



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

PROJECT DOCUMENT

Georgia

Project Title: Consolidating Parliamentary Democracy in Georgia

Project Number: 00113526 **Output number:** 00111651

Implementing Partner: Parliament of Georgia

Start Date: 7 November 2019 **End Date:** 6 November 2022 **LPAC Meeting date:** 6 November 2019

Brief Description

Georgia made some significant amendments to its constitution in 2017 becoming a parliamentary republic by the end of 2018 when the constitution predominantly entered into force after presidential elections. The role of the Parliament has consequently increased, particularly vis-à-vis the Government which has become more accountable toward the legislative branch. This has been further secured through the reform of the Parliament's Rules of Procedure in 2018 which expanded parliamentary functions and introduced new and effective mechanisms for exercising the legislative, oversight and representative functions by the Parliament. To realize its new potential the Parliament will need to substantially enhance its institutional functioning and capacities to efficiently apply the new mechanisms into practice.

Building on the success of the previous EU-funded and UNDP-delivered parliamentary support initiative, the new project will focus on consolidating the new system of parliamentary democracy in the country in line with the institution's development strategy developed with the assistance from the EU-UNDP project. The new initiative will support specific strategically important reforms aimed at ensuring sustainable institutional development and national ownership. In addition, a smaller component will be devoted to extending the strategic development approach to Ajara legislature – the Supreme Council of the Autonomous Republic of Ajara. The support to the Supreme Council will leverage on the development work conducted with the Parliament of Georgia and the tools and capacity building activities will be shared between the two institutions, leveraging additional value from the project resources.

The project contributes to:
UNPSD 2016-2020 Outcome 1/CPD 2016-2020 Outcome 1: By 2020, expectations of citizens of Georgia for voice, rule of law, public sector reforms, and accountability are met by stronger systems of democratic governance at all levels;
CPD 2016-2020 Output 1.3. By 2020, representative legislature, independent judiciary and accountable executive powers are underpinned by functioning system of checks and balances.
UNDP Strategic Plan 2018-2021: Outcome 2. Accelerate structural transformations for sustainable development/2.2.2 Constitution-making, electoral and parliamentary processes and institutions strengthened to promote inclusion, transparency and accountability
Indicative Output with gender marker:
 Output 00111651: GEN2 (Gender equality as a significant objective)

Total resources required:	1,850,000.00USD
Total resources allocated:	
EU:	1,666,666.67USD equivalent of EUR 1,500,000 per UNXRATE for Nov-2019 (0.9)
Parliament:	165,151.11USD equivalent of EUR 148,636 per UNXRATE for Nov-2019 (0.9)
Ajara Supreme Council:	18,182.22USD equivalent of EUR 16,364 per UNXRATE for Nov-2019 (0.9)
In-Kind:	Project Office in the Parliament Palace
Unfunded:	-

Agreed by:

The Parliament of Georgia:	United Nations Development Programme (UNDP):
 Archil Talakvadze Chairman of the Parliament Date:	 Louisa Vinton Resident Representative Date: 7/11/2019

List of Abbreviations

AA	Association Agreement
AP	Action Plan
CIB	Comprehensive Institution Building
CSO	Civil Society Organization
DCFTA	Deep and Comprehensive Free Trade Area
EPD	European Partnership for Democracy
EU	European Union
GIZ	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit GmbH
GRF	Governance Reform Fund (of UNDP)
IDFI	Institute for Development of Freedom of Information
IPU	Inter-Parliamentary Union
IRP	Institutional Reform Plan
LEPL	Legal Entity of Public Law
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MP	Member of Parliament
NDI	National Democratic Institute
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
OGP	Open Government Partnership
PAR	Public Administration Reform
PLS	Post-Legislative Scrutiny
PMO	Parliamentary Monitoring Organization
RoP	Rules of Procedure
SBAA	Standard Basic Assistance Agreement
SCA	The Supreme Council of the Autonomous Republic of Ajara
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
UNSMS	United Nations Security Management System
USAID/GGI	United States Agency for International Development / Good Governance Initiative
WFD	Westminster Foundation for Democracy

Contents

I.	The Development Challenge	4
1.1.	Constitutional Reform of 2017 and Revised Rules of Procedure of the Parliament of Georgia	4
1.2.	Institutional Reform Plan (IRP) of the Parliament of Georgia	5
1.3.	Open Parliament.....	5
1.4.	Organizational Development and Administrative Strengthening	6
1.5.	Role of the Parliament of Georgia in the Implementation of the EU-Georgia AA and UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)	7
1.6.	Supreme Council of the Autonomous Republic of Ajara (SCA)	8
II.	Project Strategy.....	9
III.	Results and Partnerships.....	12
3.1.	Expected Results.....	12
3.2.	Resources Required to Achieve the Expected Results	22
3.3.	Partnerships and Stakeholders.....	24
3.4.	Risks Analysis	26
3.5.	Knowledge Products.....	28
3.6.	Sustainability and Exit Strategy	28
IV.	Project Management.....	30
4.1.	Cost Efficiency and Effectiveness.....	30
V.	Results Framework.....	31
VI.	Monitoring And Evaluation (M&E).....	38
VII.	Multi-Year Work Plan	40
VIII.	Governance and Management Arrangements	42
IX.	Legal Context.....	46
X.	Risk Management.....	47
	Annex 1. Project Budget	50
	Annex 2. Social and Environmental Screening Report.....	51
	Annex 3. Quality Assessment Report	59

I. THE DEVELOPMENT CHALLENGE

1.1. Constitutional Reform of 2017 and Revised Rules of Procedure of the Parliament of Georgia

With the inauguration of the new President of Georgia on 16 December 2018, the constitutional amendments of 2017 entered into force, completing the country's evolution from a semi-presidential to parliamentary system of governance. Reflecting the move to a parliamentary system, presidential powers have been further limited, a process that began with the 2010 constitutional changes. The President remains the head of state, while the Government acts as the supreme body of executive power. Starting from 2024, the President will be elected through indirect elections by a College of Electors composed of 300 members, including Members of Parliament (MPs) and local and regional government representatives.

The Parliament of Georgia is the highest representative body determining the country's main domestic and foreign policy directions, exercising law-making and government oversight powers. It is a unicameral chamber elected every four years, consisting of 77 proportionally elected members and 73 members elected by a majoritarian voting system.

However, and although it will first require another set of constitutional amendments, by 2020, the Parliament is set to be elected through a proportional system with 0% (or, to be precise around 0.66%) threshold, which would allow a more pluralistic and multi-party representation in the Parliament.

Under the constitutional amendments, the role of the Parliament has consequently increased, particularly vis-à-vis the Government which has become more accountable toward the legislative branch. The Prime Minister and Government ministers are obliged to regularly report to the Parliament, and the procedure for declaring a vote of no confidence has been simplified. Rights of the parliamentary opposition have also increased, including the possibility to establish an investigative commission as well as the right of at least six MPs to question Government ministers during an interpellation hour.

To align with the new constitutional framework and expanded role of the Parliament, in 2017 the Parliament of Georgia launched a comprehensive revision of its Rules of Procedure (RoP). After extensive consultations with different stakeholders, including civil society, the new regulations were adopted on 6 December 2018.

As a result of the reform, the RoP introduces effective mechanisms to improve the Parliament's law-making and oversight functions, and increase accountability and citizen engagement in legislative processes. Among many tools introduced by the RoP, the following are of the most transformative nature:

- Thematic rapporteurs are to be appointed within committees to divide and focus work, allowing for more detailed and efficient performance of committee functions;
- Committees are obliged to produce annual action plans and annual reports to promote transparency and accountability of their activities;
- Important mechanisms such as thematic inquiries and Post-Legislative Scrutiny (PLS) significantly transform and strengthen the oversight activities of the Parliament and ensure close monitoring of government activities, including through engaging civil society and citizens in the process. Along with the committees, permanent parliamentary councils now also have the right of conducting thematic inquiries further strengthening their oversight role and capacities;
- Parliament's role in security sector oversight is also enhanced through expanding the mandate of a special Trust Group formed under the Defense and Security Committee.

- Any group of least 300 citizens can now submit electronic petitions and initiators of draft laws can also collect signatures electronically (at least 25,000) to support their initiative.

With the reformed RoP in place, it is important that the new regulations do not remain on paper, but are institutionalized across the Parliament and consolidated to ensure sustainability of results, strengthening of institutional capacities and enhancing public image and trust towards the Parliament.

It shall be also noted that by the next parliamentary elections, another set of RoP amendments are envisaged, including those that will be conditioned by further constitutional amendments that enter into force in 2020. Some of the planned changes will alter committee structure to align it with the Government ministries, abolition of majority-minority groups, and limiting each political group to one parliamentary faction. Hence, another review of the RoP coupled with the assessment of the effectiveness of the already enacted provisions ('lessons learned') is to be recommended before adoption of these further amendments to the RoP.

1.2. Institutional Reform Plan (IRP) of the Parliament of Georgia

The IRP of the Parliament of Georgia was adopted by the Bureau of the Parliament in May 2016, covering the period from 2016 to 2018. Its objective was to provide a framework for the strengthening of the Parliament to become a strong institution reflecting the best traditions of European and Georgian parliamentarism. The IRP was developed in the context of Georgia's commitment to integrate with the European Union; its goals also fit with Georgia's transition to a parliamentary republic. The plan contained a diagnostic of the strengths and weaknesses of the Parliament, and a roadmap for reform with four strategic solutions, eight strategic objectives and twenty priority action areas defined.

According to the IRP progress review of December 2018,¹ there has been an overall strong progress in implementing the Plan with full or partial completion of 16 out of 20 main objectives. Impressive results were reached in improving the transparency and efficiency of the law-making processes, whereas relatively limited progress was identified in parliamentary communications, and staff capacities to meet the Parliament's needs.

In light of IRP progress and challenges, and particularly the new status and powers of Parliament, the IRP was extended to 2020, with a revised Action Plan emphasizing 1) achievement of the objectives that are lagging behind, and 2) alignment of reforms to support the expanded mandate of the Parliament. The plan also took into account some of the findings of the Parliament Self-Assessment exercise undertaken in summer 2018.²

Implementation of the new IRP for 2019-2020 needs to be co-ordinated across the institution at the highest level of the parliamentary administration, with political support of the parliamentary leadership, and the engagement of all political forces through the Parliament Bureau. At the same time, the Parliament requires strengthening of its human resources to be able to carry out institutional reforms. In some cases, external support, bringing in international best practices, particularly from the European Union member states, would be critical to achieve the set objectives.

1.3. Open Parliament

The Parliament of Georgia continues to be at the forefront of legislative openness reforms in the region and beyond; it is widely recognised as one of the leading parliaments in the world in this sphere.

¹ Progress on Institutional Reform Plan and Recommendations for further implementation of Parliamentary Reform, December 2018. Jonathan Murphy

² Parliament of Georgia Self-Assessment Report, October 2018 (USAID, UNDP, IPU, Government of Sweden)

Since its engagement in the Open Government Partnership (OGP) initiative, the Parliament of Georgia has developed three openness action plans (2015-2016; 2017 and 2018-2019), and has been efficient in implementing its commitments. In numbers - 98% of commitments under 2017 Open Parliament Action Plan have been implemented (out of 24 commitments, 23 were fully and 1 - partially implemented³). The third – 2018-2019 Action Plan was adopted in June 2018 and its implementation is progressing as planned.

As the result of the above reforms, the Parliament has become more open towards the public and its transparency level has increased, citizen participation in legislative processes has been promoted through various engagement tools and several measures have been institutionalized to enhance parliamentary accountability.

Considering the overall success of the country in OGP initiatives, in September 2017 Georgia was elected as an OGP Chair and in July 2018 hosted the OGP Global Summit.

Despite the above achievements, Parliament faces challenges with low public awareness of all those initiatives and citizen engagement tools that have been introduced up to now, as also demonstrated in the Parliament of Georgia Self-Assessment Report⁴ published in October 2018. This consequently limits public participation in the legislative processes and the optimal use of available resources. Hence, the Parliament should enhance its communications activities and outreach to different groups of society, including the most vulnerable and hard to reach groups.

A comprehensive and consistent public awareness campaign is critical for showcasing all the new tools and mechanisms introduced by the Parliament under the Open Parliament plans and to encourage citizens to actively use those tools to ensure participatory democracy and parliamentary accountability.

In the 'transitional' period, i.e. when the 10th convocation of the Parliament is elected and the Permanent Parliamentary Council on Open Governance is newly formed, considerable focus will be required to building knowledge and capacities of the new Council members (MPs) to maintain and further implement legislative openness reforms as well as remain committed to OGP values and principles.

1.4. Organizational Development and Administrative Strengthening

The Parliament has received considerable donor support over the years to support its organizational development and build capacities – both of administration and committee staff; although as the general observations within the Parliament suggest, there is a considerable imbalance between those capacities, with the committee staff generally lagging behind and with a variable progress from department to department within the Parliament.

The positive developments brought by the constitutional and RoP reforms also raise challenges. Parliament's recent accomplishments have been led by reform-minded MPs and reform initiatives have not always been fully integrated into the overall functioning of the institution. This can explain the somewhat patchy reform progress in parts of the administration, and the tendency for democratic innovations to be concentrated in certain domains, such as openness and transparency, and the work of certain committees, with a risk that the reform champions will get burned out, or that when they move on to new positions, the momentum for reform will be lost. With less than two years remaining in the current Parliament, it is important that the expanded parliamentary role framed by the Constitution and defined by the new RoP should be put into full effect during the present term, forming an operational foundation for the incoming 10th convocation.

³ OGP Parliament Council Mid-term Activity Report

⁴ Parliament of Georgia Self-Assessment Report, October 2018 (USAID, UNDP, IPU, Swedish Government)

The expanded oversight role in particular places a new set of responsibilities and much heavier workload on committees, many of whose staff secretariats require significant capacity upgrading in order to support effective oversight and legislative scrutiny. A new Parliamentary Research Centre, established as a Legal Entity of Public Law (LEPL) on 1 April 2019, will enable the in-depth background research necessary for the Parliament's effective law-making and oversight activities; but to fulfil the mission, the new structure will require considerable developmental support. The existing Training Centre set to operate as a knowledge hub in the Parliament also requires transformational enhancement so that its capacity building training is aligned with, and responsive to the new needs of the institution as well as the training standards required for the civil servants under the Public Administration Reform (PAR).

Apart from the services discussed above, there are areas where progress has been limited, including in human resources management and communications. Both services face challenges that need to be well analysed and comprehensive solutions proposed; otherwise their weaknesses could prevent building proper staffing capacities and improvement of the Parliament's public image – hence risking the institutionalization of those achievements made possible by the new constitutional and legislative framework.

1.5. Role of the Parliament of Georgia in the Implementation of the EU-Georgia AA and UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)

Signed on 27 June 2014, the EU-Georgia AA was ratified on 18 July 2014 and later came into full force on 1 July 2016. The Parliament's role in the implementation of the AA is defined by Articles 410 and 411 of the document which specifies that the Parliament shall exercise oversight over the implementation of the AA, prepare recommendations and present them for execution to the Government of Georgia and respective EU institutions.

In the frames of the EU-UNDP Project – *Strengthening the System of Parliamentary Democracy in Georgia*, the Parliament developed a comprehensive (cross-sectorial) Action Plan of the Parliament of Georgia for the Implementation of the EU-Georgia AA for 2019-2020. The plan determines strategic goals and objectives of the Parliament and provides specific legal approximation and oversight activities that need to be implemented by nine parliamentary committees in the process. The plan also includes the Parliament's strategy and communications action plan for ensuring public outreach during implementation of the AA. The Plan was adopted by the Parliament Bureau on 19 March 2019.

Similar to the AA, the Parliament of Georgia also has an important role in implementing the UN SDGs. The 2030 Agenda recognizes that engagement of national parliaments is essential for the success of the SDGs, as parliaments are in the unique position of representing all geographical areas of the country, different social and ethnic groups, and diverse political viewpoints. It is widely accepted, that parliaments contribute to the achievement of 2030 Agenda mostly through focusing on two specific SDGs, namely:

- SDG 16.6 – Develop effective, accountable and transparent institutions at all levels; and
- SDG 16.7 – Ensure responsive, inclusive, participatory and representative decision-making at all levels.

The SDGs are becoming a topic of high interest among Georgian parliamentarians. The first steps have been already made to lay the groundwork for integrating the SDGs into parliamentary work. In 2015, the Parliament adopted the *Joint Declaration on Open Government for the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*⁵. Later, with the support of the EU-UNDP Project – *Strengthening the System of Parliamentary Democracy in Georgia*, the parliamentary committees have started to align concrete

⁵ https://www.opengovpartnership.org/sites/default/files/attachments/OGP_declaration.pdf

activities under their action plans with respective nationalized SDGs targets, thereby reflecting close link between national policies and global agenda.

In 2019, as part of its 2018-2019 Open Parliament Action Plan, the Parliament developed the Strategy and Action Plan for the Implementation of UN SDGs. The document covers all constitutional functions of the Parliament and provides specific goals and objectives for streamlining SDGs in law-making, budgetary, oversight and public outreach activities of the Parliament.

The Parliament needs to be prepared and well equipped to effectively implement the above-mentioned action plans, oversee the Government's fulfilment of both the AA and 2030 Agenda for Development and demonstrate its commitment internationally. Apart from receiving expertise in fields related to the AA and SDGs, the Parliament requires support in using new RoP mechanisms such as the PLS and thematic inquiries to effectively monitor the implementation of specific commitments under the plans and ensure evidence-based oversight processes.

1.6. Supreme Council of the Autonomous Republic of Ajara (SCA)

The SCA is the supreme representative body of the Autonomous Republic of Ajara which exercises the legislative function and oversees the activities of the Government of the Autonomous Republic.

The SCA consists of 21 members elected for a four-year term, with 15 members elected through the proportional list and the other six through the majoritarian system. The SCA has a Chairperson and a Deputy Chairperson who are members of the Council Bureau, along with the chairpersons of the committees and factions. The SCA has six committees and four factions. Similar to the Parliament of Georgia, the SCA has a Gender Equality Council consisting of eleven members.⁶

The SCA adopts the Constitution and other laws of Ajara; approves the budget of the Autonomous Republic and exercises financial oversight over the expenditures of the Ajara Government; expresses vote of confidence to the Government of Ajara; under the Constitution of Georgia, has the right of legislative initiative and can file a constitutional complaint at the Constitutional Court of Georgia. The official seat of the Council is Chakvi, Kobuleti Municipality.

Although the SCA mandate is not as extensive as of the Parliament of Georgia, the Council is an important democratic institution for Ajara, and needs to improve its performance to be better able to engage in the legislative process at local level, oversee the Ajara Government and represent the citizens of Ajara – all of these leading to stronger regional development. The SCA requires a holistic approach to institutional reforms and the strengthening of internal capacities.

