елементи посилення парламентського контролю за діяльністю уряду відбулись повністю або частково завдяки діяльності Програми RADA? Будь ласка, поясніть.

відповіли	3
не відповіли	21

10.

Чи зверталися Ви за інформацією або за іншою допомогою до Європейського інформаційного дослідницького центру?

ТАК	45.45%	5
НІ	54.55%	6
відповіли		11
не відповіли		13

11.

Чи покращилася з 2014 року ситуація із рівністю жінок та чоловіків у Верховній Раді?

Ні, взагалі не покращилась	0.00%	0
Так, покращилась незначно	27.27%	3
Так, дещо покращилась	45.45%	5
Так, значно покращилась	27.27%	3
відповіли		11
не відповіли		13

12.

Чи чули Ви про Програму RADA, що фінансується Агентством з міжнародного розвитку США (USAID) і реалізується Фондом Східна Європа?

ТАК	57.14%	4
НІ	42.86%	3
відповіли		7
не відповіли		17

13.

Чи брали Ви участь у інших програмах, спрямованих на посилення законодавчої гілки влади, окрім Програми RADA?

ТАК	50.00%	3
НІ	50.00%	3
відповіли		6
не відповіли		18

14.

У яких програмах Ви брали участь? Будь ласка, вкажіть всі програми, до яких Ви залучалися.

--

Програма зміцнення парламенту, що виконувалась Університетом Індіани (США)	0.00%	0
Програми Національного демократичного інституту (НДІ)	33.33%	1
Програми Європейського Союзу (ЄС)	33.33%	1
Програма розвитку Організації Об'єднаних Націй (ПРООН)	0.00%	0
Програми Вестмінстерського фонду за демократію (WFD)	0.00%	0
Програми Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ - Німецька агенція допомоги)	0.00%	0
Програми Ради Європи / Венеціанської комісії	0.00%	0
Програми Організації з безпеки та співробітництва в Європі (ОБСЄ)	0.00%	0
Інше	33.33%	1
відповіли		3
не відповіли		21

15.

Які напрями діяльності Ви вважаєте найбільш корисними у цих програмах? Будь ласка, поясніть.

відповіли	2
не відповіли	22

16.

Чи посилювався з 2014 року вплив громадськості на законодавчий процес в парламенті?

Ні, взагалі не посилювався	0.00%	0
Так, посилювався незначно	16.67%	1
Так, дещо посилювався	50.00%	3
Так, значно посилювався	33.33%	2
відповіли		6
не відповіли		18

17.

Чи посилювався з 2014 року парламентський контроль за діяльністю уряду?

Ні, взагалі не посилювався	50.00%	3
Так, посилювався незначно	16.67%	1

Так, дещо посилився	33.33%	2
Так, значно посилився	0.00%	0
відповіли		6
не відповіли		18

18.

Чи покращилася з 2014 року ситуація із рівністю жінок та чоловіків у Верховній Раді?

Ні, взагалі не покращилась	0.00%	0
Так, покращилась незначно	33.33%	2
Так, дещо покращилась	66.67%	4
Так, значно покращилась	0.00%	0
відповіли		6
не відповіли		18

Опитування штату програми RADA

1.

Однією з цілей Програми RADA є сприяння посиленню впливу громадськості на законодавчий процес. Чи посилився з 2014 року вплив громадськості на законодавчий процес в парламенті?

Ні, взагалі не посилився	0.00%	0
Так, посилився незначно	7.14%	1
Так, дещо посилився	64.29%	9
Так, значно посилився	28.57%	4
відповіли		14
не відповіли		0

2.

Наскільки таке посилення впливу громадськості на законодавчий процес відбулось завдяки діяльності Програми RADA?

взагалі не пов'язано з діяльністю Програми RADA	7.14%	1
незначною мірою пов'язано з діяльністю Програми RADA	28.57%	4
значною мірою пов'язано з діяльністю Програми RADA	64.29%	9
повністю пов'язано з діяльністю програми RADA	0.00%	0
відповіли		14
не відповіли		0

3.

Які напрями діяльності Програми RADA були найбільш дієвими для посилення впливу громадськості на законодавчий процес? Будь ласка, поясніть.

відповіли **0**

не відповіли

14

4.

Які саме елементи посилення впливу громадськості на законодавчий процес відбулись повністю або частково завдяки діяльності Програми RADA? Будь ласка, поясніть.

відповіли

0

не відповіли

14

5.

Важливою метою Програми RADA є сприяння посиленню парламентського контролю за діяльністю уряду. Чи посилювався з 2014 року парламентський контроль за діяльністю уряду?

Ні, взагалі не посилювався

0.00%

0

Так, посилювався незначно

38.46%

5

Так, дещо посилювався

46.15%

6

Так, значно посилювався

15.38%

2

відповіли

13

не відповіли

1

6.

Наскільки таке посилення парламентського контролю за діяльністю уряду відбулось завдяки діяльності Програми RADA?

взагалі не пов'язано з діяльністю Програми RADA

7.14%

1

незначною мірою пов'язано з діяльністю Програми RADA

42.86%

6

значною мірою пов'язано з діяльністю Програми RADA

50.00%

7

повністю пов'язано з діяльністю програми RADA

0.00%

0

відповіли

14

не відповіли

0

7.

Які напрями діяльності Програми RADA були найбільш дієвими для посилення парламентського контролю за діяльністю уряду? Будь ласка, поясніть.

відповіли

7

не відповіли

7

8.

Які саме елементи посилення парламентського контролю за діяльністю уряду відбулись повністю або частково завдяки діяльності Програми RADA? Будь ласка, поясніть.

відповіли	6
не відповіли	8

9.

Чи зверталися Ви за інформацією або за іншою допомогою до Європейського інформаційного дослідницького центру?

ТАК	27.27%	3
НІ	72.73%	8
відповіли		11
не відповіли		3

10.

Чи покращилася з 2014 року ситуація із рівністю жінок та чоловіків у Верховній Раді?

Ні, взагалі не покращилась	9.09%	1
Так, покращилась незначно	36.36%	4
Так, дещо покращилась	45.45%	5
Так, значно покращилась	9.09%	1
відповіли		11
не відповіли		3

11.

Чи була Програма RADA в рівній мірі корисною і для чоловіків, і для жінок?

Так, в рівній мірі була корисною для чоловіків та жінок	100.00%	11
Ні, Програма RADA була більш корисною для чоловіків	0.00%	0
Ні, Програма RADA була більш корисною для жінок	0.00%	0
відповіли		11
не відповіли		3

Опитування журналістів

1.

Чи брали Ви участь у заходах, які відбувалися у рамках Програми RADA (наприклад, навчальні візити до Києва), або чи висвітлювали Ви для Вашого ЗМІ такі заходи Програми RADA, як Town Hall?

Брав участь у заходах Програми RADA	35.71%	5
Висвітлював діяльність Програми RADA	0.00%	0

Брав участь у заходах і висвітлював діяльність Програми RADA	35.71%	5
Не брав участі в заходах та не висвітлював діяльність Програми RADA	28.57%	4
відповіли		14
не відповіли		0

2.

Чи посилюється з 2014 року вплив громадськості на законодавчий процес в парламенті?

Так	92.86%	13
Ні	7.14%	1
відповіли		14
не відповіли		0

3.

Наскільки таке посилення впливу громадськості на законодавчий процес відбулось завдяки діяльності Програми RADA?

взагалі не пов'язано з діяльністю Програми RADA	8.33%	1
незначною мірою пов'язано з діяльністю Програми RADA	33.33%	4
значною мірою пов'язано з діяльністю Програми RADA	58.33%	7
повністю пов'язано з діяльністю програми RADA	0.00%	0
відповіли		12
не відповіли		2

4.

Які напрями діяльності Програми RADA були найбільш дієвими для посилення впливу громадськості на законодавчий процес? Будь ласка, поясніть.

Answered	9
Skipped	5

5.

Які саме елементи посилення впливу громадськості на законодавчий процес відбулись повністю або частково завдяки діяльності Програми RADA? Будь ласка, поясніть.

відповіли	8
не відповіли	6

6.

Чи посилюється з 2014 року парламентський контроль за діяльністю уряду?

Ні, взагалі не посилюється	30.00%	3
Так, посилюється незначно	20.00%	2
Так, дещо посилюється	50.00%	5

Так, значно посилювся	0.00%	0
відповіли		10
не відповіли		4

7.

Наскільки таке посилення парламентського контролю за діяльністю уряду відбулось завдяки діяльності Програми RADA?

взагалі не пов'язано з діяльністю Програми RADA	0.00%	0
незначною мірою пов'язано з діяльністю Програми RADA	28.57%	2
значною мірою пов'язано з діяльністю Програми RADA	71.43%	5
повністю пов'язано з діяльністю програми RADA	0.00%	0
відповіли		7
не відповіли		7

8.