As a starting point, the SCA requires a comprehensive institutional reform framework, upon which different institutional strengthening and capacity building initiatives would be built. The Council would also benefit from opening up its institution, and engaging civil society and citizens in its activities and reform processes. This would contribute to strengthening the capacities of local civil society organizations (CSOs), and promote their greater role in political life of the Autonomous Republic. Efforts to engage the SCA in the OGP initiative could be also examined.

⁶ Official website of the SCA <http://sca.ge/eng/static/71/umaghlesi-sabchos-shesakheb>

II. PROJECT STRATEGY

The EU and UNDP and parliamentary strengthening

The project strategy builds from the core commitments of both the United Nations system and the European Union to representative, accountable democracy as the best means to assure human rights and human development: as the UNDP country programme document for Georgia states, a situation in “which people are empowered to participate in pluralistic decision-making through strong institutions, balance of power, and the rule of law, free from discrimination and with equal opportunity to contribute to, and share in, sustainable economic growth.”⁷ Similarly, the European Union, of which Georgia is an Associate Country, emphasizes in its Lisbon Treaty, article 21, that both its internal and external policies are guided by a commitment to democracy, the rule of law and of human rights⁸. Globally, the European Union is the largest international partner in parliamentary development, and UNDP delivers parliamentary support in more countries – over 70 – than any other technical assistance agency.

The project also builds on and promotes sustainability of the results achieved through the previous EU-UNDP parliamentary intervention. More particularly, in February 2014, with the support from the European Union under the EU Comprehensive Institution Building (CIB) program, UNDP initiated a project - *Strengthening the System of Parliamentary Democracy in Georgia*. The project was broken down into two phases of 2.5 years with a total budget of 3,300,000 EUR (1,665,000 EUR per each phase co-shared between the EU and the Georgian Parliament in the amount of 1,500,000 EUR and 165,000 EUR, respectively). The Project’s second (final) phase finalized on 20 May 2019 with significant results as set out below:

- Parliament was supported in developing its first ever IRP for 2016-2018 which was successfully implemented. Based on the results and current challenges, the IRP was updated for the next two years, i.e. 2019-2020.
- Comprehensive support was provided to Parliament during the above-mentioned RoP reform.
- Remarkable progress was achieved through engaging the Parliament in the global OGP initiative, and facilitating the development and implementation of its three legislative openness action plans (for 2015-2016, 2017, 2018-2019).
- Reforms of a number of parliamentary services, including the International Relations and Research services, were supported.
- A comprehensive MP Induction Programme was designed and implemented in close cooperation with parliamentary administration.
- Multi-year strategic action plans of 6 parliamentary committees were developed and monitoring and evaluation (M&E) plans designed for 10 parliamentary committees.
- Committee Staff Manual and a Guide on Explanatory Notes to Draft Legislation were developed.
- Development of the Parliament’s 2019-2020 Action Plan for Implementation and Oversight of the EU-Georgia Association Agreement was facilitated. Awareness-raising activities on Georgia’s EU integration processes were also supported.

⁷ Country programme document for Georgia (2016-2020), Executive Board of the United Nations Development Programme, the United Nations Population Fund and the United Nations Office for Project Services, DP/DCP/GEO/3, Distr.: General, 27 June, 2015, accessible at http://www.ge.undp.org/content/dam/georgia/docs/strategicdocs/UNDP_GE_CPD_2016-2020.pdf

⁸ http://ec.europa.eu/archives/lisbon_treaty/index_en.htm.

- National and international expertise and capacity building trainings in EU legal approximation to MPs and staff were provided; their partnership with EU member and candidate states facilitated.

These and other achievements have been documented in the Project's mid-term review (Phase I) undertaken by an independent international evaluation in December-January 2015⁹ and the Project's Results-Oriented Monitoring Mission report (Phase II) of August 2018¹⁰.

Theory of Change

The project theory of change is that, if Georgia is enabled to effectively implement its transition towards a parliamentary republic, through building a parliamentary institution able to carry out its constitutional responsibilities and act as the fundamental democratic link between citizens and government, the quality and accountability of governance will be enhanced, enabling improved human development, reinforcing in turn the stability and the resilience of the state, contributing to Georgia's integration of the European acquis within its governance processes.

Sharing best practices with the SCA

The main focus of the project is on the Parliament of Georgia. A second, smaller component, entails working with the SCA, the legislature of the Autonomous Republic of Ajara. The Supreme Council exercises legislative powers in Ajara, and thus it is an important governance institution in the Autonomous Republic. The Supreme Council leadership has learned of the development initiatives of the national Parliament and would like to replicate them in Ajara. The project will facilitate the sharing of expertise developed in the national Parliament, and also enable legislators and secretariat staff of the Supreme Council to participate in selected activities of the national project. The component will also have an impact on building capacities of the local civil society to engage more actively in the Council's activities in the frames of the OGP.

Turning powers into practice

The new powers that have been assumed by the Parliament require a strong institutional framework in order to be carried out effectively. Not only do MPs need to be aware of their powers and their effective use, parliamentary staff must be able to support parliamentarians to carry them out. Without a solid institutional underpinning, MPs will be unable to effectively use their powers, creating a reputational risk for the Parliament, and bringing into doubt the foundations of the representative democracy.

With the entry into effect in 2018 of substantial constitutional revisions, the Parliament of Georgia is now at the heart of the democratic governance system in Georgia, which has transformed from a semi-presidential system to become a parliamentary republic. In combination with revisions to the Law on Normative Acts and, especially, revisions to its RoP, Parliament's role in its core constitutionally mandated areas of responsibility has increased substantially. In the area of legislation, the Parliament is now entitled to comprehensive explanatory notes from the government, as well as more control of time allocated for consideration of legislation, strengthening legislative scrutiny. In oversight, among a range of accountability processes available to the Parliament of Georgia, the prime minister appears in front of Parliament each year to explain the government's progress in carrying out the programme it presented to Parliament. Further, ministers must appear at least annually to answer questions. Parliament can launch investigative inquiries into suspected state wrongdoing, as well as thematic enquiries to assess the situation and make recommendations in specific policy areas. Representation and institutional transparency have been a priority of the Parliament of Georgia for which it is widely known. Additional

⁹ Parliament Project Mid-Term Review, January 2015. By Kevin Deveaux

¹⁰ Parliament Project ROM Report, August 2018. By David Ruiz

processes to expand opportunities for transparency, communications, and representation include opportunities for citizen online comments on legislation, as well as citizen online petitions, and enhanced powers for the Parliamentary Council on Open Governance.

Parliamentary reform and European integration

European integration is a guiding principle of Georgia's democratic transformation, and the Constitutional and RoP reforms are designed to align the Parliament of Georgia with best European parliamentary practices. The project will support this national objective through fostering sustainable partnerships with European member state parliaments and the European parliament. This will include identifying areas of particular expertise within European parliaments and enabling that knowledge to be shared, through seminars, exchanges, and internships, as well as in the development and production of knowledge materials. Partnerships will be fostered both with major and long-established European parliaments, and parliaments that have more recently undergone democratic transformation and capacity enhancement. Engagements will be designed to be mutually enriching, with the objective that they will continue following the end of the current project.

Gender, diversity and inclusion

Gender equality as a vital element of diversity and inclusion, is an important principle of both the United Nations and of the European Union, as well as a fundamental principle within the Georgian Constitution. In the EU-Georgia AA, gender equality is identified as an important principle described in Chapter 14 with a series of commitments of Georgia to implement European acquis in this area. The Parliament of Georgia has an active Gender Equality Council, formally established in the RoP, which has responsibilities for promoting equality and overseeing government action in this area.

In addition, the project will assure that gender representation and gender impact is considered in all the project's activities. This will include supporting gender policy analysis within the new research centre, monitoring equality of access to training, collecting disaggregated data on citizens engagement, and maintaining records of project beneficiaries by gender.

Parliament and the SDGs

As noted in the Development Challenge section of this project document, the SDGs are an important tool to focus parliamentary support towards development objectives. Because the SDGs establish global aspirations for human development, they are useful in harmonising national efforts with global principles. Georgia has already established a national strategy to attain the SDGs, established the SDGs Council and set 99 targets in all 17 SDGs areas, with more than 200 measurable goals within all 17 goal areas¹¹. The Open Government Parliamentary Council has taken a lead role in focusing parliamentary action on the SDGs, including through development of an implementation strategy. The Parliament project will work closely with the OGP Parliamentary Council to support integration of the national targets into parliamentary committee annual oversight workplans.

Project Stakeholders and Beneficiaries

Main stakeholders of the Project are the Parliament, SCA, Government ministries, civil society – including underrepresented groups, such as ethnic and other minorities, women, and youth from urban and rural areas. academia, international and donor organizations.

Main beneficiaries are Members and staff of the Parliament and SCA, civil society and public at large.

¹¹ <https://sdgsgeorgiasite.wordpress.com/>

III. RESULTS AND PARTNERSHIPS

3.1. Expected Results

The new EU-UNDP initiative will focus on consolidation of the achievements and strengthening national parliamentary performance in the new context of the constitutional framework and governance system. This will be attempted through the activities linked with policy and law-making, parliamentary oversight, enhanced public engagement in parliamentary processes through promotion of participatory democracy and open governance principles, and promoting institutional effectiveness and efficiency through strategic planning and capacity development initiatives. The support will also be extended to the legislative organ of the Ajara Autonomous Republic – the SCA – with an intention to promote an effective and efficient institutional framework, institutional openness, transparency and citizen engagement. More specifically, the project will deliver the following results under each of the outcomes and outputs:

Outcome 1 - Strengthened parliamentary performance in the new context of constitutional and legislative framework

Expected outputs under this outcome will be the following:

Output 1.1. Evidence-based policy and law-making processes strengthened in the Parliament

Output 1.2. Parliament's capacities for the Government oversight increased

Output 1.3. Enhanced public engagement in parliamentary processes through promotion of participatory democracy and open governance principles

Output 1.4. Improved institutional effectiveness and efficiency through strategic planning and capacity development initiatives

Output 1.1. Evidence-based policy and law-making processes strengthened in the Parliament

As described in the chapter on *Development Challenge* above, the new RoP has introduced substantial changes and new mechanisms to improve the Parliament's exercise of its constitutional functions, including in policy and law-making. New tools will transform parliamentary practices and enable higher standards of work. The new tools need to be backed up with the respective knowledge and capacities to ensure their effective application in practice.

Given the expanded role of the Parliament, as a starting point, a clear and common understanding is required, specifying the **Parliament's exclusive role in different stages of legislative process**, including during ex ante analysis of draft legislation, legislative scrutiny of submitted draft bills and ex post analysis of enacted laws.

When it comes to the policy-making function of the Parliament, it can initiate and adopt **concept papers** which according to the Article 132 of the new RoP, become an important leverage for the Parliament in defining the country's main policy directions and representing a full spectrum of constituency. As part of a large-scale PAR in Georgia, supported by the EU, the Government is in the process of introducing evidence-based policy planning standards and practices to improve its planning across all Ministries and Government entities. Currently, UNDP PAR project (*funded by UK Aid*) supports the Government administration in developing respective policy planning guidelines. Parliament's awareness raising on the policy planning guidelines will build knowledge in the Parliament to be better able to engage in the policy-making exercise and more effectively monitor the implementation of different policy documents and programs.

The new RoP has also introduced the new function of **thematic rapporteurs** within parliamentary committees, which will help develop a culture of shared responsibilities and cooperation among the Members of committees. It entails a system for distributing concrete fields and topics among individual MPs, which will promote effective and efficient implementation of committee action plans. The Project will support the thematic rapporteurs and their staff in developing respective skills and improving performance, including deepening understanding of diversity and inclusion principles within and throughout the Parliament's work.

Throughout the years since independence, Parliament's exercise of its legislative and oversight functions has been challenged by insufficient internal analytical and research capacities. With the obligations undertaken under the EU-Georgia AA, and commitments to the 2030 Agenda for Development, the need for insightful and comprehensive analysis of policy decisions and legislative initiatives becomes even more vital. To address the challenge, the Parliament decided to reform its research services and pursuant to the new RoP, on 1 April 2019, established a new **Parliamentary Research Centre** as a LEPL. The mission of the Centre is to raise legislative and political culture in Georgia, and create a platform for involving academic and other specialized expertise in the inclusive policy- and law-making process. As a newly established institution, the Parliamentary Research Centre will require comprehensive strategic development and capacity building support. The highest priority will be to ensure that the Parliament has timely access to neutral, evidence-based and quality support across a wide spectrum of complex and diverse issues. It will of course be of significant importance to ensure that these quality research services are provided across the party lines.

Considering the above elements, the project will be designed around a set of following activities:

Activity 1.1.1. Support the Development of Parliament's Policy-Making Capacities

Drawing on the best international/European practices, the Project in close cooperation with the Parliament, will develop a *Parliament's Guide to the Legislative Process* demonstrating the Parliament's actual role in each stage of the process. At the same time, the Project will facilitate raising Parliament's awareness of the Government's policy-planning standards and guidelines through a number of joint workshops with the Government. Where required, support will be provided in developing the Parliament's vision/concept paper in concrete policy areas with emphasis on diversity and inclusion.

Activity 1.1.2. Provide Support to Parliamentary Committees and Thematic Rapporteurs

To provide support to parliamentary committees and thematic rapporteurs (selected by the project based on the committees' interest and request) for effective implementation of their duties, the project will share best European practices on the organization and planning of work of committees and thematic rapporteurs, including staff support, and methods of cooperation with different parliamentary and non-parliamentary stakeholders. Among other, trainings will be offered on the usage of new structure of explanatory notes. Where required, the project will also offer technical expertise on different topics related to concrete legislative initiatives, including those falling within the EU-Georgia AA and the 2030 Agenda for Development.

Activity 1.1.3. Support the Strengthening of the Parliamentary Research Centre

The Project will provide comprehensive support to the new Parliamentary Research Centre. Support will encompass both guidance in strategic planning process, and targeted capacity building program for the Centre Director and other staff members. A special multi-year organizational development strategy will be produced in close coordination with the parliamentary leadership, top

administration and the new Centre, complemented by a resourced action plan. Among other objectives, it will include the elaboration of a cooperation framework between the Centre and committees to enable a smart distribution of tasks. The development of the menu of services of the research unit will also be supported through the Project. The Project will elaborate capacity development activities, including but not limited to trainings, workshops and international peer exchanges. The Centre will also benefit from building and reinforcing international partnerships with the EU member states parliaments in terms of sharing best practices in undertaking neutral, high-quality and evidence-based research and providing effective support to parliamentarians. International parliamentary workshops and conferences will further inform the process. The research produced by the Center will be built on the basic principles of gender policy analysis, as well as diversity and inclusion.

Output 1.2. Parliament's capacities for the Government oversight Increased

Throughout the years, weak parliamentary oversight in Georgia prevented the establishment of an effective system of checks and balances in the country. Relations between the Executive and Legislative bodies have had considerable flaws, mostly reflected in the lack of effective and efficient mechanisms to hold Government accountable. Lack of political will and limited capacities of parliamentary staff to provide professional support to MPs in their oversight activities further aggravated the problem.

With the adoption of the new RoP, transformative change is brought into this area of parliamentary activity. As mentioned in the above chapter on the *Development Challenge*, a number of effective oversight mechanisms have been introduced to facilitate the Parliament's stronger role vis-à-vis the Government and ensure consistent scrutiny of its performance. Some of the new mechanisms introduced to enable the Parliament exercise its oversight function effectively and in line with best European practices include: regular reporting to the Parliament by the Prime Minister and other Government ministers on the implementation of Governmental programme; Ministerial Hours and interpellations followed by debates; establishment of the Audit Group under the Budget and Finance Committee; and, increased scope of the Parliament's Trust Group to oversee the activities of the security sector.

Two of the most important and potentially effective oversight mechanisms under the new RoP are thematic inquiries by parliamentary committees and permanent councils, and PLS to monitor the implementation of adopted normative acts.

Thematic inquiries were first launched in the Parliament of Georgia in spring 2018, before the adoption of the new RoP. Piloted at the Committee on Environmental Protection and Natural Resources, this oversight tool received wide acclaim and approval by the whole Parliament. Supported by a joint initiative of UNDP, WFD and the Government of Sweden, the first inquiry focused on air quality in Tbilisi, with the intention of identifying and exploring solutions to the underlying causes for poor ecological conditions in the capital city. Originally introduced in the Westminster Parliament, thematic inquiries are largely based on a parliament-citizen partnership modality, and encourage evidence-based submissions by citizens and different groups of society to research deeper into subjects of high public interest and afterwards provide a set of recommendations to respective government agencies. Thematic inquiries could become an important tool for researching and addressing challenges pertaining to the most vulnerable and underrepresented groups in Georgian society, as well as, raise awareness and increase participation of such groups. In some cases, inquiries might lead to the initiation of a new law or amendments to existing legislation. While several thematic inquiries have been already launched, there is a need for wider awareness raising and skills development among the MPs and staff on this important oversight mechanism. Parliamentary committees and permanent parliamentary councils, particularly the Open Parliament

Council, require substantive support in the process. In parallel, CSOs working in different fields of activity across the country need to be informed on the purpose and advantages of thematic inquiries and mentored on how to best use the tool and effectively engage in the process. Informational meetings with the media are also needed to ensure the accurate news coverage and communication of information to public.

In parallel to thematic inquiries, the Parliament can now use the PLS mechanism to oversee the Government's implementation of adopted legislation. PLS helps the Parliament to examine the impact and consequences of concrete laws and whether the planned policy objectives have been met. Through consultations with different stakeholders, including those affected by the legislation, possible gaps and deficiencies are identified in the legislation or its implementation, leading to a set of recommendations to the Government, as well as the possibility of the initiation of amendments to the legislation. The Parliament of Georgia is just starting to get familiarized with this oversight mechanism. Hence, support is also required in this area of parliamentary activity, to build the capacities of Members and staff of Parliament, including through exposing them to best international practices. At the same time, guidance will be provided to the newly-established Parliamentary Research Centre on how to best support the MPs during the PLS process.

In common with many countries, Georgia has a series of **independent state institutions** accountable to Parliament, ranging from the Prosecutor General to Ombudsperson. Independent institutions play an increasingly important role in contemporary democratic governance, because they enable parliament to carry out detailed and informed oversight. They also reduce the concentration of power and governance capacity in the hands of the executive. However, to be effective, the work of independent institutions needs to be carefully integrated with the work of parliament. This is because parliament has the power and the responsibility to study and follow-up on the recommendations of the independent bodies that are accountable to and report to parliament. In a preferred model, when parliament adopts certain recommendations of the independent oversight institution, it submits them to the government, and requests a response, and where appropriate, plans for implementation of the proposed institutional reforms. Given the Parliament's enhanced oversight powers, this is a good time to study interaction with the independent institutions, including in comparison with international good practice in this area, and to introduce necessary changes to enhance synergies and effective governance.

As part of the RoP reform, the Parliament made steps in strengthening the **oversight over the security sector** which had been traditionally closed to the public and remained largely unaccountable to the Parliament. First of all, the RoP defined those agencies that constituted the state security and defense system and consequently were accountable to the Parliament. Secondly, the mandate of the Parliamentary Trust Group under the Defence and Security Committee was expanded to monitor classified activities, including those related to secret procurement, of all departments within the sector, and provide respective recommendations. In 2017-2019, EU-funded *Parliamentary Oversight of the Security Sector* project provided substantive support during the elaboration of respective RoP provisions and delivered a set of capacity development activities to selected committees. Nevertheless, the support shall continue to expose the Parliament to best international practices and equip MPs and staff with knowledge and skills to effectively apply the new procedures in practice. During the absence of a dedicated project on security oversight, the present project will cover this component as well.

To respond to the above challenges, the Project plans the following activities:

Activity 1.2.1. Facilitate the Process of Thematic Inquiries across Parliamentary Committees

Committee inquiries will be introduced in selected committees aimed at initiating evidence-based scrutiny of topics of high public interest, including those falling under the EU-Georgia AA and 2030

Agenda for Development. The Project will ensure greater public - including underrepresented groups from urban and rural areas, engagement in the process. The necessary package of capacity development, including trainings, mentorship and international peer exchange, will be provided to Parliament representatives as well as selected CSOs and also media to increase their knowledge about the mechanism, and to improve the quality of evidence to be submitted. The Project will base its capacity development support on the special *Thematic Inquiries Manual* prepared by the abovementioned UNDP/WFD/Swedish Government initiative.

Activity 1.2.2. Support Parliamentary Committees in PLS

The Project will support selected committees in undertaking PLS through an inclusive and participatory process, engaging different stakeholders including civil society, academia, private sector and other interested groups. Best international experience, trainings and on-the-job-consultancies will be provided in the course of this support. It will also be ensured that the PLS is supported through the newly enhanced research functions of the Parliament.

Activity 1.2.3. Improve Collaboration between the Parliament and Independent State Institutions

The Project will analyze the current relationships between the Parliament and independent state institutions and develop an options paper with recommendations for possible changes and reinforcement of collaboration. International practices will be also shared, focusing on Parliaments with strong oversight follow-up experience.

Activity 1.2.4. Support the Improvement of Parliamentary Capacity to Exercise Better Oversight of Security Sector

The Project will provide the Parliament with international expertise during the scrutiny of legislative initiatives, including codification of military legislation submitted by the Government. Capacity building activities will be offered to the Defence and Security Committee and the Trust Group on good practices in security oversight area. Need for a study visit to one of the EU member states will be also explored.

Output 1.3. Enhanced public engagement in parliamentary processes through promotion of participatory democracy and open governance principles

Since 2015 the Parliament of Georgia has made significant progress in both adopting open governance principles and kicking off respective reforms. As the result of the implementation of the **Open Parliament** Action Plans (prepared under the auspices of the Permanent Parliamentary Council on Open Governance and its Consultative Group), the legislative basis has been created and technological mechanisms introduced to foster greater transparency and citizen engagement in legislative processes. While the current convocation of the Parliament requires continued support in the implementation of the 2018-2019 Open Parliament Action Plan, after the 2020 Parliamentary Elections the composition of the Parliament will be renewed. This process will not affect the functioning of the Parliamentary Council as it is a permanent/institutionalized body, but the members of the Council will have to be selected anew. Therefore, the new Council will have a pressing need for in-depth induction/capacity building support to ensure a smooth transition phase, continued full-scale engagement in the OGP initiative, and the uninterrupted implementation of openness commitments.

Furthermore, a situation analysis conducted as part of the Communications Strategy of the Parliament's Open Governance Council and the Social Media Concept of the Parliament of Georgia (*developed within the frames of EU-UNDP Strengthening the System of Parliamentary Democracy in Georgia*) has demonstrated that the Parliament of Georgia faces various challenges in engaging public in legislative processes, as well as in developing and implementing informational campaigns across social media

channels. The *Survey on Public Attitudes* conducted in April 2019 by NDI, demonstrates that the engagement and communication challenges are especially reflected on the most vulnerable and underrepresented communities in rural and urban areas, such as ethnic and other minorities, persons with disabilities, women, and youth.¹² Raising public awareness, including through the usage of new technologies & innovative approaches, will boost communication between the Parliament and public. To address the challenge, the project will design a number of activities to facilitate more active engagement of the Parliament with different groups of society, targeting youth, women, disabled citizens, ethnic and other minorities and other underrepresented groups using the most relevant communication channels for each of the groups aiming at ensuring the diversity and inclusion of all.

In addition, the progress review of 2016-2018 IRP revealed gaps in the performance of the Parliament's Public Relations and Information Department whose organizational setup and human resource capacities have failed to keep up with the pace of institutional reforms. As the mentioned progress review suggests, *"parliament's communications and citizen engagement functions remain insufficiently institutionalized to enable broad citizen understanding of parliament's role and engagement with parliamentary processes as required in the new parliamentary republic. Currently the [Open Governance] Council, which is defined in the RoP as having an advisory role, is carrying out a range of engagement and communications activities that should be institutionalized and carried out by the Public Relations and other departments of the administration"*.

While engaging with the broader public, special emphasis to be made on those citizens, who due to various barriers, cannot equally exercise their political rights. Thus, while communicating with the public, the Parliament shall put special efforts in engaging the diverse groups of most vulnerable and underrepresented citizens from rural and urban areas.

From the 2020 parliamentary elections, Georgia is expected to shift from a system in which 77 MPs were elected through a proportional list and 73 by majoritarian vote in individual constituencies, to a proportional system based on national party lists (subject to the adoption of new constitutional amendments). The new system aims to provide greater accountability of MPs and reduce the inbuilt advantage that government has in the current system through its ability to attract majoritarian MPs to the winning side. Currently, each majoritarian MP is entitled to have an office (bureau) in the constituency, which provides advice and services to citizens. In 2018-2019 the parliamentary administrative leadership has moved towards strengthening the work of local offices through a series of capacity building programs. One issue that will arise with the abolition of single MP constituencies is thus the potential loss of **connection between the citizen and Parliament**; this is an important challenge given that parliament already ranks fairly low in terms of public perception. Although not all majoritarian MPs have been doing extensive outreach in constituencies, some of them are well-known and represent the Parliament in their local community. It is important that this type of direct link continues once the national proportional list system is introduced. Various countries have introduced nation-wide proportional representation and have had to address this issue. In South Africa, parliamentarians are informally allocated by their party to an individual community and expected to keep in touch with citizens through organizing regular local meetings. In other countries, such as Canada, parliament reaches out to citizens through the use of parliamentary hearings that can travel across the country to discuss particular oversight topics or proposed legislation. Drawing on the best international practices, the Parliament of Georgia should introduce the most effective and efficient system that will work in the local context and ensure strong linkage between parliamentarians and a full spectrum of citizens.

¹² Public Attitudes in Georgia, Results of 2019 Survey, NDI <https://bit.ly/2VU7w0f>

Activity 1.3.1. Support the Parliament in the Implementation of Legislative Openness Reforms

The project will support the Parliamentary Council on Open Governance through facilitating the Council's meetings with different stakeholders and interest groups to ensure effective elaboration, implementation and monitoring of progress towards the fulfilment of the Parliament of Georgia's commitments undertaken as part of Open Parliament Action Plans. Public participation will be ensured during the Action Plan elaboration process including open call for new ideas for the action plan.

After the 2020 Parliamentary elections, the project team will launch an intensive advocacy and awareness raising campaign to support the newly selected council members in absorbing knowledge on OGP and working towards continued engagement in the OGP initiative. In order to share the best practices of OGP member countries, and follow the modern trends of OGP community, the project will facilitate council members' participation at different regional, international and/or global events.

The Project will also support the Parliament in the implementation of selected objectives/tasks under the Council's Communications Action Plan. This will encompass production of a series of information materials on the available citizen engagement tools. A special Citizen's Guide on Legislative engagement will be prepared and disseminated via various channels. The Guide will be based on principles of diversity and inclusion, enabling engagement of the full spectrum of citizens.

To monitor the impact of newly-available citizen engagement tools and the related public awareness campaign, the project will support the Parliament in collecting respective data (registered petitions, legislative initiatives and proposals, various information requests, attendance at the committee meetings, comments left on the draft legislation, etc.) to compare it with the earlier findings in the *Baseline Study on Citizen Engagement* produced at the beginning of 2019 (*within the frames of the EU-UNDP Strengthening the System of Parliamentary Democracy*). The key findings will be used to provide recommendations to the Parliament on enhancing inclusive public engagement in the legislative process. The project will advocate for the Parliament to collect, analyse and publish similar data on an annual basis.

Activity 1.3.2. Support the Improvement of the Parliament's Communications Capacities

The project will conduct parliamentary communications and engagement diagnostic, and develop a comprehensive, inclusive, and resourced communications strategy and action plan in line with the new constitutional and regulatory framework and institutional needs, and drawing on best international practices. Where required, provide capacity building program to the respective staff members to enable them carry out the activities planned under the new strategy/action plan.

Activity 1.3.3. Facilitate the Introduction of Post-2020 Constituency Outreach Framework

In the context of the planned transition to a proportional electoral system from 2020, the Project will commission a *comparative study on constituency outreach in proportional electoral systems*. The project will further work with the Parliament's political and administrative leadership to develop a *concept paper* for connecting a full spectrum of citizens to Parliament once the majoritarian system ends, including underrepresented and the most vulnerable groups. The paper will include alternatives at the level of individual MPs, political factions, committees, and the institution as a whole. The concept paper will be discussed at a multi-stakeholder forum to explore and debate advantages and disadvantages of different approaches to parliamentary outreach and citizen engagement in the post-majoritarian era. Based on the received input, the paper will be finalized and submitted to the Parliament leadership for follow-up actions.

Output 1.4. Improved institutional effectiveness and efficiency through strategic planning and capacity development initiatives

Strong institutional performance of the Parliament is key to ensuring the effective implementation of its functions. In the new constitutional and legislative framework, this becomes even more critical as the overall challenge is now to develop and align the institutional structure, functioning, and resources with the Parliament's expanded role and new responsibilities. The progress review of the 2016-2018 IRP manifested that while a number of impressive reforms were undertaken in the Parliament, mostly driven by reform-minded politicians, the professional capacities of the staff were insufficient to meet the new institutional demands. While some of the administrative departments have enhanced their capacities, others still require considerable strengthening.

The same is applicable to committee staff whose performance and skillset is quite often criticized by the leadership of the committees. In the light of the expanded oversight role for the Parliament and increased workload due to a wide range of new oversight mechanisms available to the Parliament, the need for highly qualified and skilled staff will be critical. Considering that no large-scale organization review is planned within the next two years, the strategy would be to concentrate on departmental and committee staff with the most potential for professional growth, and provide **targeted capacity building programs** to narrow the gap between institutional transformation and the relevance of human resources. The Training Centre will be an important partner in this undertaking. The Centre's course offerings need to be expanded and harmonized with emphasis on institutional development priorities, and a particular focus on new oversight functions of Parliament, as well as basic principles of diversity and inclusion within and throughout the Parliament. Online/distance courses will also be offered to expand the outreach to MPs and staff.

From mid-2020, the Training Centre and the whole of the administration will start preparing for the new cohort of MPs to be elected in 2020. Respectively, the **MP Induction Program** that was designed in 2016 (as part of EU-UNDP Strengthening the System of Parliamentary Democracy in Georgia) needs to be revised and upgraded.

Parliaments need to be accountable to the full spectrum of citizens who elect them, in meaningful ways. Citizens frequently have a limited understanding of the proper roles of parliaments and thus often judge parliamentary performance on the basis of sensational headlines or isolated examples of parliamentary wrongdoing. Media, both traditional and social, can also magnify misunderstandings of parliamentary performance by focusing on colourful incidents rather than overall institutional effectiveness. Parliamentary Monitoring Organizations (PMOs) have come to play an important role in many countries, in both holding parliaments and parliamentarians to account, and in providing useful and unbiased information on MPs parliamentary work and the progress of legislation. PMOs such as *They Work for You* in the UK, and *Regards Citoyens* in France have helped to demystify parliament for citizens, and provide unbiased information about MPs performance. In Georgia, organizations such as *Transparency International* research and publish information about the Parliament of Georgia and regularly assess its performance. The selection and implementation of **parliamentary monitoring** data needs to be conducted with care, as poorly designed indicators can in fact distort the reality and establish wrong measurements for success or failure in parliamentary work; for instance, the number of pieces of legislation initiated does not necessarily mean their high quality. With the new powers and procedures of Parliament now in effect, the project will support collaborative work between PMO's and Parliament, to jointly develop a simple and clear methodology for measuring parliamentary and parliamentarians' performance, taking into account international good practices.

The new Parliament to be elected in 2020 could well have a large turnover of MPs, with limited prior knowledge of Parliament or of its reform trajectory. Given the major transformations Parliament has undertaken in recent years, particularly the constitutional and regulatory changes of 2017 to 2019, and the two phases of the IRP 2016-2020, it is important that reform momentum is not lost in the early period of the new Parliament to be elected. It is a truism of organizational reform that the greatest opportunities for reform occur relatively early in a new leadership mandate. A Mid-term Review of progress towards the 2019-2020 IRP could identify lessons learned and remaining challenges for developing a **vision of key priority areas for parliamentary reform for the next parliamentary convocation** – developed collaboratively by the political and administrative leadership of Parliament in consultation with stakeholders inside and outside Parliament. While an incoming leadership will be entitled to develop its own plan, an existing strategy developed by the previous parliament will provide continuity, underlining the need to view parliamentary development as an institutional, rather than a political, task. Engaging the political opposition in the process will increase the likelihood of the strategy being maintained in a future Parliament.

The above process could benefit from a **comprehensive review of the results of the revisions to Parliament's RoP** to take place by mid-2020. In-depth analysis of the effectiveness of the 2018 RoP, lessons learned, and challenges encountered by the MPs during application of parliamentary regulations, will assist the Parliament in preparing another set of amendments to the RoP to ensure further improvement of the document and also to align them with the constitutional changes that are to come into force after the 2020 parliamentary elections.

The design of this particular Activity of the project is largely based on the progress review of the 2016-2018 IRP and the updated 2019-2020 Action Plan, with the following actions proposed:

Activity 1.4.1. Provide *on demand* institutional and capacity building support to the Parliament's administrative and committee staff.

In coordination with the Training Centre, organize trainings, seminars and workshops on topics that will considerably improve administrative and committee staff performance and be in line with the institutional needs. Support the Training Centre in launching distance/online courses for MPs and staff. Advise the Centre and administration in the process of preparing the upgraded MP induction program for newly-elected parliamentarians in 2020.

Activity 1.4.2. Facilitate the Introduction of Parliamentary Monitoring Methodology

The project will commission desk research on options for parliamentary monitoring indicators, including looking at existing indicators and successful systems in other countries. Based on research, develop a draft methodology to be discussed at a workshop on parliamentary monitoring, organized under the aegis of the Council on Open Governance. Based on the inputs received from different stakeholders during the workshop, finalize the draft methodology for parliamentary monitoring and make available to CSOs for implementation.

Activity 1.4.3. Provide Support in Post-2020 Parliamentary Reform

The project will launch a consultative review of IRP 2019-2020 implementation progress and, based on the diagnostic of areas requiring focus and priority over the next years, support the Parliament in producing an institutional development strategy to be handed over to the 10th Convocation of the Parliament for further follow-up.

In mid-2020, the Project will also conduct an in-depth evaluation of the process of implementation of the 2018 RoP changes, including successes, challenges, lessons learned, areas for improvement.

The document will lay basis for the Parliament to prepare another set of amendments for further improvement of parliamentary procedures and regulations.

OUTCOME 2 - Improved institutional performance of the Supreme Council of Ajara (SCA)

Expected outputs under this outcome will be the following:

Output 2.1. Improved institutional framework and strategic planning at the SCA

Output 2.2. Framework for implementing open governance reforms in the SCA introduced

Output 2.1. Improved institutional framework and strategic planning at the SCA

The elected SCA plays an important role in the governance system in the Autonomous Republic of Ajara. Given the project's experience supporting the Georgian National Parliament, the Supreme Council leadership expressed an interest in benefiting from this knowledge and project technical expertise in order to enhance the Supreme Council's own work and thus strengthen democratic processes in Ajara. Since there has been no prior or current active engagement of the donor community or external projects at the SCA, the project will mostly focus on carrying out the groundwork for continuous institutional development. Correspondingly, the project will undertake the following activities:

Activity 2.1.1. Support the SCA in Strategic Planning Process

The project will undertake a comprehensive needs assessment of the institution to identify gaps and challenges in the functional and operational performance of the SCA. Based on the assessment report, provide support to the SCA in leading an inclusive and consultative process for designing a multi-year Institutional Development Strategy and Action Plan. The plan will define a comprehensive road map for the SCA leadership and staff to implement sustainable institutional reforms, estimate required resources and define a scheme for monitoring and evaluation of progress.

Activity 2.1.2. Facilitate the Implementation of Institutional Reforms and Capacity Building of the SCA

Based on the above Strategy and Action Plan, the project will identify several actions where the Project's support will be instrumental in supporting institutional reform and strengthening. The main focus will be made on streamlining the organizational structure and enhancing administrative capacities.

Output 2.2. Framework for implementing open governance reforms in the SCA introduced

Georgia is one of the unique examples globally, where all branches of government are engaged in the OGP process: Legislature, Executive and Judiciary. It should be mentioned that a number of local governments have also joined the initiative in 2016 (cities: Tbilisi, Batumi, Zugdidi and Akhaltsikhe). Therefore, adherence of the regional legislature, namely the SCA, to the OGP values and principles will contribute to the implementation of the unified system of openness, transparency, accountability and citizen engagement across all governance levels.

The SCA exercises legislative powers and is an important governance institution in the Autonomous Republic. Promotion of the OGP principles will be ensured by replicating the best practices of the Parliament of Georgia, with a particular focus on a so-called 'co-creation' approach with the civil society. The main objective will be to draft and adopt an Openness Action Plan of the SCA. The Project will have a double impact, through building capacities of local CSOs to engage and support the SCA in openness initiatives, as well as monitoring the implementation progress of openness plans.

Considering the above, the Project will undertake the following actions:

Activity 2.2.1. Support the SCA in promoting the open governance principles

The project will work with the SCA to create/institutionalize the working group created on the inter-factional principle and its consultative group composed of local CSOs. Facilitation will be provided in the preparation of the first openness action plan of the SCA and monitoring of its implementation. Meetings and workshops will be organized with the participation of different stakeholders, civil society, youth, women, ethnic and other minorities from rural and urban areas, media to ensure broad discussions and consultative and participatory processes. At the same time, close communication and experience sharing with the Parliament’s Open Governance Council will be ensured. The SCA members’ participation at different OGP-related events locally and internationally will be facilitated for capacity building purposes.