Які напрями діяльності Програми RADA були найбільш дієвими для посилення парламентського контролю за діяльністю уряду? Будь ласка, поясніть.

відповіли	5
не відповіли	9

9.

Які саме елементи посилення парламентського контролю за діяльністю уряду відбулись повністю або частково завдяки діяльності Програми RADA? Будь ласка, поясніть.

відповіли	1
не відповіли	13

10.

Чи була Програма RADA в рівній мірі корисною і для чоловіків, і для жінок?

Так, в рівній мірі була корисною для чоловіків та жінок	100.00%	9
Ні, Програма RADA була більш корисною для чоловіків	0.00%	0
Ні, Програма RADA була більш корисною для жінок	0.00%	0
відповіли		9
не відповіли		5

Опитування організацій громадянського суспільства

1.

Чи посилюється з 2014 року вплив громадськості на законодавчий процес в парламенті?

Ні, взагалі не посилюється	0.00%	0
Так, посилюється незначно	22.22%	2
Так, дещо посилюється	33.33%	3
Так, значно посилюється	44.44%	4
відповіли		9
не відповіли		0

2.

Наскільки таке посилення впливу громадськості на законодавчий процес відбулось завдяки діяльності Програми RADA?

взагалі не пов'язано з діяльністю Програми RADA	0.00%	0
незначною мірою пов'язано з діяльністю Програми RADA	50.00%	4
значною мірою пов'язано з діяльністю Програми RADA	50.00%	4
повністю пов'язано з діяльністю програми RADA	0.00%	0
відповіли		8
не відповіли		1

3.

Які напрями діяльності Програми RADA були найбільш дієвими для посилення впливу громадськості на законодавчий процес? Будь ласка, поясніть.

відповіли	6
не відповіли	3

4.

Які саме елементи посилення впливу громадськості на законодавчий процес відбулись повністю або частково завдяки діяльності Програми RADA? Будь ласка, поясніть.

відповіли	4
не відповіли	5

5.

Чи посилюється з 2014 року парламентський контроль за діяльністю уряду?

Answer Choices	Responses	
Ні, взагалі не посилюється	40.00%	2
Так, посилюється незначно	20.00%	1
Так, дещо посилюється	40.00%	2
Так, значно посилюється	0.00%	0
відповіли		5
не відповіли		4

6.

Наскільки таке посилення парламентського контролю за діяльністю уряду відбулось завдяки діяльності Програми RADA?

Answer Choices	Responses	
взагалі не пов'язано з діяльністю Програми RADA	0.00%	0
незначною мірою пов'язано з діяльністю Програми RADA	0.00%	0
значною мірою пов'язано з діяльністю Програми RADA	100.00%	3
повністю пов'язано з діяльністю програми RADA	0.00%	0
	відповіли	3
	не	
	відповіли	6

7.

Які напрями діяльності Програми RADA були найбільш дієвими для посилення парламентського контролю за діяльністю уряду? Будь ласка, поясніть.

відповіли	2
не відповіли	7

8.

Які саме елементи посилення парламентського контролю за діяльністю уряду відбулись повністю або частково завдяки діяльності Програми RADA? Будь ласка, поясніть.

відповіли	3
не відповіли	6

9.

Чи брали Ви участь у заходах у форматі Town Hall разом із народними депутатами?

ТАК	25.00%	1
НІ	75.00%	3
	відповіли	4
	не відповіли	5

10.

Чи Програма RADA була в рівній мірі корисною і для чоловіків, і для жінок?

Так, в рівній мірі була корисною для чоловіків та жінок	100.00%	3
Ні, Програма RADA була більш корисною для чоловіків	0.00%	0
Ні, Програма RADA була більш корисною для жінок	0.00%	0
	відповіли	3
	не	
	відповіли	6

ANNEX J: FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION SUMMARIES

The evaluation team conducted four focus group discussions with 21 people who represented homogeneous groups of stakeholders who benefitted from program activities; for example, parliamentary staff and journalists. Each discussion lasted approximately 1.5 hours. These facilitated discussions allowed for exchange and discussion of experiences and viewpoints, and enabled the team to probe for perceptions of relevance and effectiveness as well as to identify lessons learned and recommendations for any future activity. Focus group discussions were held at two locations in Kyiv: National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy (Journalists) and the Verkhovna Rada (Parliamentary Staff).

In addition, the evaluation team scheduled a focus group with representatives of seven participating NGOs recommended by RADA Program staff, but all of the NGOs declined the opportunity to discuss their involvement with the register.