Activity 2.2.2. Provide Capacity Building Support to the Local Constituency and Civil Society in open governance

The project will work with the local citizens and CSOs, to raise their awareness on the OGP initiative and train them on their role and functions in the process. Meetings and workshops with CSOs – members of the Consultative Group of the Parliament’s Open Governance Council – will be facilitated to exchange experience, best practices. All the above will promote the sustainability and institutionalization of the openness reforms locally. The project will use various communication sources including local media coverage and publications/infographics to support the SCA in raising public awareness on OGP and the SCA’s openness action plan and its implementation progress.

The project has defined an appropriate logical framework, as contained in section V, and a M&E system, as contained in section VI. Both will ensure the appropriate delivery of targeted outputs to achieve the expected outcomes and impact of the project, as reflected in the logical framework, which includes relevant indicators, baselines and sources of verification. The project will ensure evidence-based gender-sensitive data collection, analysis and reporting on the basis of the logical framework in order to ascertain progress and achievements on a regular basis, increase gender equality and to inform further review processes upon completion.

3.2. Resources Required to Achieve the Expected Results

The detailed budget of the project is provided in Annex 1.

The total required funding for activities proposed under this project amounts to EUR 1,665,000 including the EU contribution of EUR 1,500,000 and the cost-sharing from the Parliament of Georgia and the SCA in the amount of EUR 147,000 and EUR 18,000 respectively, and divided across different outcomes, visibility and management costs in the following manner:

Outcome	Amount (EUR)
Outcome 1	890,000.00
Outcome 2	169,510.00
Visibility Costs	113,572.94
Management Costs	381,564.00
GMS, EU 7%	98,130.84
TOTAL COST	EUR 1,665,000

Calculations for each outcome reflect the use of all key inputs such as core staff, international and local technical expertise, equipment, goods and services, as well as works (within project components), travel costs, and building partnerships with various stakeholders.

Required material and human resources, are listed below. Respective costs are spelled out in Annex 1 Budget.

In-kind contribution from the Parliament

The Project will have an office in the Parliament of Georgia (8, Rustaveli Avenue, Tbilisi) as an in-kind contribution from the Parliament. Costs related to utilities (electricity, water, heating) and cleaning services will be covered as part of an in-kind contribution.

Project equipment and other project running costs

The Project budget includes the following costs:

- Cost of IT and telecommunication
- Stationery supplies for operation of the office
- Maintenance, insurance, fuel and depreciation costs for a vehicle
- Computer and office equipment purchase
- Costs of travel and field trips for the project activities
- Costs of project communication and visibility activities (as spelled out in the Communication and Visibility Plan)

List of staff directly attributed to the project:

While the section below provides a brief description of the respective positions, section VII on Governance and management arrangements of the project includes a detailed explanation for each; detailed costs per each position are also spelled out in the budget (Annex 1).

1. Project Manager (SB4/MID – 100%) – Programmatic and administrative oversight and internal controls, coordination and supervision of institutional relations with the Project beneficiary institutions, communication and reporting to the EU Delegation
2. Project Administrative Finance Assistant (SB3/MID – 100%) – responsible for technical support in financial, contractual and organisational matters.
3. Project Institutional Development Specialist (SB4/Q1 – 100%) – responsible for project components targeting the beneficiary's institutional development needs. S/he provides support to the Project Manager in all the on-going project planning and implementation activities and is responsible for M&E function for the entire project ensuring compliance to UNDP and EU standards.
4. Project Officer (SB4/MID – 50%) – programmatic and administrative oversight and internal controls for Project Outcome 2, coordination of institutional relations with the SCA, communication and reporting to the Project Manager
5. Project Administrative/Finance Assistant – (SB3/Q1 – 50%) - responsible for technical support in financial, contractual and organisational issues for Project Outcome 2.
6. Project Driver/logistician (SB1/MID - 100%) – responsible for driving project staff to and from different meetings/events and supporting in logistical matters including transportation in regions during implementation of project activities when and as necessary.

7. UNDP Democratic Governance (DG) Team Leader (NoB – 15%) – responsible for quality assurance of the project, supporting the Project Board, facilitating coordination within UNDP, other UN agencies and concerned stakeholders. The DG Team Leader will complete monthly timesheets reflecting actual time spent on the given project.
8. UNDP DG Programme Associate (G6 - 15%) – responsible for providing administrative advice and supporting project implementation from the Country Office. S/he will provide administrative, contractual and reporting related support to ensure compliance of administrative processes with respective UNDP rules and regulations, and the respective Country Office Standard Operational Procedures. The DG Programme Associate will complete monthly timesheets reflecting actual time spent on the given project.
9. UNDP Communications Analyst (NoB – 8%) – provides advice on all communications-related matters and supports the project in the implementation of its Communication and Visibility Plan. S/he also liaises directly with the communications team of the EU Delegation to Georgia. UNDP Communications Analyst will complete monthly timesheets reflecting actual time spent on the given project.

Venues, catering and other logistical arrangements for activities will be sourced with constant attention to prudence and exemplarity in the use of taxpayer's money at times of fiscal constraints, as well as to the carbon print. Public venues will be prioritised over private ones, distance from the usual work places of respective audience will be minimal, and use of five star hotel or resorts will be avoided except in exceptional circumstances duly authorised by the EU Delegation with 2-3 weeks of prior notice.

3.3. Partnerships and Stakeholders

The project's main partners are its primary beneficiaries – **Parliament of Georgia**, more particularly, (1) Members of Parliament from all political and gender groups to ensure balanced representation in project activities, and, (2) Staff of the Parliament from departments and committees with balanced gender representation; and the SCA – its elected members from all political and gender groups and administrative staff with balanced gender representation

Other project stakeholders include the Government officials, civil society and international organizations:

Government representatives will mostly participate in the Project activities, such as meetings and workshops, to ensure close coordination between the Legislative and Executive branches, particularly in the frames of the Parliament's oversight activities.

Recognizing the crucial role of the **civil society** in legislative and decision-making processes in general, the Project will facilitate active engagement of the CSOs in project activities, including through the OGP initiative and Parliament's thematic inquiries, to promote transparency and civil society involvement in the parliamentary processes. Apart from the Project's long-standing partner – IDFI, which implements the project components related to the OGP initiative (both at the Parliament and SCA), the cooperation will unfold with other PMOs as well, such as *Transparency International Georgia*, to improve PMO's capacities in regular monitoring of the Parliament's performance through applying best international methodologies and practices.

Coordination, Complementarities and Synergies with other development partners/projects

Throughout the years, the Parliament of Georgia has received extensive support from different donor and international organizations. Interest has particularly increased in recent years when the Parliament began to make first tangible steps towards its strengthening. In the current constitutional and regulatory context

when the Parliament's role and functions have considerably increased, international development partners are keener to capitalise on developing and enhancing parliamentary democracy in Georgia. UNDP views this as a window of opportunity for different organizations to complement, build upon each other's activities and explore synergies for concrete reform initiatives.

UNDP will ensure active cooperation with the other **EU-funded projects**, including the following:

- **Facility to the Association Agreement, Phase II** has both governmental and parliamentary dimensions, and supports the Legislature in activating its role in the implementation and oversight of the AA and provides capacity building programs in EU legal approximation. Joint initiatives and synergies will be explored in the area of thematic inquiries and PLS that target topics falling under the AA/DCFTA.
- **EU4Economic Governance and Fiscal Accountability Programme** is aimed at reinforcing economic governance and democratic accountability, including strengthening the parliamentary oversight of public finances. In this context, the programme prioritizes on strengthening of the Parliament's Finance and Budget Committee and establishing a full-fledged Public Accounts Committee. The project will ensure regular information exchange with the programme and will specifically coordinate during the review of the RoP with the purpose of advocating for the establishment of a dedicated Public Accounts Committee in the Parliament.
- **EU4Security, Accountability and Fight against Crime in Georgia (SAFE) Programme** contributes to increasing the security of the Georgian citizens by strengthening good governance and the rule of law, *inter alia*, through enhancing the oversight over the security sector. In that regard, the programme aims to improve capacities and coordination among the Parliament, Public Defender's Office and State Audit Office. Complementarities with the programme activities will be ensured, particularly while providing capacity building support to the Parliament's Defence and Security Committee and the Trust Group.
- **Support to the Public Administration Reform in Georgia Programme** contributes to the implementation of large-scale PAR reforms in the country. The project will coordinate with the programme as required on matters pertaining to the PAR and capacity building of civil servants.
- **INTER PARES Parliaments in Partnership** is a EU global programme to improve the functioning of parliaments in partner countries, by enhancing their legislative, oversight, representative, budgetary and administrative functions.¹³ If feasible, the project will coordinate with the programme in the areas related to the exchange of experience with the EU member states' parliaments with a focus on professional development of the staff of the Parliament. Synergies could be explored while organizing inter-parliamentary workshops and conferences on the issues related to the on-going institutional reforms in the Parliament of Georgia.

UNDP will continue its active cooperation with the **National Democratic Institute (NDI)** both in the frames of the Parliament's OGP-related activities, as well as in building capacities of the Parliament's Training Centre where the NDI is a leading development partner. Together with **NDI** and **USAID Good Governance Initiative (GGI)** programs, the Training Centre will be once again supported in the implementation of an innovative MP Induction Program for the newly-elected parliamentarians in 2020.

Close coordination and complementarity of initiatives will be ensured with **USAID GGI** which also provides support to selected parliamentary committees in the process of thematic inquiries and post-legislative

¹³ The Parliament of Georgia may be considered as a beneficiary of the global programme.

scrutiny. A coherent approach will be ensured in the process through using the same methodologies and guidebooks (*Guide on Thematic Inquiries* prepared by UNDP/WFD/Swedish Government; *Guide on PLS*, prepared by USAID GGI/WFD).

Along with the NDI and USAID GGI, the project will cooperate with the **GIZ programs** that work on Parliament's administrative capacity building as well as in implementing some of the openness initiatives directed at citizen engagement in budgetary processes.

The project will partner and coordinate with most of the above-mentioned donor organizations/projects, particularly **USAID GGI** and **NDI**, while providing comprehensive institutional and capacity building support to the newly-established Parliamentary Research Centre which is currently one of the priority reform areas for the Parliament.

The project will also closely cooperate with three other projects from the UNDP Democratic Governance Portfolio. The first one – **UNDP Governance Reform Fund (GRF)** (*funded by the Swedish Government*) has already engaged with the Parliament through several initiatives, including the piloting of the thematic inquiries at the Environmental Protection and Natural Resources Committee, developing the Green Parliament Concept, and building capacities of Parliament security personnel to interact with persons with special needs (the deaf).

The second – **UNDP PAR** – project (*funded by UK Aid*) is currently supporting the Administration of Georgia in developing the *Policy Planning Guide* to support the Government across all of its ministries in evidence-based policy planning. The EU-UNDP project will explore synergies with the PAR project to raise awareness of the Parliament on the policy planning cycle, and its principles and standards, which will be instrumental for raising policy-making capacities in the Parliament and increasing their capacities to monitor the implementation of different state/Government policy documents.

The third project – **UN Joint Programme for Gender Equality, Phase II** (*funded by the Swedish Government*) has already engaged with the Parliament through several initiatives, including two thematic inquiries (“access to the state-funded programmes for women’s economic empowerment” and “women’s access to vocational education in Georgia”), led by the Parliament’s Gender Equality Council. UNJP has been strengthening the Gender Equality Council since 2012. The EU-UNDP project will explore synergies with the UNJP in supporting the Training Centre and newly established Parliamentary Research Centre.

Finally, apart from bilateral coordination and partnerships, UNDP through the EU-UNDP project will continue participating in the **technical donor coordination meetings** organized by the Head of Speaker’s Cabinet jointly with the Secretary General. Those take place on a regular basis (mostly quarterly) to exchange information on the implemented and planned activities of different organizations covering the parliamentary dimension, in order to avoid overlaps, explore possible synergies and join efforts for joint interventions. Meetings also serve to inform the donor supported projects on the Parliament’s emerging needs and planned initiatives.

3.4. Risks Analysis

Management of operational risks and assumptions will be delivered through the construction and regular updating of risks and issues logs, escalation of identified gaps in performance, performance reporting, minutes of meetings and Project Board and an adequately skilled and fully resourced project management function. Detailed list of risks and measures of their mitigation is presented in the Risk Log below:

P = probability; I = Impact; Scores are based on a scale from 1 (low) to 4 (high).

#	Description	Date Identified	Type	Probability & Impact	Countermeasures / Management response	Owner
1	Preparations for 2020 Parliamentary Elections prevents MPs' active engagement in and commitment to Project activities during spring-fall 2020	March 2019	Political	P = 4 I = 3	Focus will be directed at staff capacity building, production of strategic documents at administrative level and preparations for newly-elected Parliament (induction programs, materials, etc.)	Project Manager/ Project Team
2	Newly-elected MPs are reluctant to engage and follow up on the reforms implemented by the previous Parliament	March 2019	Political	P = 2 I = 3	UNDP will communicate advantages of the project activities to the Parliament. For better results, the so-called 'reform-minded' MPs (incl. those who also served in the 9 th convocation) will be identified to champion the process and encourage their colleagues to engage. MP induction program will be also instrumental in MPs' awareness-raising on their role and functions. If the problem persists, UNDP CO will communicate challenges to parliamentary leadership to find more effective solutions.	UNDP Country Office Project Manager/ Project Team
3	Inadequate staffing in parliamentary committees and some of the departments prevents implementation of concrete project activities	March 2019	Operational	P = 3 I = 3	UNDP will communicate the challenge with the parliamentary leadership and explain the importance of efficient and skilled staff to strengthen the organization and carry out important reforms. Where possible, the most capable staff members will be identified, and support provided. If the problem persists, UNDP will redirect its resources to similar activities but involving different structures (e.g. Open Governance Council and/or Citizen Engagement Centre instead of the Communications Department)	UNDP Country Office Project Manager/ Project Team
4	Donors concentrate and provide support mostly to those committees and departments that are willing to engage in different initiatives.	March 2019	Operational	P = 4 I = 2	UNDP will ensure close coordination with the donor community on regular basis to avoid such overlaps and/or explore possibilities for joint activities.	UNDP Country Office Project Manager/ Project Team

#	Description	Date Identified	Type	Probability & Impact	Countermeasures / Management response	Owner
	Having just a few active beneficiaries, limits the area of operation for donors and results in overlap of their activities as all of them focus on the same structures.					

3.5. Knowledge Products

Some of the specific knowledge products that will be produced by the project include:

- Parliament’s Guide to the Legislative Process
- Video tutorial on explanatory notes
- Parliamentary Research Centre Strategy and Action Plan
- Distance/e-learning program for MPs and staff
- Paper on Relations between the Parliament and independent state institutions
- Open Parliament Action Plan for 2020-2021
- Comparative study on constituency outreach and concept paper for the Parliament of Georgia
- Parliament’s Communications Strategy and Action Plan
- Citizen Guide on Legislative Engagement
- Mini guide on social media content generation
- Training materials for MPs and staff, including updated MP Induction Program curricula
- Assessment report on the implementation of 2018 RoP
- Parliament’s institutional development strategy for the 10th Convocation
- Parliamentary Monitoring Methodology
- Institutional Development Strategy and Action Plan of Ajara Supreme Council

3.6. Sustainability and Exit Strategy

The Parliament of Georgia has received support from various donors, including the European Union, over a number of years. The Parliament’s strengthening, facilitated through this support, is evident both in the expansion of its constitutional responsibilities and in the leading role the parliament plays in international parliamentary organizations, including its global leadership in the open parliament movement. At the same time, there are clear reasons and justifications for support. Despite its advances, Georgia remains a young democracy, and democratic processes are not yet fully institutionalized. Although elections are well-managed, the ‘rules of the game’ are not always agreed or observed. The country has recently undergone a major constitutional transformation towards a parliamentary republic, and the support being provided through this project will help assure that this transformation is successful.

The support is geared towards sustainability. Where in the past, the Parliament has often relied on outside support to enhance capacities and sometimes to carry out core functions, the proposed project is closely aligned with the Parliament’s multi-year Institutional Reform Strategy. The Strategy is itself based on internalizing and institutionalizing Parliament’s functional responsibilities, including in strengthening of human resources development through the enhanced Training Centre, and the improvement of research support to Parliament through the new Research Centre. Further, the project will foster supportive relationships with European member state parliaments that are intended to continue beyond the project support phase, integrating the Parliament of Georgia into the informal ecosystem of mutual support among European parliaments.

The project exit strategy is built from the sustainability strategy. The Parliament of Georgia, with external support, has put in place the framework necessary for continued development and reform without ongoing development assistance. The key features fostering autonomous growth and development include:

1. The Constitutional framework of the Parliamentary Republic in which Parliament is vested with the necessary Constitutional powers to act as an effective counterbalance to the Executive;
2. The new RoP that provide the procedural mechanisms allowing the operationalization of the new Constitutional powers;
3. The revised IRP of 2019-2020 and a follow-up Institutional Development Strategy for 2020-2024 that define and provide a reform roadmap for the institutional reforms necessary so that MPs receive technical and professional support they require to effectively carry out their functions;
4. The establishment of the new Research Centre that will enable the Parliament to make decisions based on quality independent research necessary for effective legislative scrutiny and parliamentary oversight of the executive;
5. An upgraded Training Centre that provides staff training and skills enhancement corresponding with the Parliament's needs;
6. A communications and dialogue strategy that enables the institution to effectively communicate its work to Georgian citizens, and to engage citizens and civil society constructively in the policy process.
7. Technical donor coordination mechanism has been established and run by Head of Speaker's Cabinet jointly with Secretary General of the Parliament.

Once these elements are in place, Parliament will be equipped for self-directed development, assuming a continued reform oriented Parliamentary leadership after 2020 and the stability of political vision. The project exit strategy is therefore focused on supporting the institutionalization of the new parliamentary functions. In the past phase, the project supported the revision of the RoP, the development of a first phase of the IRP, and the developmental work on the new Research Centre. The upgrading of the Training Centre is also underway under the committed leadership of the Secretary General and the support of NDI and other international partners.

The new project is also aligned with the revised IRP, and thus supporting the Parliament's own priorities which are to strengthen the new parliamentary structures and processes. The outcome of this support to the comprehensive reform process will be that the developmental functions that have in the past been outsourced to some extent to external internationally-funded projects such as the EU-UNDP Strengthening the System of Parliamentary Democracy in Georgia project, will be rooted in-house, with a development orientation, framed by a nationally-directed strategic development approach, and with leadership vested in the political and administrative leadership of Parliament.

The new Research Centre will assume a policy scrutiny and innovation role, again as an in-house body. The training centre will work with the Secretary General and the Human Resources Department to align courses offered and training services provided including based on the IRP. Finally, through the leadership of the Open Parliament Council, a new communications and dialogue approach will be implemented that will not only help citizens understand Parliament, but also hold Parliament to account, enhancing the external monitoring of the institution and thus replacing accountability to donors with accountability to citizens, as is the case in mature democracies within the European Union and beyond.

IV. PROJECT MANAGEMENT

4.1. Cost Efficiency and Effectiveness

Costs incurred in project implementation will focus only on those actions required to provide support to the Parliament of Georgia and SCA.

To accomplish this, the project will seek to complement and build upon the results of the EU-UN Project “Strengthening the System of Parliamentary Democracy in Georgia”, as well as other EU and UNDP initiatives related to developing parliamentary system of governance in the country and strengthening the functioning of the legislative branch.

The resources will be primarily used for:

- Participatory based planning of technical assistance to the project beneficiaries and effective implementation of the project workplan;
- Effective targeting of beneficiaries by the project resources;
- Proper M&E systems design and functioning.

The Project will closely coordinate with different donor-supported projects and initiatives funded by EU, USAID, GIZ, UK and Swedish governments and others while planning of parliamentary development initiatives and activities for ensuring coherence of institutional reforms and effective synergy in the process.

The Project will be managed in close coordination with the various UNDP Country Office Programme dimensions, particularly within the Democratic Governance portfolio.

All the envisaged project activities will be carried out and results achieved through appropriate use of available resources and value-for-money analysis during all procurement and tendering procedures. Project co-financing by the beneficiary as well as in-kind contribution of office spaces and communal expenses will contribute to the Project’s overall efficiency.

Additional information on project management and staff is available in Sub-Section 3.2 “Resources Required to Achieve the Expected Results” and Section VIII “Governance and Management Arrangements”.

V. RESULTS FRAMEWORK

Intended Outcome as stated in the UN Partnership Strategic Document (UNPSD) 2016-2020/Georgia Country Programme Document (CPD) 2016-2020: Outcome 1. By 2020, expectations of citizens of Georgia for voice, rule of law, public sector reforms, and accountability are met by stronger systems of democratic governance at all levels

Outcome indicators as stated in the CPD 2016-2020: Results and Resources Framework, including baseline and targets:

1/ Worldwide Governance Indicators. *Baseline (2013): Voice and Accountability¹⁴ index 54.5%; Rule of law index 53.6%; Government Effectiveness Index 69.4%; Targets (2020): Voice and Accountability index >60%; Rule of law index >58%; Government Effectiveness Index >72%;* 2. Level of public confidence and satisfaction with legislature, judiciary, democratic system and public service delivery. *Baseline: to be established (2015); Target: to be set based on 2015 baseline;* 3. Seats held by women in parliament and local councils. *Baseline: Parliament 11% (2012); Local councils 11.8% (2014); Target: Parliament 15% (2016) 20% (2020); Local Councils 15% (2017)*

Country Programme Document (CPD) 2016-2020 output indicators/baseline/targets:

1.3.1. Checks and balances improved; *Baseline: Partially satisfactory (2:4 ratio); Target: Satisfactory (3:4 ratio); Source: Assessment reports by international organizations and NGOs*
 1.3.2. Parliamentary decree defines role and assigns human resources to engage in the Open Government Partnership (OGP) framework, including through innovative data collection and citizen engagement; *Baseline: No; Target: Yes; Source: Parliamentary decree on OGP participation*

Applicable Output(s) from the UNDP Strategic Plan 2018-2021: Outcome 2 Accelerate structural transformations for sustainable development/2.2.2 Constitution-making, electoral and parliamentary processes and institutions strengthened to promote inclusion, transparency and accountability

Project title and Atlas Project Number: Consolidating Parliamentary Democracy in Georgia, Project: 00113526/Output: 00111651

	Results Chain	Objectively verifiable/Indicators of achievement	Baseline (April 2019)	Target (June 2022)	Sources and means of verification	Assumptions & Risks
Impact	Democratic governance in Georgia improved	(a) Democratic governance rate at national level (b) Georgia Nationalized SDG indicator 16.6.2.3 Voice and Accountability Index (c) Georgia Nationalized SDG indicator 16.7.2 Rate of population that thinks that decision-making process is inclusive and rapid	(a) In Freedom House Country Report for 2018, Georgia scored 5.50 for National Democratic Governance (b) 2015: 55% (c) To be measured after the development of a methodology at global level	(a) Increase to <6.50 (b) & (c) TBD	(a) Freedom House Country Report www.freedomhouse.org (b) & (c) Georgia SDG implementation progress report (data aggregated through SDG tracker)	N/A

¹⁴ Also refers to measurement progress in outcome 2. By 2020 all living in Georgia - including minorities, people with disabilities, vulnerable women, migrants, internally displaced persons and persons in need of international protection – have trust in and improved access to the justice system, which is child-friendly, enforces national strategies and operates in accordance with United Nations human rights standards.

Outcome	Results Chain	Objectively verifiable/Indicators of achievement	Baseline (April 2019)	Target (June 2022)	Sources and means of verification	Assumptions & Risks
	1. Strengthened parliamentary performance in the new context of constitutional and legislative framework	1.1./ Rate of achievement of IRP 2019-2020 1.2./ Rate of achievement of Open Parliament Action Plans	1.1./ 0% 1.2./ 20% of openness commitments are implemented	1.1./ 70% of strategic goals and objectives 1.2./ 70% of openness commitments are implemented	1.1/ IRP progress review report 1.2/ Open Parliament Action Plans progress reports www.parliament.ge www.transparency.ge	<u>Assumptions:</u> Political system remains stable prior and after the parliamentary elections. The Parliament and SCA engage in the Project's interventions and ensure continuous and smooth level of cooperation. <u>Risks:</u> 2020 Parliamentary elections may, on one hand, raise political temperatures and involve MPs in pre-electoral campaign, thereby slowing down the pace of reforms; on the other hand, the newly-elected lawmakers might be reluctant or not assign priority to reforms thereby preventing their implementation.
	2. Improved institutional performance of the SCA	2.1./ Status of institutional reforms in the SCA 2.2./ Rate of the institutional reforms implemented	2.1./ Strategic framework for institutional reforms is not in place 2.2./ 0%	2.1/ Strategic framework for institutional reforms is in place 2.2/ At least 50% of institutional reforms implemented	2.1/SCA's Institutional Development Strategy 2.2/Strategy implementation review www.sca.ge	

Output	1.1 Evidence-based policy and law-making processes strengthened in the Parliament	1.1.1 Support the Development of Parliament's Policy Making Capacities	1.1.2 Provide Support to Parliamentary Committees and Thematic Rapporteurs
		1.1.1(a) Availability of guidelines on the Parliament's role in legislative process 1.1.1(b) Number of MPs and staff (both men and women) trained on policy-planning standards	1.1.1(a) Parliament's role in legislative process is envisaged under the Constitution and RoP; however, a clear process description paper is required to highlight Parliament's role at each stage of the legislative process 1.1.1(b) 0
		1.1.1(a) Parliament's Guide to the Legislative Process is developed and becomes integral part of the Parliament's training program 1.1.1(b) At least 30 MPs and 60 staff members (with balanced gender representation) trained on policy-planning standards	1.1.1(a) Parliament's Guide to the Legislative Process 1.1.1(b) Training materials, agendas, lists of participants and participants' evaluations
			<u>Assumptions:</u> The parliamentary leadership is committed to strengthen the role of the Parliament in policy and law-making processes. Thematic rapporteurs have their assigned roles and themes and are willing to perform their mandate at full scale. The Research Centre is staffed and operational. <u>Risks:</u> Committee leadership might

	1.1.2(a) Number of committees equipped with skills to effectively perform their policy-making function and engage in legislative process	1.1.2(a) 3 committees have been provided with expertise to perform their policy and law-making function within the frames of the previous EU-UNDP Parliament project	1.1.2(a) At least 6 out of 15 committees equipped with respective skills	1.1.2(a) Draft legislative amendments/concepts/recommendations produced by committees and thematic rapporteurs; training materials, agendas, lists of participants; workshop/study visit reports	attempt to exclude opposition/minority MPs from Project activities. Thematic rapporteurs might not be active or interested in taking lead in different areas of policy and law-making. The interest and demand from MPs/committees toward the new Research Centre might be insufficient.
	1.1.2(b) Percentage of newly-elected MPs and staff (both women and men) trained on the basic principles of diversity and inclusion within and throughout the Parliament's work	1.1.2(b) 0	1.1.2(b) At least 60% of newly-elected MPs and staff are trained	1.1.2(b) Training materials, agendas, lists of participants and participants' evaluations	
	1.1.3 Strengthen Parliamentary Research Centre				
	1.1.3(a) Availability of strategic development vision of the Parliamentary Research Centre	1.1(c) Parliamentary Research Centre is established but not yet operational is not staffed yet and has no strategic development vision	1.1(c) Parliamentary Research Centre development strategy and action plan are produced and applied in practice	1.1.3(a) Parliamentary Research Centre Strategy and action plan	
	1.1.3(b) Availability of knowledgeable and skilled staff (both men and women) to provide high-quality research and analytical services to MPs	1.1.3(b) Research Centre is not yet staffed	1.1.3(b) At least 70% of staff (with balanced gender representation) trained and exposed to best international practices; Staff satisfaction rate is above average	1.1.3(b) Staff satisfaction survey (by MPs); Training, workshop, study visit materials, agendas, lists of participants; workshop/study visit reports	

1.2. Parliament's capacities for the Government oversight increased	1.2.1 Facilitate the process of Thematic Inquiries across Parliamentary Committees			Assumptions:
	1.2.1(a) Number of conducted thematic inquiries and committees supported	1.2.1(a) No thematic inquiries have been supported by the previous EU-UNDP project	1.2.1(a) At least 6 thematic inquiries and at least 4 out of 15 committees supported	Committees assign priority to the exercise of their oversight function. There is also interest in better collaboration with the civil society and independent state institutions to further the oversight role of the Parliament.
	1.2.1(b) Number of CSOs equipped with skills to engage and contribute to thematic inquiries	1.2.1(b) Only information sessions on thematic inquiries (and no trainings) were provided to CSOs within the UNDP GRF project	1.2.1(b) At least 15 CSOs both from Tbilisi and regions trained on thematic inquiries	Risks: Committee leadership might

					evaluations.	attempt to exclude opposition/minority MPs from Project activities. Political changes in the parliamentary leadership and committees might limit the local ownership and sustainability of Project outputs.
1.2.2. Support Parliamentary Committees in PLS						
	1.2.2(a) Number of conducted PLSs and committees supported	1.2.2(a) None	1.2.2(a) At least 4 PLSs and 4 out of 15 committees supported	1.2.2(a) PLSs reports by committees; meeting agendas, media coverage; trainings/study visit reports, agendas		
1.2.3 Improve collaboration between the Parliament an Independent State Institutions						
	1.2.3/ Availability of best international practices of collaboration between the Parliament and independent state institutions	1.2.3/ General framework for collaboration is provided under the Constitution and RoP; more detailed process based on best international practices is required	1.2.3/ Options paper including best international practices is developed and presented to parliamentary leadership	1.2.3/ Options paper		
1.2.4 Support the Improvement of Parliamentary Capacity to Exercise Better Oversight of Security Sector						
	1.2.4(a) Availability of recommendations on codification of military legislation	1.2.4(a) Defence Code of Georgia is currently drafted by the Government	1.2.4(a) Conclusions and recommendations on the draft Code are produced by the Parliament	1.2.4(a) Conclusion /recommendations		
	1.2.4(b) Number of trainings and study visits on best practices in security oversight	1.2.4(b) Trainings/study visits provided in the frames of EU-funded project in 2017-2019	1.2.4(b) At least 4 trainings and 1 study visit implemented	12.4(b) Training, study visit materials, agendas, reports, lists of participants		
1.3. Enhanced public						
1.3.1 Support the Parliament in the implementation of Legislative Openness Reforms						
						Assumptions:

engagement in parliamentary processes through promotion of participatory democracy and open governance principles	<p>1.3.1(a) Availability of 2020-2021/2 Action Plan</p> <p>1.3.1(b) Number of openness commitments implemented</p> <p>1.3.1(c) Availability of information for a full spectrum of citizens on how to engage in parliamentary processes</p> <p>1.3.1(d) Status of engagement of diverse groups (women, ethnic and other minorities, youth from rural and urban areas) enjoying access to the public information on engaging in parliamentary process</p>	<p>1.3.1(a) 2020-2021/2 Action Plan is not yet developed</p> <p>1.3.1(b) None</p> <p>1.3.1(c) 2 types of leaflets available on legislative initiative and citizen petition; no information available to citizens on other Parliament engagement tools</p> <p>1.3.1(d) No disaggregated data is being collected</p>	<p>1.3.1(a) 2020-2021/2 Action Plan adopted</p> <p>1.3.1(b) At least 3 commitments implemented</p> <p>1.3.1(c) Citizen Guide on Legislative Engagement developed and available at the Parliament website, also disseminated during different public outreach meetings in rural and urban areas</p> <p>1.3.1(d) Disaggregated data on citizens engagement is collected demonstrating engagement status</p>	<p>1.3.1(a) Action Plan and Parliament Bureau Resolution on approving the Action Plan www.parliament.ge</p> <p>1.3.1(b) Open Parliament Action Plan</p> <p>Implementation progress reports; strategic documents/legislative amendments www.parliament.ge</p> <p>www.matsne.ge</p> <p>1.3.1(c) Citizen Guide on Legislative Engagement www.parliament.ge</p> <p>1.3.1(d) Disaggregated data</p>	<p>Parliament continues to be committed to legislative openness reforms and views public/citizen engagement as an integral part of its legislative and oversight activities.</p> <p>Risks:</p> <p>Newly-elected MPs do not have openness reforms on their priority agenda; newly-formed Open Governance Council cannot reach cross-party consensus on the reforms to be implemented. Limited staff capacities and insufficient political backing prevent the effective implementation of the communications strategy and action plan.</p>

1.4. Improved institutional effectiveness and efficiency through strategic planning and capacity development initiatives	1.4.1 Provide on demand institutional and capacity building support to the Parliament's administrative and committee staff			<p>Assumptions:</p> <p>Parliament continues to be committed to institutional reforms. Parliament's administrative and committee staff identify their capacity development needs and address the project with respective requests. There's an interest from the Parliament to introduce efficient parliamentary monitoring methodology and CSOs are willing to apply new methodology in practice.</p> <p>Risks:</p> <p>2020 parliamentary elections slow down the implementation of parliamentary reforms, including IRP 2019-2020.</p>
	1.4.1(a) Capacity building programs for administrative and committee staff (both men and women) to aid performance of their duties in the new constitutional and legal framework	1.4.1(b) Availability of distance learning courses	1.4.1(c) Availability of updated MP Induction Program	
	1.4.1(a) Trainings are regularly offered to committee and administrative staff	1.4.1(b) One distance learning course on parliamentary oversight is prepared	1.4.1(c) MP Induction Program is outdated and does not respond to new constitutional and legal framework	
	1.4.2 Facilitate the Introduction of Parliamentary Monitoring Methodology			
	1.4.2 Availability of parliamentary monitoring methodology reflecting best international practices	1.4.2 Parliamentary monitoring methodology used by different CSOs does not comply with best international standards	1.4.2 New Parliamentary monitoring methodology is produced based on best international practices	1.4.2/ Parliamentary monitoring methodology
	1.4.3 Provide support in Post-2020 Parliament Reform			
	1.4.3(a) Rate of implementation of the Parliament's IRP 2019-2020	1.4.3(b) Availability of the Parliament's institutional development strategy for 2020-2024	1.4.3(c) Status of 2018 RoP reform	1.4.4(a) Report on the Implementation progress of IRP 2019-2020 1.4.4(b) Institutional development strategy; Parliament Bureau Resolution www.parliament.ge 1.4.3(c) Evaluation report of 2018 RoP and recommendations
		1.4.4(a) 0%: 2019-2020 IRP is developed and pending approval from Parliament	1.4.4(b) None	
		1.4.3(c) Parliament's RoP were adopted in December 2018 and tested in practice		
			1.4.4(a) At least 70% of IRP 2019-2020 is implemented	
			1.4.4(b) Institutional development strategy is developed	
			1.4.3(c) Evaluation of the application of the RoP conducted and recommendations for possible legislative amendments/adjustments produced	

2.1. Improved institutional framework and strategic planning at the SCA	<p align="center">2.1.1 Support the SCA in Strategic Planning Process</p> <p>2.1.1(a) Availability of the Council's comprehensive needs assessment</p> <p>2.1.1(b) Availability of the Council's Institutional Development Strategy</p> <p>2.1.2 Facilitate the implementation of institutional reforms and capacity building of the SCA</p> <p>2.1.2/ Number of actions under the Council's Institutional Development Strategy implemented</p>				<p>Assumptions: Council is willing and committed to launch institutional reforms and there's a cross-party consensus on the topic.</p> <p>Risks: Different levels of engagement of elected members and administrative staff in strategic planning process; <i>and/or</i> the process is not consultative nor participatory resulting in unrealistic planning and lack of local ownership.</p>
	2.1.1(a) Comprehensive needs assessment report of the Council is produced	2.1.1(a) Comprehensive needs assessment report of the Council is produced	2.1.1(a) Comprehensive needs assessment report of the Council is produced	2.1.1(a) Comprehensive needs assessment report of the Council is produced	
	2.1.1(b) Institutional Development Strategy	2.1.1(b) Institutional Development Strategy of the Council is developed	2.1.1(b) Institutional Development Strategy of the Council is developed	2.1.1(b) Institutional Development Strategy of the Council is developed	
	2.1.2/ 0	2.1.2/ At least 3 actions under the Strategy implemented	2.1.2/ At least 3 actions under the Strategy implemented	2.1.2/ Evaluation/ assessment reports	
2.2. Framework for implementing open governance reforms in the SCA introduced	<p align="center">2.2.1 Support the SCA in ensuring an institutional framework for open governance reforms</p> <p>2.2.1(a) Availability of a dedicated body in the SCA to undertake open governance reforms</p> <p>2.2.1(b) Availability of openness action plan</p> <p>2.2.2 Provide Capacity Building support to the local civil society on open governance</p> <p>2.2.2/ Awareness of local CSOs on OGP initiative and their role in the process</p>				<p>Assumptions: Council is willing and committed to launch openness reforms and there's a cross-party consensus on the topic. Council is also ready to closely cooperate with the local CSOs in the process.</p> <p>Risks: There is limited understanding of the importance and benefits of openness reforms; Local CSOs lack capacities to efficiently contribute into the process.</p>
	2.2.1(a) No special body assigned in the Council on openness topics	2.2.1(a) A special body/working group created in the Council to implement and monitor OGP-related reforms	2.2.1(a) A special body/working group created in the Council to implement and monitor OGP-related reforms	2.2.1(a) Working group charter	
	2.2.1(b) None	2.2.1(b) Openness action plan developed by the Council	2.2.1(b) Openness action plan developed by the Council	2.2.1(b) Openness Action Plan	
	2.2.2/ None	2.2.2/ At least 5 local CSOs trained on OGP initiative to effectively engage with the Council's OGP-related work	2.2.2/ At least 5 local CSOs trained on OGP initiative to effectively engage with the Council's OGP-related work	2.2.2/ Workshop reports, training materials, agendas, participants' lists and evaluations	

VI. MONITORING AND EVALUATION (M&E)

M&E of the project will be conducted using the project-specific logical framework attached to the present document. Reporting shall be made on the results at impact, outcome and output levels, linked to sources of verification presented in the logical framework. Reporting to the donor (EU) will be carried out through Interim Progress and Final Reports and done through EU projects monitoring platform OPSYS, when available to UN organisations. The results framework may be revised for further streamlining by the parties; with that in view, for the better quality of the logical framework and indicators, it is encouraged to get familiar with DG NEAR guidelines on Indicators - P. 45 and the EU Results Framework. Wherever an indicator set out in the project logical framework is also reflected in the EU Results Framework, project reporting will also mention that.