FOCUS GROUP WITH JOURNALISTS WHO PARTICIPATED IN THE RADA PROGRAM (NOVEMBER 11, 2017, NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF KYIV-MOHYLA ACADEMY).

Participants:

1. Kurennaya Daria, journalist, Radio SVOBODA (now and at the moment of participation of RADA Program's events)
2. Turchyn Olesia, now – TV Channel ICTV, informational producer for Program “Bilshenizhpavda”, (journalist of ZIK – Western Informational Company at the moment of participation of RADA Program's events)
3. Kateryna Zavada, journalist, ZIK – Western Informational Company, Program “Stezhkamyvijny”, (journalist of Informational Agency “UKRINFORM” at the moment of participation of RADA Program's events)

Participants of the focus group discussion participated in media tours to Model Districts. Such media tours were organized by the RADA Program for outside journalists stationed mostly in Kyiv to Model Districts to learn more about local issues and provide media coverage of activities of MPs in their Model Districts. These tours generated reports around the country on those issues and raised public awareness of the laws or agencies involved. Journalists stated that Model District activities increased their interaction with deputies, both at press events organized with the support of the RADA Program and in covering deputies' other public events.

Participants of the focus group discussion did not participate in media tours to parliament in Kyiv. However, from their interactions with journalists who participated in these tours they draw that media tours to Model Districts were more productive and useful.

FOCUS GROUP WITH PARLIAMENTARY STAFF WHO PARTICIPATED IN RADA PROGRAM GENDER TRAINING (NOVEMBER 17, 2017, VERKHOVNA RADA).

Participants:

1. Aronova Maria, Chief Consultant, Secretariat of Committee for Health Protection, Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine
2. Kornienko-Zenkova Natalia, Chief Consultant, Secretariat of Committee on Legal Policy and Justice, Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine
3. Voitovych Luidmyla, Consultant, Secretariat of Committee on Environmental Policy, Nature Management and Liquidation of the Consequences of the Chernobyl Disaster, Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine
4. Shumar Natalia, Deputy Head, Secretariat of Committee on Informatization and Communication, Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine
5. Tsaruk Oleksandr, Chief Consultant, Secretariat of Committee on Informatization and Communication, Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine

All participants of the gender trainings found them very useful. Trainings on gender issues were undertaken in a professional manner combining theoretical knowledge with practical tools of gender issues. A RADA Program gender consultant was knowledgeable and enthusiastic. Trainings promoted a more gender-sensitive parliament and a greater willingness of MPs to focus on gender equality. Gender trainings widened the horizons of staffers, aides and others on questions they had acceptance of women in political life. Trainings helped to move gender issues to the mainstream of public policy and debates in the national parliament; they are not a marginal concern of a narrow group of MPs.

Trainings increased expertise in gender issues, such as the steps needed to legislate and institutionalize equal rights and expanded expertise in promoting gender tolerance. Training also assisted to develop and build awareness for gender analysis and expertise of legislation. Participants improved their analytical skills thanks to the provision of information about the history and development of the women's movement, analysis of discriminatory policies against women, and Ukraine's obligations to promote gender equality under international laws and rights, developing their problem-solving skills, etc. Participants stated that so far there are not legal grounds for conducting gender expertise of all legislative drafts and gender-related parliamentary activities should be held in a more comprehensive and systemic manner.

FOCUS GROUP WITH PARLIAMENTARY STAFF WHO PARTICIPATED IN RADA PROGRAM ACTIVITIES ON THE E-PARLIAMENT INITIATIVES, SOCIAL NETWORKING, CYBER SECURITY (NOVEMBER 17, 2017, VERKHOVNA RADA).

Participants:

1. Rudkovska Valentina, Deputy Head, Department for Relations with Local Authorities and Local Self-Government Bodies, Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine
2. Kovtun Valentyna, Senior Consultant, Committee on Health Care, Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine
3. Mykhailo Mihai, Senior Specialist, Committee on Corruption Prevention and Counteraction, Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine
4. TereheiloYurii, Specialist, Committee for Industrial Policy and Entrepreneurship, Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine
5. Tovstenko Volodymyr, Specialist, Committee on Family Matters, Youth Policy, Sports and Tourism, Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine

In general, participants found these training quite informative but less useful than many other trainings conducted in the parliament. The extent that e-parliament initiatives are implemented in their day-to-day work depends mostly on the leadership of individual committees. Many committee chairs are reluctant to use e-parliament initiatives.