Reporting will be based on evidence-based data collected and analysed using the internal M&E system, and, when relevant, other reliable sources of information. The project M&E system will be completed during the assessment phase, on the basis of the above Results Framework, including the establishment of a robust baseline and the regular collection and analysis of evidence-based data and other information relevant to M&E purposes. On this basis, the project will submit annual progress reports. Reporting will be based on progress as per annual implementation work plans, to be submitted and approved by the Project Board.

The project will support the establishment of the mechanisms required for regular collection, analysis and reporting of evidence-based statistical data, including trainings and other incentives, equipment and complementary materials including baselines/endlines, dedicated research, surveys, needs assessments, results snapshots, lessons learned initiatives, study tours, field and exchange visits, ad hoc evaluations and others. The results of regular monitoring activities and lesson learned will be used to initiate changes during the project implementation to achieve the intended results. The project M&E will introduce ad-hoc/quick assessments, needs and capacity assessments and monitoring exercises to be regularly updated. For this purpose, dedicated M&E tools will ensure that specific info is available on the support and the impact of the project considering gender aspects, youth, people with disabilities, ethnic and other minority groups.

Close to its end the project will commission external final evaluation in order to measure project achievements, assess sustainability of its results, identify best practices and provide recommendations that may be used in the future programming.

Monitoring Activity	Purpose	Frequency	Expected Action	Partners (if joint)	Cost (if any)
Track results progress	Progress data against the results indicators in the Results Framework will be collected and analysed to assess the progress of the project in achieving the agreed outputs.	Annually, or in the frequency required for each indicator.	Slower than expected progress will be addressed by project management.		
Monitor and manage risk	Identify specific risks that may threaten achievement of intended results. Identify and monitor risk management actions using a risk log. This includes monitoring measures and plans that may have been required as per UNDP's Social and Environmental Standards. Audits will be conducted in accordance with UNDP's	Quarterly	Risks are identified by project management and actions are taken to manage risk. The risk log is actively maintained to keep track of identified risks and actions taken.		

Monitoring Activity	Purpose	Frequency	Expected Action	Partners (if joint)	Cost (if any)
	audit policy to manage financial risk.				
Learn	Knowledge, good practices and lessons will be captured regularly, as well as actively sourced from other projects and partners and integrated back into the project.	At least annually	Relevant lessons are captured by the project team and used to inform management decisions.		
Annual project quality assurance	The quality of the project will be assessed against UNDP's quality standards to identify project strengths and weaknesses and to inform management decision making to improve the project.	Annually	Areas of strength and weakness will be reviewed by project management and used to inform decisions to improve project performance.	Project Board Members	
Review and make course corrections	Internal review of data and evidence from all monitoring actions to inform decision making.	At least annually	Performance data, risks, lessons and quality will be discussed by the Project Board and used to make course corrections.		
Project reporting	Annual progress briefings will be presented to the Project Board and key stakeholders, consisting of progress data showing the results achieved against pre-defined annual targets at the output level, the annual project quality rating summary, an updated risk log with mitigation measures, and any evaluation or review reports prepared over the period. Progress and final reports will be submitted to the donor (EU) in line with Article 3 of the EU contract's General Conditions. The Project Board will hold annual meetings, beside ad-hoc meetings as necessary:	Annually (interim reports, payments), and final report (closure)	Annual progress reports and work plans for the following periods should be submitted at least one week in advance to the Project Board annual review meetings		
Project review (Project Board)	- for regular project review, guidance and decision making against annual operational (progress) reports submitted at least one week in advance to the meetings, including review annual work plans for the next periods to ensure implementation is on track, correct deviations if necessary, and ensure realistic budgeting over the life of the project.	Annually	Review, guidance and decision-making on project planning, implementation, M&E. Any quality concerns or slower than expected progress should be discussed by the Project Board and management actions agreed to address the issues identified.	Project Board members	

Evaluation Plan

Evaluation Title	Planned Completion Date	Key Evaluation Stakeholders	Cost and Source of Funding
Final Project Evaluation	September-2022	EU, Parliament	USD 15,000/Project budget

VII. MULTI-YEAR WORK PLAN

Outcomes, Outputs, Activities		2019				2020				2021				2022			
		IV	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III
Outcome 1. Strengthened parliamentary performance in the new context of constitutional and legislative framework																	
Output 1.1. Evidence-based policy and law-making processes strengthened in the Parliament																	
Activities																	
1.1.1	Support the Development of Parliament's Policy-Making Capacities		X			X			X			X			X		X
1.1.2	Provide Support to Parliamentary Committees and Thematic Rapporteurs		X			X			X			X			X		X
1.1.3	Support the Strengthening of the Parliamentary Research Centre		X			X			X			X			X		
Output 1.2. Parliament's capacities for the Government oversight increased																	
Activities																	
1.2.1	Facilitate the Process of Thematic Inquiries across Parliamentary Committees		X			X			X			X			X		X
1.2.2	Support Parliamentary Committees in PLS		X			X			X			X			X		X
1.2.3	Improve Collaboration between the Parliament and Independent State Institutions		X			X			X								
1.2.4	Support Improvement of Parliamentary Capacity to Exercise Better Oversight of Security Sector		X			X			X			X					
Output 1.3. Enhanced public engagement in parliamentary processes through promotion of participatory democracy and open governance principles																	
Activities																	
1.3.1	Support the Parliament in the Implementation of Legislative Openness Reforms		X			X			X			X			X		X
1.3.2	Support the Improvement of the Parliament's Communications Capacities		X			X			X			X			X		
1.3.3	Facilitate the Introduction of Post-2020 Constituency Outreach Framework		X			X			X			X			X		

Outcomes, Outputs, Activities		2019				2020				2021				2022			
		IV	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III	IV	I	II	III
Output 1.4. Improved institutional effectiveness and efficiency through strategic planning and capacity development initiatives																	
Activities																	
1.4.1	Provide on demand institutional and capacity building support to the Parliament's administrative and committee staff.		X		X		X		X		X		X		X		X
1.4.2	Facilitate the Introduction of Parliamentary Monitoring Methodology		X		X												
1.4.3	Provide Support in Post-2020 Parliamentary Reform	X	X		X		X										
Outcome 2. Improved institutional performance of the SCA																	
Output 2.1: Improved institutional framework and strategic planning at the SCA																	
Activities																	
2.1.1	Support the SCA in Strategic Planning Process		X		X												
2.1.2	Facilitate the Implementation of Institutional Reforms and Capacity Building of the SCA				X		X				X				X		X
Output 2.2: Framework for implementing open governance reforms in the SCA introduced																	
Activities																	
2.2.1	Support the SCA in ensuring an institutional framework for open governance reforms	X	X		X		X		X		X		X		X		X
2.2.2	Provide Capacity Building Support to the Local Civil Society on open governance	X	X		X		X		X		X		X		X		X
Implementation of Visibility and Communication Plan*																	
	Project launch																
	Project closing																X
	PROJECT MANAGEMENT, M&E	X	X		X		X		X		X		X		X		X
	Management, monitoring, reporting	X	X		X		X		X		X		X		X		X

VIII. GOVERNANCE AND MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

7.1. Governance arrangements

Acknowledging the importance of national leadership and ownership of the donor-funded interventions for achieving tangible results and guaranteeing sustainability of project outputs, the project will be implemented by the Parliament with UNDP full CO Support to National Implementation Modality (NIM). While UNDP will be responsible for the execution of all the project activities and provision of inputs, including implementation of all support services and management of all project funds, the Parliament will be engaged in project activity planning and implementation. The Parliament will be also responsible for resource mobilisation activities as planned and required.

UNDP will undertake overall supervisory and quality assurance role in the project implementation and will use its convening powers where and when necessary.

While the overall implementation of the Project rests with the UNDP, a number of preliminarily defined activities will be carried out in cooperation with the project's responsible parties/grant beneficiaries IDFI and WFD. Both organizations have been selected based on the successful cooperation within the frames of the EU-UNDP Project "Strengthening the System of Parliamentary Democracy in Georgia" and their significant contribution to the project results. At the same time, both organizations are well established, including internationally as they possess demonstrated knowledge and expertise in their respective fields of activity. More specifically:

- IDFI is a Georgian NGO founded in 2009 with the goal to improve government openness, access to information, transparency and accountability. It is the leading civil society organization with strong expertise in OGP work and a supporter of Georgia's engagement in the OGP Initiative both at executive and legislative levels. IDFI Director Giorgi Kldiashvili has been successfully leading the Consultative Group of the Permanent Parliamentary Council on Open Governance since 2015; moreover, in 2017, he has been elected as a CSO member of the global OGP Steering Committee. IDFI has greatly contributed to the establishment of robust cooperation between the Council and its Consultative Group comprised of civil society and international organizations; its role has been also critical in the successful implementation of openness reforms in the Parliament.
- WFD is a UK-based organization dedicated to supporting democracy around the world. It is also a constituent member of the European Partnership for Democracy (EPD), the Brussels-based umbrella organisation for European democracy assistance organisations. Established over 25 years ago, the WFD has a long history of managing parliamentary strengthening programmes globally, including in Georgia. Holding deep knowledge of the Westminster parliamentary practices, ability to mobilize strong expertise in the field and excellent knowledge of the local context is a valuable asset of the organization. Relevant to the current project scope (and as mentioned in the above sections), WFD has supported the Parliament of Georgia to pilot its first ever thematic inquiry and PLS. As part of this support, the organization prepared special guidebooks which are the main methodological documents for the Parliament of Georgia in these areas.

In view of the above, **IDFI** will continue implementing the components of the Project related to open governance both at the Parliament and SCA levels. The organization will cover the following activities under *Outcomes 1 and 2*:

- *Activity 1.3.1 – Support the Parliament in the implementation of legislative openness reforms;*
- *Activity 2.2.1 – Support the SCA in ensuring an institutional framework for open governance reforms; and*
- *Activity 2.2.2 – Provide capacity building support to the local civil society on open governance.*

As for **WFD**, it will cover the below listed two activities under the *Outcome 1* which are directly related to sharing of the Westminster practices of undertaking thematic inquiries and PLS – two powerful oversight mechanisms originating in the Westminster Parliament and introduced in the Parliament of Georgia under the newly-adopted RoP:

- *Activity 1.2.1 – Facilitate the process of thematic inquiries across parliamentary committees; and*
- *Activity 1.2.2 – Support parliamentary committees in PLS.*

Pursuant to the Full Support to NIM framework, the **National Project Director (NPD)** is a senior official of the Parliament. Currently, the relevant role will be assumed by the Head of Cabinet of the Speaker of the Parliament

The Project will be coordinated by a **Project Board** composed of representatives from EU, UNDP and the Parliament. Local and international organizations mentioned above will be invited to the Project Board meetings as a regular practice. A proposed structure is presented in the chart below. The Project Board is expected to provide overall guidance and decision-making support during all phases of project implementation and will grant final approval on sub-grants in case the grant is not incorporated in the project documentation. The Project Board is proposed to meet annually, although meetings could be called by any of the members at any time to discuss any particular issue of concern. The first Project Board shall be held within three months after the project launch.

The project shall be implemented in Tbilisi and in Chakvi, Ajara with the overall effect for the whole territory of Georgia.

7.2 Management arrangements

The key project management functions will be performed by the *Project Manager*. In particular, the *Project Manager* will be in charge of:

- *Administrative oversight and internal controls*, in procurement, recruitment, financial management, administration and human resources processes will be exercised by the Project Manager with a respective management experience and a solid understanding of UNDP procedures. The Manager will be responsible to ensure that project implementation is in line

with the conditions set forth through the EU-UNDP agreement, and all UNDP rules and regulations are respected throughout project implementation

- *Coordination and supervision of institutional relations with the project beneficiary and other stakeholders* to ensure timely and appropriate institutional ownership and engagement in the planning and implementation of the project activities
- *Representational tasks* of the project
- *Communication and reporting to the EU Delegation.*

The *Project Manager* will be accountable to the Project Board for achievement of the project objectives. Internally within UNDP, the project manager will report to UNDP DG Team Leader.

In addition, as part of the Project Core Team, UNDP will engage an *Institutional Development Specialist* (for the whole project) and a *Project Specialist* (for Outcome 2; based in Ajara). *Project support staff*, including Administrative/Finance specialists and driver/logistician, will support implementation of all project outputs.

Local and international consultants will provide technical expertise to the beneficiaries in different areas covered by the Project. High-level advisers will be invited on an ad-hoc basis to provide overall guidance and policy advice to the Parliamentary leadership on key aspects of on-going institutional and legislative reforms and initiatives. Where needed, the Project will also engage local and international organizations to provide expertise and facilitate implementation of concrete components under the Project.

UNDP DG Team Leader will provide quality assurance for financial matters and reporting and advice project personnel on financial, administrative and reporting procedures.

UNDP Programme Associate will be responsible for providing administrative advice and supporting project implementation from the Country Office.

UNDP Communications Analyst will provide advice on all communications-related matters and supports the project in the implementation of its Communication and Visibility Plan.

UNDP Country Office will support the project in the following areas: human resources management services, financial services, procurement and contracting services as well as with logistics and administration.

Project Board

Senior Beneficiaries:
Parliament of Georgia
Supreme Council of Ajara

Senior Supplier:
EU Delegation to Georgia

Co-Suppliers:
Parliament of Georgia
Supreme Council of Ajara

Executive:
UNDP Georgia

Project Assurance:
UNDP DG Team Leader
UNDP Country Office

Project Manager

Project Support:
Institutional Development Specialist
Admin/Finance Assistant
Driver/Logistician
Project Specialist (Outcome 2)
Admin/Finance Assistant (Outcome 2)

Local and international organizations/ companies

Local and international consultants

IX. LEGAL CONTEXT

This project document shall be the instrument referred to as such in Article 1 of the Standard Basic Assistance Agreement between the government of Georgia and UNDP, signed on 1-Jul-1994. All references in the Standard Basic Assistance Agreement (SBAA) to "Executing Agency" shall be deemed to refer to "Implementing Partner."

The project will be implemented by the Parliament of Georgia ("Implementing partner") in accordance with its financial regulations, rules, practices and procedures only to the extent that they do not contravene the principles of the Financial Regulations and Rules of UNDP. Where the financial governance of an Implementing Partner does not provide the required guidance to ensure best value for money, fairness, integrity, transparency, and effective international competition, the financial governance of UNDP shall apply.

X. RISK MANAGEMENT

1. Consistent with the Article III of the SBAA, the responsibility for the safety and security of the Implementing Partner and its personnel and property, and of UNDP's property in the Implementing Partner's custody, rests with the Implementing Partner. To this end, the Implementing Partner shall:
 - a) put in place an appropriate security plan and maintain the security plan, considering the security situation in the country where the project is being carried;
 - b) assume all risks and liabilities related to the Implementing Partner's security, and the full implementation of the security plan.
2. UNDP reserves the right to verify whether such a plan is in place, and to suggest modifications to the plan when necessary. Failure to maintain and implement an appropriate security plan as required hereunder shall be deemed a breach of the Implementing Partner's obligations under this Project Document.
3. The Implementing Partner agrees to undertake all reasonable efforts to ensure that no UNDP funds received pursuant to the Project Document are used to provide support to individuals or entities associated with terrorism and that the recipients of any amounts provided by UNDP hereunder do not appear on the list maintained by the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999). The list can be accessed via http://www.un.org/sc/committees/1267/qa_sanctions_list.shtml. This provision must be included in all sub-contracts or sub-agreements entered under/further to this Project Document.
4. Consistent with UNDP's Programme and Operations Policies and Procedures, social and environmental sustainability will be enhanced through application of the UNDP Social and Environmental Standards (<http://www.undp.org/ses>) and related Accountability Mechanism (<http://www.undp.org/secu-srm>).
5. The Implementing Partner shall: (a) conduct project and programme-related activities in a manner consistent with the UNDP Social and Environmental Standards, (b) implement any management or mitigation plan prepared for the project or programme to comply with such standards, and (c) engage in a constructive and timely manner to address any concerns and complaints raised through the Accountability Mechanism. UNDP will seek to ensure that communities and other project stakeholders are informed of and have access to the Accountability Mechanism.
6. All signatories to the Project Document shall cooperate in good faith with any exercise to evaluate any programme or project-related commitments or compliance with the UNDP Social and Environmental Standards. This includes providing access to project sites, relevant personnel, information, and documentation.
7. Consistent with the Article III of the SBAA *[or the Supplemental Provisions to the Project Document]*, the responsibility for the safety and security of the Implementing Partner and its personnel and property, and of UNDP's property in the Implementing Partner's custody, rests with the Implementing Partner. To this end, the Implementing Partner shall:
 - c) put in place an appropriate security plan and maintain the security plan, taking into account the security situation in the country where the project is being carried;
 - d) assume all risks and liabilities related to the Implementing Partner's security, and the full implementation of the security plan.
8. UNDP reserves the right to verify whether such a plan is in place, and to suggest modifications to the plan when necessary. Failure to maintain and implement an appropriate security plan as required hereunder shall be deemed a breach of the Implementing Partner's obligations under this Project Document.
9. The Implementing Partner agrees to undertake all reasonable efforts to ensure that no UNDP funds received pursuant to the Project Document are used to provide support to individuals or entities associated with terrorism and that the recipients of any amounts provided by UNDP hereunder do not appear on the list maintained by the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999). The list can be accessed via http://www.un.org/sc/committees/1267/qa_sanctions_list.shtml.

10. Social and environmental sustainability will be enhanced through application of the UNDP Social and Environmental Standards (<http://www.undp.org/ses>) and related Accountability Mechanism (<http://www.undp.org/secu-srm>).
11. The Implementing Partner shall: (a) conduct project and programme-related activities in a manner consistent with the UNDP Social and Environmental Standards, (b) implement any management or mitigation plan prepared for the project or programme to comply with such standards, and (c) engage in a constructive and timely manner to address any concerns and complaints raised through the Accountability Mechanism. UNDP will seek to ensure that communities and other project stakeholders are informed of and have access to the Accountability Mechanism.
12. All signatories to the Project Document shall cooperate in good faith with any exercise to evaluate any programme or project-related commitments or compliance with the UNDP Social and Environmental Standards. This includes providing access to project sites, relevant personnel, information, and documentation.
13. The Implementing Partner will take appropriate steps to prevent misuse of funds, fraud or corruption, by its officials, consultants, responsible parties, subcontractors and sub-recipients in implementing the project or using UNDP funds. The Implementing Partner will ensure that its financial management, anti-corruption and anti-fraud policies are in place and enforced for all funding received from or through UNDP.
14. The requirements of the following documents, then in force at the time of signature of the Project Document, apply to the Implementing Partner: (a) UNDP Policy on Fraud and other Corrupt Practices and (b) UNDP Office of Audit and Investigations Investigation Guidelines. The Implementing Partner agrees to the requirements of the above documents, which are an integral part of this Project Document and are available online at www.undp.org.
15. In the event that an investigation is required, UNDP has the obligation to conduct investigations relating to any aspect of UNDP projects and programmes. The Implementing Partner shall provide its full cooperation, including making available personnel, relevant documentation, and granting access to the Implementing Partner's (and its consultants', responsible parties', subcontractors' and sub-recipients') premises, for such purposes at reasonable times and on reasonable conditions as may be required for the purpose of an investigation. Should there be a limitation in meeting this obligation, UNDP shall consult with the Implementing Partner to find a solution.
16. The signatories to this Project Document will promptly inform one another in case of any incidence of inappropriate use of funds, or credible allegation of fraud or corruption with due confidentiality.

Where the Implementing Partner becomes aware that a UNDP project or activity, in whole or in part, is the focus of investigation for alleged fraud/corruption, the Implementing Partner will inform the UNDP Resident Representative/Head of Office, who will promptly inform UNDP's Office of Audit and Investigations (OAI). The Implementing Partner shall provide regular updates to the head of UNDP in the country and OAI of the status of, and actions relating to, such investigation.

17. *Option 1:* UNDP shall be entitled to a refund from the Implementing Partner of any funds provided that has been used inappropriately, including through fraud or corruption, or otherwise paid other than in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Project Document. Such amount may be deducted by UNDP from any payment due to the Implementing Partner under this or any other agreement. Recovery of such amount by UNDP shall not diminish or curtail the Implementing Partner's obligations under this Project Document.

Where such funds have not been refunded to UNDP, the Implementing Partner agrees that donors to UNDP (including the government) whose funding is the source, in whole or in part, of the funds for the activities under this Project Document, may seek recourse to the Implementing Partner for the recovery of any funds

determined by UNDP to have been used inappropriately, including through fraud or corruption, or otherwise paid other than in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Project Document.

Note: The term "Project Document" as used in this clause shall be deemed to include any relevant subsidiary agreement further to the Project Document, including those with responsible parties, subcontractors and sub-recipients.

18. Each contract issued by the Implementing Partner in connection with this Project Document shall include a provision representing that no fees, gratuities, rebates, gifts, commissions or other payments, other than those shown in the proposal, have been given, received, or promised in connection with the selection process or in contract execution, and that the recipient of funds from the Implementing Partner shall cooperate with any and all investigations and post-payment audits.
19. Should UNDP refer to the relevant national authorities for appropriate legal action any alleged wrongdoing relating to the project, the government will ensure that the relevant national authorities shall actively investigate the same and take appropriate legal action against all individuals found to have participated in the wrongdoing, recover and return any recovered funds to UNDP.
20. The Implementing Partner shall ensure that all of its obligations set forth under this section entitled "Risk Management" are passed on to each responsible party, subcontractor and sub-recipient and that all the clauses under this section entitled "Risk Management Standard Clauses" are included, *mutatis mutandis*, in all sub-contracts or sub-agreements entered into further to this Project Document.

Annexes:

Annex 1: Project Budget

Annex 2: Social and Environmental Screening Report (SESP)

Annex 3: Project Quality Assurance Report

ANNEX 1. PROJECT BUDGET

EU Reference: ENI/2019/409831	Costs	TOTAL BUDGET				2019	2020	2021	2022
		Atlas Activity	Costs (in EUR)	Costs (in USD)	Costs (in USD)				
1. Human Resources including short-term national and international consultants	Activity 1,2,3	543,064.00	603,404.44	14,237.22	214,486.67	200,931.11	173,749.44		
2. Travel	Activity 1,2	37,200.00	41,333.33	333.33	19,333.33	11,333.33	10,333.33		
3. Equipment and supplies	Activity 3	4,000.00	4,446.20	1,111.55	2,223.10	1,111.55	0.00		
4. Local office	Activity 3	14,310.00	15,900.00	883.33	5,300.00	5,300.00	4,416.67		
5. Other costs, services	Activity 1,2,3	316,072.94	351,192.16	15,960.46	126,508.50	120,508.50	88,214.71		
6. Responsible Party Agreements:									
WFD	Activity 1,3	350,000.00	388,887.13	54,195.24	170,214.92	146,793.87	17,683.10		
IDFI	Activity 1,2,3	290,000.00	322,222.22	27,655.56	121,561.32	140,535.40	32,469.94		
7. Subtotal Net Budget		1,554,646.94	1,727,385.48	114,376.69	659,627.84	626,513.76	326,867.19		
GMS EU - 7%		98,130.84	109,034.27	7,358.22	38,441.97	40,353.37	22,880.70		
GMS Parl - 8%		11,010.07	12,233.42	740.74	7,489.71	4,002.96			
GMS SCA - 8%		1,212.15	1,346.83		1,346.83				
8. Subtotal GMS		110,353.06	122,614.51	8,098.96	47,278.52	44,356.33	22,880.70		
GRAND TOTAL		1,665,000.00	1,850,000.00	122,475.65	706,906.36	670,870.10	349,747.90		
	Of which:								
EU		1,500,000.00	1,666,666.67	112,475.65	587,613.02	616,830.10	349,747.90		
Parliament		148,636.00	165,151.11	10,000.00	101,111.11	54,040.00			
Supreme Council of Ajara		16,364.00	18,182.22		18,182.22	0.00			

ANNEX 2. SOCIAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCREENING REPORT

Project Information

Project information

1. Project Title
Consolidating Parliamentary Democracy in Georgia
2. Project Number
00113526
3. Location
(Global/Region/Country)
Georgia

Part A. Integrating Overarching Principles to Strengthen Social and Environmental Sustainability

QUESTION 1: How Does the Project Integrate the Overarching Principles in order to Strengthen Social and Environmental Sustainability?

Briefly describe in the space below how the Project mainstreams the human-rights based approach

The project will be guided by the human rights based approach. All project activities will be based and will apply Human rights principles such as: Equality and non-discrimination, participation and inclusion, accountability and rule of law. This will be particularly evident while supporting the Parliament in legislative openness reforms, conducting thematic inquiries and post-legislative scrutiny and other. During these processes, a focus will be made on ensuring that parliamentary information is accessible to all, including the most vulnerable and hard to reach groups, and those groups are given opportunities to engage in legislative activities.

Briefly describe in the space below how the Project is likely to improve gender equality and women's empowerment

The project will assure that gender representation and gender impact is considered in all the project's activities. This will include supporting gender policy analysis within the new Parliamentary Research Centre, monitoring equality of access to training, collecting disaggregated data on citizens engagement, and maintaining records of project beneficiaries by gender.

Briefly describe in the space below how the Project mainstreams environmental sustainability

This will be ensured when/if the project extends support to the Parliament's Environmental Protection and Natural Resources Committee, particularly in undertaking thematic inquiries and post-legislative scrutiny on issues and/or legislation affecting environmental sustainability.

Part B. Identifying and Managing Social and Environmental Risks

QUESTION 2: What are the Potential Social and Environmental Risks?
Note: Describe briefly potential social and environmental risks identified in Attachment 1 – Risk Screening Checklist (based on any “Yes” responses). If no risks have been identified in Attachment 1 then note “No Risks Identified” and skip to Question 4 and Select “Low Risk”. Questions 5 and 6 not required for Low Risk Projects.

QUESTION 3: What is the level of significance of the potential social and environmental risks?
Note: Respond to Questions 4 and 5 below before proceeding to Question 6

QUESTION 4: What is the overall Project risk categorization?
 Select one (see SESP for guidance)
 Low Risk
 Moderate Risk
 High Risk

QUESTION 5: Based on the identified risks and risk categorization, what requirements of the SES are relevant?
 Check all that apply

QUESTION 6: What social and environmental assessment and management measures have been conducted and/or are required to address potential risks (for Risks with Moderate and High Significance)?

Risk: No risks identified
 [add additional rows as needed]

Risk Description	Impact and Probability (1-5)	Significance (Low, Moderate, High)	Comments

- Principle 1: Human Rights
- Principle 2: Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment
- 1. Biodiversity Conservation and Natural Resource Management
- 2. Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation
- 3. Community Health, Safety and Working Conditions
- 4. Cultural Heritage
- 5. Displacement and Resettlement
- 6. Indigenous Peoples
- 7. Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency

Final Sign Off

<i>Signature</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Description</i>
QA Assessor Gigi Bregadze, Governance Team Leader	6-Nov-2019	UNDP staff member responsible for the Project, typically a UNDP Programme Officer. Final signature confirms they have "checked" to ensure that the SESP is adequately conducted.
QA Approver Anna Chernyshova DRR	6-Nov-2019	UNDP senior manager, typically the UNDP Deputy Country Director (DCD), Country Director (CD), Deputy Resident Representative (DRR), or Resident Representative (RR). The QA Approver cannot also be the QA Assessor. Final signature confirms they have "cleared" the SESP prior to submittal to the PAC.
PAC Chair Louisa Vinton, RR	6-Nov-2019	UNDP chair of the PAC. In some cases PAC Chair may also be the QA Approver. Final signature confirms that the SESP was considered as part of the project appraisal and considered in recommendations of the PAC.

SESP Attachment 1. Social and Environmental Risk Screening Checklist

Checklist Potential Social and Environmental Risks		
Principles 1: Human Rights		Answer (Yes/ No)
1.	Could the Project lead to adverse impacts on enjoyment of the human rights (civil, political, economic, social or cultural) of the affected population and particularly of marginalized groups?	No
2.	Is there a likelihood that the Project would have inequitable or discriminatory adverse impacts on affected populations, particularly people living in poverty or marginalized or excluded individuals or groups? ¹⁵	No
3.	Could the Project potentially restrict availability, quality of and access to resources or basic services, in particular to marginalized individuals or groups?	No
4.	Is there a likelihood that the Project would exclude any potentially affected stakeholders, in particular marginalized groups, from fully participating in decisions that may affect them?	No
5.	Is there a risk that duty-bearers do not have the capacity to meet their obligations in the Project?	No
6.	Is there a risk that rights-holders do not have the capacity to claim their rights?	No
7.	Have local communities or individuals, given the opportunity, raised human rights concerns regarding the Project during the stakeholder engagement process?	No
8.	Is there a risk that the Project would exacerbate conflicts among and/or the risk of violence to project-affected communities and individuals?	No
Principle 2: Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment		
1.	Is there a likelihood that the proposed Project would have adverse impacts on gender equality and/or the situation of women and girls?	No
2.	Would the Project potentially reproduce discriminations against women based on gender, especially regarding participation in design and implementation or access to opportunities and benefits?	No
3.	Have women's groups/leaders raised gender equality concerns regarding the Project during the stakeholder engagement process and has this been included in the overall Project proposal and in the risk assessment?	No
4.	Would the Project potentially limit women's ability to use, develop and protect natural resources, taking into account different roles and positions of women and men in	No

¹⁵ Prohibited grounds of discrimination include race, ethnicity, gender, age, language, disability, sexual orientation, religion, political or other opinion, national or social or geographical origin, property, birth or other status including as an indigenous person or as a member of a minority. References to "women and men" or similar is understood to include women and men, boys and girls, and other groups discriminated against based on their gender identities, such as transgender people and transsexuals.

accessing environmental goods and services? <i>For example, activities that could lead to natural resources degradation or depletion in communities who depend on these resources for their livelihoods and well being</i>	
Principle 3: Environmental Sustainability: Screening questions regarding environmental risks are encompassed by the specific Standard-related questions below	
Standard 1: Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Natural Resource Management	
1.1 Would the Project potentially cause adverse impacts to habitats (e.g. modified, natural, and critical habitats) and/or ecosystems and ecosystem services? <i>For example, through habitat loss, conversion or degradation, fragmentation, hydrological changes</i>	No
1.2 Are any Project activities proposed within or adjacent to critical habitats and/or environmentally sensitive areas, including legally protected areas (e.g. nature reserve, national park), areas proposed for protection, or recognized as such by authoritative sources and/or indigenous peoples or local communities?	No
1.3 Does the Project involve changes to the use of lands and resources that may have adverse impacts on habitats, ecosystems, and/or livelihoods? (Note: if restrictions and/or limitations of access to lands would apply, refer to Standard 5)	No
1.4 Would Project activities pose risks to endangered species?	No
1.5 Would the Project pose a risk of introducing invasive alien species?	No
1.6 Does the Project involve harvesting of natural forests, plantation development, or reforestation?	No
1.7 Does the Project involve the production and/or harvesting of fish populations or other aquatic species?	No
1.8 Does the Project involve significant extraction, diversion or containment of surface or ground water? <i>For example, construction of dams, reservoirs, river basin developments, groundwater extraction</i>	No
1.9 Does the Project involve utilization of genetic resources? (e.g. collection and/or harvesting, commercial development)	No
1.10 Would the Project generate potential adverse transboundary or global environmental concerns?	No
1.11 Would the Project result in secondary or consequential development activities which could lead to adverse social and environmental effects, or would it generate cumulative impacts with other known existing or planned activities in the area? <i>For example, a new road through forested lands will generate direct environmental and social impacts (e.g. felling of trees, earthworks, potential relocation of inhabitants). The new road may also facilitate encroachment on lands by illegal settlers or generate unplanned commercial development along the route, potentially in sensitive areas.</i>	No

<i>These are indirect, secondary, or induced impacts that need to be considered. Also, if similar developments in the same forested area are planned, then cumulative impacts of multiple activities (even if not part of the same Project) need to be considered.</i>		
Standard 2: Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation		
2.1	Will the proposed Project result in significant ¹⁶ greenhouse gas emissions or may exacerbate climate change?	No
2.2	Would the potential outcomes of the Project be sensitive or vulnerable to potential impacts of climate change?	No
2.3	Is the proposed Project likely to directly or indirectly increase social and environmental vulnerability to climate change now or in the future (also known as maladaptive practices)? <i>For example, changes to land use planning may encourage further development of floodplains, potentially increasing the population's vulnerability to climate change, specifically flooding</i>	No
Standard 3: Community Health, Safety and Working Conditions		
3.1	Would elements of Project construction, operation, or decommissioning pose potential safety risks to local communities?	No
3.2	Would the Project pose potential risks to community health and safety due to the transport, storage, and use and/or disposal of hazardous or dangerous materials (e.g. explosives, fuel and other chemicals during construction and operation)?	No
3.3	Does the Project involve large-scale infrastructure development (e.g. dams, roads, buildings)?	No
3.4	Would failure of structural elements of the Project pose risks to communities? (e.g. collapse of buildings or infrastructure)	No
3.5	Would the proposed Project be susceptible to or lead to increased vulnerability to earthquakes, subsidence, landslides, erosion, flooding or extreme climatic conditions?	No
3.6	Would the Project result in potential increased health risks (e.g. from water-borne or other vector-borne diseases or communicable infections such as HIV/AIDS)?	No
3.7	Does the Project pose potential risks and vulnerabilities related to occupational health and safety due to physical, chemical, biological, and radiological hazards during Project construction, operation, or decommissioning?	No
3.8	Does the Project involve support for employment or livelihoods that may fail to comply with national and international labor standards (i.e. principles and standards of ILO fundamental conventions)?	No
3.9	Does the Project engage security personnel that may pose a potential risk to health and safety of communities and/or individuals (e.g. due to a lack of adequate training or	No

¹⁶ In regards to CO₂, 'significant emissions' corresponds generally to more than 25,000 tons per year (from both direct and indirect sources). [The Guidance Note on Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation provides additional information on GHG emissions.]

accountability)?	
Standard 4: Cultural Heritage	
4.1 Will the proposed Project result in interventions that would potentially adversely impact sites, structures, or objects with historical, cultural, artistic, traditional or religious values or intangible forms of culture (e.g. knowledge, innovations, practices)? (Note: Projects intended to protect and conserve Cultural Heritage may also have inadvertent adverse impacts)	No
4.2 Does the Project propose utilizing tangible and/or intangible forms of cultural heritage for commercial or other purposes?	No
Standard 5: Displacement and Resettlement	
5.1 Would the Project potentially involve temporary or permanent and full or partial physical displacement?	No
5.2 Would the Project possibly result in economic displacement (e.g. loss of assets or access to resources due to land acquisition or access restrictions – even in the absence of physical relocation)?	No
5.3 Is there a risk that the Project would lead to forced evictions? ¹⁷	No
5.4 Would the proposed Project possibly affect land tenure arrangements and/or community based property rights/customary rights to land, territories and/or resources?	No
Standard 6: Indigenous Peoples	
6.1 Are indigenous peoples present in the Project area (including Project area of influence)?	No
6.2 Is it likely that the Project or portions of the Project will be located on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples?	No
6.3 Would the proposed Project potentially affect the human rights, lands, natural resources, territories, and traditional livelihoods of indigenous peoples (regardless of whether indigenous peoples possess the legal titles to such areas, whether the Project is located within or outside of the lands and territories inhabited by the affected peoples, or whether the indigenous peoples are recognized as indigenous peoples by the country in question)? <i>If the answer to the screening question 6.3 is “yes” the potential risk impacts are considered potentially severe and/or critical and the Project would be categorized as either Moderate or High Risk.</i>	No
6.4 Has there been an absence of culturally appropriate consultations carried out with the objective of achieving FPIC on matters that may affect the rights and interests, lands,	No

¹⁷ Forced evictions include acts and/or omissions involving the coerced or involuntary displacement of individuals, groups, or communities from homes and/or lands and common property resources that were occupied or depended upon, thus eliminating the ability of an individual, group, or community to reside or work in a particular dwelling, residence, or location without the provision of, and access to, appropriate forms of legal or other protections.

	resources, territories and traditional livelihoods of the indigenous peoples concerned?	
6.5	Does the proposed Project involve the utilization and/or commercial development of natural resources on lands and territories claimed by indigenous peoples?	No
6.6	Is there a potential for forced eviction or the whole or partial physical or economic displacement of indigenous peoples, including through access restrictions to lands, territories, and resources?	No
6.7	Would the Project adversely affect the development priorities of indigenous peoples as defined by them?	No
6.8	Would the Project potentially affect the physical and cultural survival of indigenous peoples?	No
6.9	Would the Project potentially affect the Cultural Heritage of indigenous peoples, including through the commercialization or use of their traditional knowledge and practices?	No
Standard 7: Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency		
7.1	Would the Project potentially result in the release of pollutants to the environment due to routine or non-routine circumstances with the potential for adverse local, regional, and/or transboundary impacts?	No
7.2	Would the proposed Project potentially result in the generation of waste (both hazardous and non-hazardous)?	No
7.3	Will the proposed Project potentially involve the manufacture, trade, release, and/or use of hazardous chemicals and/or materials? Does the Project propose use of chemicals or materials subject to international bans or phase-outs? <i>For example, DDT, PCBs and other chemicals listed in international conventions such as the Stockholm Conventions on Persistent Organic Pollutants or the Montreal Protocol</i>	No
7.4	Will the proposed Project involve the application of pesticides that may have a negative effect on the environment or human health?	No
7.5	Does the Project include activities that require significant consumption of raw materials, energy, and/or water?	No

ANNEX 3. QUALITY ASSESSMENT REPORT

Design & Appraisal Stage Quality Assurance Report

Form Status: Approved
Overall Rating: Satisfactory
Decision: Approve: The project is of sufficient quality to continue as planned. Any management actions must be addressed in a timely manner.
Portfolio/Project Number: 00113526
Portfolio/Project Title: Parliamentary Support-3/EU
Portfolio/Project Date: 2019-11-07 / 2022-11-06

Strategic Quality Rating: Satisfactory

1. Does the project specify how it will contribute to higher level change through linkage to the programme's Theory of Change?