Participants state that perhaps the strongest feature of the e-parliament initiatives of the RADA Program is the move to paperless circulation of documents. Staff found this to be particularly practical when holding committee meetings in a different building from committee offices, as it reduced the need to physically transport documents.

Committee staff, however, identified concerns with the use of committee websites to facilitate communication with citizens. During a focus group discussion, staff stated that they were unsure of how they should regard citizen comments that are submitted electronically. They said that it would be impossibly time-consuming if they were required to respond to every electronic comment in the same way that they reply to formal letters. Staff added that analyzing every citizen comment on pending legislation would also be too time-consuming and would require them to provide the same attention to possibly uninformed comments as they do to expert advice. “There is no problem with the platform itself: It is a good IT solution for communication between the Verkhovna Rada and the public,” said one committee staffer. “The main problem is the legal basis for using the platform.” Another participant named two additional problems: large work load and a lack of time.

FOCUS GROUP WITH PARLIAMENT’S STAFF-AIDES OF MODEL DISTRICT MPS (NOVEMBER 17, 2017, VERKHOVNA RADA).

Participants:

1. Kuprianchyk Aliona, assistant-consultant of MP Olena Sotnyk,
2. Borysenko Iryna, assistant-consultant of MP Igor Sobolev

3. Hasyuk Iryna, assistant-consultant of MP Pavlo Rizanenko
4. Lisova Iryna, assistant-consultant of MP Pavlo Rizanenko
5. Nepopenko Kateryna, assistant-consultant of MP Ivan Krulko
6. Ishchenko Halyna, assistant-consultant of MP Ivan Krulko
7. Klhymchuk Viktoria, assistant-consultant of MP Igor Huz
8. Kaminsky Maksym, assistant-consultant of MP Oleksandr Chernenko

All participants stated that Model Districts is a very valuable part of the RADA Program that provided many opportunities to Model District MPs to link their parliamentary activities with both ordinary citizens and their districts/constituencies. Thus, the various public outreach activities, such as town hall meetings, forums and roundtables were viewed particularly effective and fruitful. Many Model District MPs were able to forge and advance fruitful cooperation between MPs and local governments.

Participants said that the training provided by the RADA Program offered them relevant skills and knowledge that they used in their parliamentary outreach work. Staff who participated in an exchange program to experience constituent work by parliamentary deputies in Germany also gave that program high marks and said it provided examples that they use in their own constituency work. With few exceptions staff gave RADA Program trainers high marks for how they delivered the programs.

Focus group participants stated that Model Districts work better for MPs who were elected to the Rada from single-member districts. Their experience with party-list MPs varies. Some MPs were able to use the Model District program much better and more effective than other ones. Participants suggested to expand the program and include additional MPs elected in majoritarian districts. In addition, aides of Model District MPs who participated in the focus group discussion suggested that Model District MPs should be rotated: they learned from this program a lot and new MPs should be given this good opportunity to learn from program as well.

ANNEX K: TABLE OF EVALUATION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

<u>Findings</u>	<u>Conclusions</u>
<p>Model District program addressed a need for greater connection between MPs and the people they represent. (EQ1)</p> <p>MPs and staff use EIRC information and analysis in their legislative work. (EQ1)</p> <p>Efforts to increase transparency and openness, particularly committees publishing more information on websites, were valued. (EQ1)</p> <p>Civic Platform NGO Register, E-Petitions platform and Citizen E-Platform were not valued. (EQ1)</p> <p>Model District initiative included many activities that contained an oversight component. (EQ2)</p> <p>Activities aimed at strengthening cooperation between deputies and local governments had an oversight component. (EQ2)</p> <p>Support for oversight of decentralization legislation also extended to initiatives beyond parliamentary committees. (EQ2)</p> <p>EIRC provided support to parliamentary oversight through policy papers, info briefs and discussions of oversight internationally. (EQ2)</p> <p>Shadow reports were of limited utility, and other oversight initiatives failed to gain support. (EQ2)</p> <p>Model District initiative increased deputies' contact with voters. (EQ3)</p> <p>Effectiveness of Model District activity illustrated by interest in expansion. (EQ3)</p> <p>Model District initiative included party-list MPs but did not work with factions. (EQ3)</p> <p>EIRC products were effective and timely. (EQ3)</p>	<p>Model District is the most relevant representation activity. (EQ1)</p> <p>EIRC filled a need for comparative international information. (EQ1)</p> <p>Program increased transparency and openness. (EQ1)</p> <p>Few activities to strengthen oversight were relevant. (EQ2)</p> <p>The most successful oversight activities were designed to promote public representation. (EQ2)</p> <p>Several activities under Objective 3 corresponded to Cox recommendations but had little support among beneficiaries. (EQ2)</p> <p>The Model District initiative is the signature activity of the RADA Program and increased MP contact with constituents. (EQ3)</p> <p>Local party offices could provide resources and support for Model District party-list MPs. (EQ3)</p> <p>EIRC provides a good foundation for a parliamentary research service. (EQ3)</p> <p>Initiatives to increase parliamentary transparency and openness have been effective. (EQ3)</p> <p>Program contributed little to improving parliamentary oversight. (EQ4)</p> <p>Program collaborated effectively with other parliamentary strengthening programs and with some USAID ODG programs. (EQ5)</p> <p>Program successfully supported decentralization and local self-government oversight. (EQ5)</p>

<p>Stakeholders credited RADA Program with progress on transparency and openness. (EQ3)</p> <p>Oversight function in the Verkhovna Rada is weak and there has been little improvement. (EQ4)</p> <p>RADA Program operated cooperatively with several ODG programs. (EQ5)</p> <p>Program leveraged USAID's decentralization and local self-government programming. (EQ5)</p> <p>Little or no collaboration with USAID human rights, labor, economic or health programs. (EQ5)</p> <p>Effective cooperation with international parliamentary strengthening programs. (EQ5)</p> <p>Program did not fully take advantage of the changing political context after 2014. (EQ6)</p> <p>Select activities were relevant towards improving representation. (EQ6)</p> <p>Activities directed towards oversight were overly ambitious. (EQ6)</p> <p>RADA Program was most active international parliamentary strengthening program. (EQ7)</p> <p>Parliamentary Internship Program improved professionalism of young people. (EQ7)</p> <p>Public representation in the legislative process has improved in part due to RADA Program. (EQ7)</p> <p>Oversight component contributed little to systematic improvement in oversight. (EQ7)</p> <p>The RADA Program assisted parliament to build capacity for gender analysis of legislation. (EQ8)</p> <p>Trainings on gender issues were undertaken in a professional manner. (EQ8)</p>	<p>The different components of the RADA Program were relevant within the context of developments in Ukraine between 2013 and 2015. (EQ6)</p> <p>Events since 2013 and management difficulties meant the effectiveness of the Program can be only measured for approximately two years. In the light of this short period the Program has accomplished much. (EQ7)</p> <p>Gender trainings promoted a more gender-sensitive parliament and a greater willingness of MPs to focus on gender equality. (EQ8)</p>
--	---

Program mobilized young women and established networks with CSOs and experts. (EQ8)	
---	--

ANNEX L: MS POWERPOINT PRESENTATION OF EVALUATION DESIGN, FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



RADA Program Evaluation: Preliminary Findings

John Lis
Dr. Taras Kuzio
Dr. Andriy Meleshevykh
Oksana Vynnychuk

Kyiv: November 22, 2017



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



RADA Program Overview

- Sixth USAID parliamentary support program since 1994
- Nov. 25, 2013-Nov. 24, 2018
- \$4.5 million total estimated cost
- Implemented by a local organization for the first time: East Europe Foundation
- Local implementing partners: Internews, OPORA, ALI
- Most work with Verkhovna Rada MPs and staff
- Model District program in six oblasts + Kyiv city
- Engages CSOs, journalists and local officials



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



RADA Program Objectives

- **Objective 1:** Improved public representation in the legislative process
- **Objective 2:** Expanded role of citizens in monitoring the work of Parliament
- **Objective 3:** Role of legislature in providing independent oversight of the executive branch strengthened.



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



RADA Program Evaluation Objective

- Assess the relevance and effectiveness of the RADA Program in advancing parliamentary reform in Ukraine
 - Improving public representation in the legislative process
 - Strengthening independent oversight of the legislature over the executive branch



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



RADA Program Data Collection Methods

- Document review
 - RADA Program documents
 - RADA Program products for MPs, staff and public
 - 2012 USAID assessment and 2016 EP roadmap
 - EIRC research products for parliament
- 64 key informant interviews with 142 people
 - Parliament: MPs, committee staff, department heads, MD staff. Speaker's staff
 - Kyiv: USG, RADA Program, local implementing partners, other donors, other implementers, outside experts, GoU officials
 - Model Districts: local officials, CSOs, journalists, MP aides