3: The project is clearly linked to the programme's theory of change. It has an explicit change pathway that explains how the project will contribute to outcome level change and why the project's strategy will likely lead to this change. This analysis is backed by credible evidence of what works effectively in this context and includes assumptions and risks.

2: The project is clearly linked to the programme's theory of change. It has a change pathway that explains how the project will contribute to outcome-level change and why the project strategy will likely lead to this change.

1: The project document may describe in generic terms how the project will contribute to development results, without an explicit link to the programme's theory of change.

Evidence: Section Theory of Change, p. 10

List of Uploaded Documents

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

No documents available.

2. Is the project aligned with the UNDP Strategic Plan?

3: The project responds to at least one of the development settings as specified in the Strategic Plan¹ and adapts at least one Signature Solution². The project's RRF includes all the relevant SP output indicators. (all must be true)

2: The project responds to at least one of the development settings as specified in the Strategic Plan⁴. The project's RRF includes at least one SP output indicator, if relevant. (both must be true)

1: The project responds to a partner's identified need, but this need falls outside of the UNDP Strategic Plan. Also select this option if none of the relevant SP indicators are included in the RRF.

Evidence: The project responds to UNDP SP Outcome 2.2.2 (see Results Framework). However, SP indicator is not included in the RRF.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.		

3. Is the project linked to the programme outputs? (i.e., UNDAF Results Group Workplan/CPD, RPD or Strategic Plan IRRF for global projects/strategic interventions not part of a programme)

- Yes
- No

Evidence: The project is linked to CPD Output 1.3. UNPSD 2016-2020 Outcome 1, SP 2018-2021 Output 2.2.2 (See Result Framework)

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.		

Relevant Quality Rating: Satisfactory

4. Do the project target groups leave furthest behind?

- 3: The target groups are clearly specified, prioritising discriminated, and marginalized groups left furthest behind, identified through a rigorous process based on evidence.
- 2: The target groups are clearly specified, prioritizing groups left furthest behind.
- 1: The target groups are not clearly specified.

Evidence: Under Section "Project Stakeholders and Beneficiaries", the targeted audience, part from primary target of Parliament, includes underrepresented groups of CSOs, such as ethnic and other minorities, also women, and youth from urban and rural areas. academia, international and donor organizations.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.		

5. Have knowledge, good practices, and past lessons learned of UNDP and others informed the project design?

- 3: Knowledge and lessons learned backed by credible evidence from sources such as evaluation, corporate policies/strategies, and/or monitoring have been explicitly used, with appropriate referencing, to justify the approach used by the project.
- 2: The project design mentions knowledge and lessons learned backed by evidence/sources but have not

been used to justify the approach selected.

☐ 1: There is little, or no mention of knowledge and lessons learned informing the project design. Any references made are anecdotal and not backed by evidence.

Evidence: The project represents 3rd phase of the EU funded assistance to the Parliament and therefore "builds on and promotes sustainability of the results achieved through the previous EU-UNDP parliamentary intervention". (see Project Strategy)

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.		

6. Does UNDP have a clear advantage to engage in the role envisioned by the project vis-à-vis national / regional / global partners and other actors?

☐ 3: An analysis has been conducted on the role of other partners in the area where the project intends to work, and credible evidence supports the proposed engagement of UNDP and partners through the project, including identification of potential funding partners. It is clear how results achieved by partners will complement the project's intended results and a communication strategy is in place to communicate results and raise visibility vis-à-vis key partners. Options for south-south and triangular cooperation have been considered, as appropriate. (all must be true)

☑ 2: Some analysis has been conducted on the role of other partners in the area where the project intends to work, and relatively limited evidence supports the proposed engagement of and division of labour between UNDP and partners through the project, with unclear funding and communications strategies or plans.

☐ 1: No clear analysis has been conducted on the role of other partners in the area that the project intends to work. There is risk that the project overlaps and/or does not coordinate with partners' interventions in this area. Options for south-south and triangular cooperation have not been considered, despite its potential relevance.

Evidence: Section "Partnerships and Stakeholders" provides analysis of the partners involved in the area and interventions, with which the project will establish synergies.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.		

Principled

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

7. Does the project apply a human rights-based approach?

☐ 3: The project is guided by human rights and incorporates the principles of accountability, meaningful participation, and non-discrimination in the project's strategy. The project upholds the relevant international and national laws and standards. Any potential adverse impacts on enjoyment of human rights were rigorously identified and assessed as relevant, with appropriate mitigation and management measures incorporated into project design and budget. (all must be true)

☑ 2: The project is guided by human rights by prioritizing accountability, meaningful participation and non-

discrimination. Potential adverse impacts on enjoyment of human rights were identified and assessed as relevant, and appropriate mitigation and management measures incorporated into the project design and budget. (both must be true)

1: No evidence that the project is guided by human rights. Limited or no evidence that potential adverse impacts on enjoyment of human rights were considered.

Evidence: The project strategy builds from the core commitments to representative, accountable democracy as the best means to assure human rights and human development (see section Strategy)

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

8. Does the project use gender analysis in the project design?

3: A participatory gender analysis has been conducted and results from this gender analysis inform the development challenge, strategy and expected results sections of the project document. Outputs and indicators of the results framework include explicit references to gender equality, and specific indicators measure and monitor results to ensure women are fully benefitting from the project. (all must be true)

2: A basic gender analysis has been carried out and results from this analysis are scattered (i.e., fragmented and not consistent) across the development challenge and strategy sections of the project document. The results framework may include some gender sensitive outputs and/or activities but gender inequalities are not consistently integrated across each output. (all must be true)

1: The project design may or may not mention information and/or data on the differential impact of the project's development situation on gender relations, women and men, but the gender inequalities have not been clearly identified and reflected in the project document.

Evidence: Section "Gender, diversity and inclusion" deals with the commitments of the project to promote gender equality, collecting disaggregated data on citizens engagement, and maintaining records of project beneficiaries by gender. Requirement of balanced gender representation is reflected in 3 of the RF indicators.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.			

9. Did the project support the resilience and sustainability of societies and/or ecosystems?

3: Credible evidence that the project addresses sustainability and resilience dimensions of development challenges, which are integrated in the project strategy and design. The project reflects the interconnections between the social, economic and environmental dimensions of sustainable development. Relevant shocks, hazards and adverse social and environmental impacts have been identified and rigorously assessed with appropriate management and mitigation measures incorporated into project design and budget. (all must be true)

2: The project design integrates sustainability and resilience dimensions of development challenges. Relevant shocks, hazards and adverse social and environmental impacts have been identified and assessed,

and relevant management and mitigation measures incorporated into project design and budget. (both must be true)

- 1: Sustainability and resilience dimensions and impacts were not adequately considered.

Evidence: The project deals with the capacity strengthening of the Parliament and therefore, social and environmental impacts are not applicable to it.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.		

10. Has the Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) been conducted to identify potential social and environmental impacts and risks? The SESP is not required for projects in which UNDP is Administrative Agent only and/or projects comprised solely of reports, coordination of events, trainings, workshops, meetings, conferences and/or communication materials and information dissemination. [if yes, upload the completed checklist. If SESP is not required, provide the reason for the exemption in the evidence section.]

- Yes
- No
- SESP not required because project consists solely of (Select all exemption criteria that apply)
 - 1: Preparation and dissemination of reports, documents and communication materials
 - 2: Organization of an event, workshop, training
 - 3: Strengthening capacities of partners to participate in international negotiations and conferences
 - 4: Partnership coordination (including UN coordination) and management of networks
 - 5: Global/regional projects with no country level activities (e.g. knowledge management, inter-governmental processes)
 - 6: UNDP acting as Administrative Agent

Evidence: SESP uploaded

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name	Risk Category	Risk Requirements	Document Status	Modified By	Modified On
1	SESP-Parliament3_2381_110	Low		Final	khatuna.chanukvadze@undp.org	11/13/2019 10:15:00 AM

Management & Monitoring Quality Rating: Satisfactory

11. Does the project have a strong results framework?

- 3: The project's selection of outputs and activities are at an appropriate level. Outputs are accompanied by SMART, results-oriented indicators that measure the key expected development changes, each with credible data sources and populated baselines and targets, including gender sensitive, target group focused, sex-disaggregated indicators where appropriate. (all must be true)

2: The project's selection of outputs and activities are at an appropriate level. Outputs are accompanied by SMART, results-oriented indicators, but baselines, targets and data sources may not yet be fully specified. Some use of target group focused, sex-disaggregated indicators, as appropriate. (all must be true)

1: The project's selection of outputs and activities are not at an appropriate level; outputs are not accompanied by SMART, results-oriented indicators that measure the expected change and have not been populated with baselines and targets; data sources are not specified, and/or no gender sensitive, sex-disaggregation of indicators. (if any is true)

Evidence: The Results Framework indicators are SMART. The project uses also indicators for high level results (impact and outcome), per donor requirement. Sustainability of results and exit strategy is in place.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.		

12. Is the project's governance mechanism clearly defined in the project document, including composition of the project board?

3: The project's governance mechanism is fully defined. Individuals have been specified for each position in the governance mechanism (especially all members of the project board.) Project Board members have agreed on their roles and responsibilities as specified in the terms of reference. The ToR of the project board has been attached to the project document. (all must be true)

2: The project's governance mechanism is defined; specific institutions are noted as holding key governance roles, but individuals may not have been specified yet. The project document lists the most important responsibilities of the project board, project director/manager and quality assurance roles. (all must be true)

1: The project's governance mechanism is loosely defined in the project document, only mentioning key roles that will need to be filled at a later date. No information on the responsibilities of key positions in the governance mechanism is provided.

Evidence: The project's governance mechanism is clearly described under Governance Arrangements.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.		

13. Have the project risks been identified with clear plans stated to manage and mitigate each risk?

3: Project risks related to the achievement of results are fully described in the project risk log, based on comprehensive analysis drawing on the programme's theory of change, Social and Environmental Standards and screening, situation analysis, capacity assessments and other analysis such as funding potential and reputational risk. Risks have been identified through a consultative process with key internal and external stakeholders, including consultation with the UNDP Security Office as required. Clear and complete plan in place to manage and mitigate each risk, including security risks, reflected in project budgeting and monitoring plans. (both must be true)

2: Project risks related to the achievement of results are identified in the initial project risk log based on

a minimum level of analysis and consultation, with mitigation measures identified for each risk.

1: Some risks may be identified in the initial project risk log, but no evidence of consultation or analysis and no clear risk mitigation measures identified. This option is also selected if risks are not clearly identified, no initial risk log is included with the project document and/or no security risk management process has taken place for the project.

Evidence: Project risks identified in Risk Log

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.		

Efficient

Quality Rating: Satisfactory

14. Have specific measures for ensuring cost-efficient use of resources been explicitly mentioned as part of the project design? This can include, for example:

- i) Using the theory of change analysis to explore different options of achieving the maximum results with the resources available.
- ii) Using a portfolio management approach to improve cost effectiveness through synergies with other interventions.
- iii) Through joint operations (e.g., monitoring or procurement) with other partners.
- iv) Sharing resources or coordinating delivery with other projects.
- v) Using innovative approaches and technologies to reduce the cost of service delivery or other types of interventions.

Yes

No

Evidence: Cost efficiency considerations are well elaborated under section 4.1/ Cost Efficiency and Effectiveness

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.		

15. Is the budget justified and supported with valid estimates?

3: The project's budget is at the activity level with funding sources, and is specified for the duration of the project period in a multi-year budget. Realistic resource mobilisation plans are in place to fill unfunded components. Costs are supported with valid estimates using benchmarks from similar projects or activities. Cost implications from inflation and foreign exchange exposure have been estimated and incorporated in the budget. Adequate costs for monitoring, evaluation, communications and security have been incorporated.

2: The project's budget is at the activity level with funding sources, when possible, and is specified for the duration of the project in a multi-year budget, but no funding plan is in place. Costs are supported with valid estimates based on prevailing rates.

1: The project's budget is not specified at the activity level, and/or may not be captured in a multi-year budget.

Evidence: The project has detailed project budget with relevant justifications.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.		

16. Is the Country Office / Regional Hub / Global Project fully recovering the costs involved with project implementation?

3: The budget fully covers all project costs that are attributable to the project, including programme management and development effectiveness services related to strategic country programme planning, quality assurance, pipeline development, policy advocacy services, finance, procurement, human resources, administration, issuance of contracts, security, travel, assets, general services, information and communications based on full costing in accordance with prevailing UNDP policies (i.e., UPL, LPL.)

2: The budget covers significant project costs that are attributable to the project based on prevailing UNDP policies (i.e., UPL, LPL) as relevant.

1: The budget does not adequately cover project costs that are attributable to the project, and UNDP is cross-subsidizing the project.

Evidence: The project is funded by EU and therefore no DPC can be charged. However, the project offsets this by including in the budget salary costs of CO staff: UNDP CO DG Team Leader (15%); UNDP CO Programme Associate (15%); UNDP CO Communications Analyst (8%).

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.		

Effective

Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory

17. Have targeted groups been engaged in the design of the project?

3: Credible evidence that all targeted groups, prioritising discriminated and marginalized populations that will be involved in or affected by the project, have been actively engaged in the design of the project. The project has an explicit strategy to identify, engage and ensure the meaningful participation of target groups as stakeholders throughout the project, including through monitoring and decision-making (e.g., representation on the project board, inclusion in samples for evaluations, etc.)

2: Some evidence that key targeted groups have been consulted in the design of the project.

1: No evidence of engagement with targeted groups during project design.

Not Applicable

Evidence: The direct beneficiary of the project is the Parliament, which has full ownership of the project,

demonstrated by the fact that the project is implemented by the Parliament.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.		

18. Does the project plan for adaptation and course correction if regular monitoring activities, evaluation, and lesson learned demonstrate there are better approaches to achieve the intended results and/or circumstances change during implementation?

- Yes
- No

Evidence: Section 6. MONITORING AND EVALUATION (M&E) indicate that "the results of regular monitoring activities and lesson learned will be used to initiate changes during the project implementation to achieve the intended results".

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.		

19. The gender marker for all project outputs are scored at GEN2 or GEN3, indicating that gender has been fully mainstreamed into all project outputs at a minimum.

- Yes
- No

Evidence: The project is assigned GEN2

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.		

Sustainability & National Ownership Quality Rating: Highly Satisfactory

20. Have national / regional / global partners led, or proactively engaged in, the design of the project?

- 3: National partners (or regional/global partners for regional and global projects) have full ownership of the project and led the process of the development of the project jointly with UNDP.
- 2: The project has been developed by UNDP in close consultation with national / regional / global partners.
- 1: The project has been developed by UNDP with limited or no engagement with national partners.

Evidence: The project has been developed in close consultation with the national partner (Parliament),

which will be implementing the project.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.		

21. Are key institutions and systems identified, and is there a strategy for strengthening specific / comprehensive capacities based on capacity assessments conducted?

- 3: The project has a strategy for strengthening specific capacities of national institutions and/or actors based on a completed capacity assessment. This strategy includes an approach to regularly monitor national capacities using clear indicators and rigorous methods of data collection, and adjust the strategy to strengthen national capacities accordingly.
- 2: A capacity assessment has been completed. There are plans to develop a strategy to strengthen specific capacities of national institutions and/or actors based on the results of the capacity assessment.
- 1: Capacity assessments have not been carried out.
- Not Applicable

Evidence: The project's primary objective is capacity building of the Parliament. Comprehensive needs/capacity assessment of Parliament was conducted by UNDP in 2015 and respective Institutional Reform Plan was elaborated for 2016-2018. Progress review, conducted in Dec 2018, resulted in the updated Plan for 2019-2020. Current project's capacity building activities, among others, is based on this Plan.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.		

22. Is there is a clear strategy embedded in the project specifying how the project will use national systems (i.e., procurement, monitoring, evaluations, etc.,) to the extent possible?

- Yes
- No
- Not Applicable

Evidence: The project is NIM with full CO support.

List of Uploaded Documents

#	File Name Modified By	Modified On
No documents available.		

23. Is there a clear transition arrangement / phase-out plan developed with key stakeholders in order to sustain or scale up results (including resource mobilisation and communications strategy)?

- Yes

No

Evidence: Section 3.6. Sustainability and Exit Strategy elaborates on exit strategy, which is built from the sustainability strategy.

List of Uploaded Documents

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

No documents available.

QA Summary/LPAC Comments

The project conducted electronic LPAC on 6 November 2019 and with minor editorial changes the prodoc was recommended for approval. SESP is uploaded.

The first part of the report is a general introduction to the project. It describes the objectives and the scope of the work. The second part is a detailed description of the methodology used in the study. This includes a discussion of the data sources, the statistical methods employed, and the procedures for data analysis. The third part of the report presents the results of the study. This section includes a series of tables and figures that illustrate the findings. The final part of the report is a conclusion and a discussion of the implications of the results.