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



RADA Program Data Collection Methods

- 4 Focus Group Discussions (Kyiv) – 20 people:
 - VR staff
 - VR staff in gender programs
 - Model District staff
 - Kyiv-based journalists
- Web-based mini-surveys (10 questions)
 - All 422 MPs
 - 76 Staff
 - 46 CSO representatives (nationwide)
 - 46 Journalists (nationwide)



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



Data Collection in Model Districts

- **Volodymyr-Volynskyi** (Volyn Oblast), Nov. 13
(John + interpreter)
- **Kharkiv**, Nov. 13 (Taras + Andriy)
- **Chernihiv**, Nov. 21 (John + Oksana)
- **Brovary** (Kyiv Oblast), Nov. 21 (Taras + Andriy)
 - Observation of Town Hall event
 - KIIs with local officials, journalists and CSOs



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



RADA Program Evaluation Questions 1-3

1. Which RADA Program activities do RADA Program stakeholders perceive to have been the most beneficial for improving public representation in the legislative process and why?
2. Which RADA Program activities do RADA Program stakeholders perceive to have been the most beneficial for strengthening independent oversight of the legislature over the executive branch and why?
3. What changes in public representation in the legislative process do RADA Program stakeholders perceive to be the result, in whole or in part, of the RADA Program's work?



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



RADA Program Evaluation Questions 4-5

4. What changes in independent oversight of the legislature over the executive branch do RADA Program stakeholders perceive to be the result, in whole or in part, of the RADA Program's work?
5. How well did the RADA Program respond to opportunities to leverage resources and advance relevant parliamentary reforms through collaboration with other USAID and non-USAID development assistance programs?



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



RADA Program Evaluation Questions 6-8

6. How relevant was the RADA Program in advancing parliamentary reform in Ukraine?
7. How effective was the RADA Program in advancing parliamentary reform in Ukraine?
8. How well did the RADA Program promote gender equality in its programming, in the Verkhovna Rada, and in public policy in Ukraine?



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



EQ1: Most Beneficial Activities for Representation

- Model District program
 - Staff training
 - Town Hall meetings
 - Public reports
 - Public hearings, forums, roundtables, meetings
 - Local self-government
 - Led to changes in legislation
 - Internally displaced persons (IDPs)
 - Victims of communism
 - Activities generally linked to local issues, but not always



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



EQ1: Most Beneficial Activities for Representation

- **European Information Research Center**
 - Users found products useful and timely
 - Valued as source of comparative international information
 - Most valued by individual MPs; some committees found too basic
 - Not universally known – greater awareness needed
- **Transparency and Openness**
 - More information on VR committee websites
 - Greater transparency in work of committees
 - Training on social media and cyber-security
 - Legal basis for VR electronic interaction with citizens is lacking



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



EQ1: Activities Not Perceived as Beneficial

- E-Petitions (only 3 out of 800 reached threshold)
- Citizens-Rada Legislative Discussion E-Platform
- Open Parliament Initiative
- NGO Register (only 2 committees found it useful)



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



EQ2: Most Beneficial Activities for Oversight

- Model District program
 - Town Hall meetings
 - Citizen appeals presented by MPs to ministers
 - Media tours and press conferences
- Oversight of implementation of local self-government laws
 - Committee field hearings, meetings and visits
 - Roundtable discussions
 - Municipal conference (Lviv, March 2017)
- Analytical support for MP inquiries to executive branch
- EIRC: oversight discussions and info briefs



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



EQ2: Activities not Perceived as Beneficial

- Shadow reports barely used
- Budget video
- www.corrupt.ua website
- Rules of Procedure reform
- Accounting Chamber cooperation with the VR
- Code of Ethics



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



EQ3: Representation Changes Attributed to RADA

- Model District program
 - Increased MP contact with voters
 - Increased MP contact with local media
 - Increased MP contact with civil society
 - Public reports by MPs to constituents, including legislative activity
 - Institutionalization by MPs of district offices
 - Interest in Model District expansion to additional MPs
 - MPs outside MD program copying MD activities
- European Information Research Center
- Greater transparency in the legislative process



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



EQ4: Oversight Changes Attributed to RADA

- Increased oversight of local self-government legislation
- Greater media attention to implementation of laws through Model District program
- Increased quantity and quality of MP inquiries to executive
- Committee field hearings, meetings and visits
- Government ministers honor committee reporting requests



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



EQ5: Collaboration with Other Programs

- Resource for other USAID programs
 - Leveraged local self-government programming
 - Viewed in Volyn as USAID's local government support
 - Emphasized local government in legislative & oversight activities
 - Raised media awareness of success stories in local government
 - Partnered with DG programs; e.g., MDs used NDI database
 - RADA Program did not work with political parties
 - RADA viewed as “window” for New Justice to VR committees
- RADA coordinated with UNDP and WFD programs in VR
- Donor coordination focused too much on RADA priorities



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



EQ6: Overall Relevance of RADA Program

- Timing opportune for legislative strengthening program
 - Shift to parliamentary system
 - New MPs more supportive of VR reform than any previous VR
 - Addressed need to bring VR closer to people
 - Society and civil society are more politically mature
 - RADA activities aligned to Cox report recommendations
- Too many elements in RADA program; not focused
- Lack of input from VR in program design
- Shift of intern program to VR secretariat was needed



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



EQ7: Overall Effectiveness of RADA Program

- Events of 2014 delayed start of RADA Program activities
- RADA management issues delayed successful start
- Responded to increased interest in international practices
- Brought greater transparency to VR
- Training improved staff capacity and tech savvy
- More public input in legislative process
- More MP responsiveness to voters
- Gender analysis capacity created
- Intern program successful: 4 MPs, numerous staff
- VR oversight of executive remains poor



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



EQ8: Promotion of Gender Equality

- RADA Program trained more women than men
 - FY16: 76 men, 120 women
 - FY17: 108 men, 149 women
- “Gender issues have moved from margins to mainstream.”
- RADA built gender analysis capacity in VR
- Capacity not being utilized; gender analysis not required



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



Lessons Learned

- Flexibility is essential in legislative strengthening
- Consult with beneficiaries during program design
- Revisit program design in case of major political changes
- Program activities need to be focused
- Double-down on what is working
- Transition activities to parliament when it is ready
- Effective collaboration can advance other DG goals



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



THANK YOU

QUESTIONS?

ANNEX M: RADA PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

Table MI: RADA Program activities

KEY: Activity promoted public representation

Activity promoted oversight

Activity promoted both

*-All activities in conjunction with Model District Program

** -Some activities in conjunction with Model District Program

Objective 1: Improved Public Representation in Legislative Process

Model District Program

Regional press tours*

Reports on Open Government Partnership

Training for MPs and staff**

CSO registry

Public education on decentralization

Training on policy analysis

E-Petitions platform

Support for European Information Research Center

Policy dialogue meetings on internal parliamentary reform

Cooperation between MPs and local governments

Regional policy dialogues

Town hall meetings**

Local government association reports to committees

Objective 2: Expanded Role of Citizens in Monitoring the Work of Parliament

Support to interactive map-based web portal

Support civic education campaigns

Develop youth workshops

Public discussions on access to information

Recommendations for high school teachers

Press tours to Verkhovna Rada

Youth Parliament Initiative

TV Programs/Public education campaign

Parliamentary readings

Citizen E-Platform

CSO monitoring/ Bill-tracking for CSOs

Support to advocacy

Presentations on USAID programs/Participation of USAID program representatives in parliament

Objective 3: Role of Legislature in Providing Independent Oversight of Executive Branch Strengthened

II training course on budget analysis
 Anti-corruption website
 Changes to Rules of Procedure
 Use of Accounting Chamber reports
 Discussion of ethics issues
 Cooperation with IFES on electoral legislation*
 Shadow reports
 Support to MP inquiries
 Training on lawmaking
 Parliamentary Internship Program

Table M2: Stakeholder perceptions of relevance and effectiveness of RADA Program representation and oversight activities

Relevant and Effective Model District Program Regional press tours* Training for MPs and staff** Roundtable expert discussions Training on policy analysis European Information Research Center Cooperation between MPs & local government** Regional policy dialogues Town hall meetings** Local government association reports Cooperation with IFES on electoral legislation* Support to MP inquiries Training on lawmaking (OPORA transparency)	Relevant but Ineffective CSO registry Use of Accounting Chamber reports
Effective but Irrelevant	Irrelevant and Ineffective Reports on Open Government Partnership E-Petitions platform† Citizen E-Platform† Video training course on budget analysis Anti-corruption website Shadow reports

†A USAID official noted that E-Parliament tools meant to ensure openness and transparency of the Verkhovna Rada as an institution and provide additional opportunities for citizen engagement require time after their introduction to produce results. The official also noted that

awareness campaigns and legal regulation of these tools are needed in order for them to be used well and function properly.