**Project Title**: Supporting Local Self-Governance Reform in Kazakhstan

**Project Number:** 00108173

**Implementing Partner:** Ministry of National Economy of the Republic of Kazakhstan

**Start Date:** May 2020 **End Date:** December 2022 **PAC Meeting date:** XXXX

|  |
| --- |
| **Brief Description** |
| *.**The main steps towards a more decentralized and inclusive governance were mapped out in the First President’ program ‘Five institutional reforms’ (2016). The Government of the RK has been subsequently fulfilling the self-governance reform stage by stage. According to the logic of these institutional changes, at the first stage (2016-2017) local communities in the rural areas got to elect akims of districts, villages and rural districts, to draft planes for local community development, to monitor land use and collect taxes. At the second stage (2018-2020), the discrete 4th level budgeting was introduced for more than 2,000 administrative units (townships, villages and rural districts) with an average population of 2,000 people per unit. Also, the institute of communal property was created. Starting 2020, Kazakhstan moves to the third stage, when introduction of an independent local government budget will be launched in settlements with a population of less than 2 thousand people, also each local community will be creating a representative body of local self-government, that will facilitate procedures for considering citizens' proposals for draft local budgets that affect socially significant issues. Implementation of all these measures will increase transparency of the decision-making process by state bodies and will contribute to the development of the local government system.**Consequently, the Ministry of National Economy of the Republic of Kazakhstan seeks to support these institutional changes and lessen possible risks of the self-governance reform implementation failures. Therefore, the Ministry - in partnership with UNDP Kazakhstan - plans to implement a 3-year project, which will: [i] raise capacity of the local akims, key staff of the akimats and local citizen activists to manage 4th level of budgeting and facilitate involvement of the citizenry into decision-making process; [ii] adapt and distribute techniques and methodologies of the citizens’ participation on the local level; and [iii] build up expertise and provide recommendations on further institutionalization of the self-governance in Kazakhstan.*  |

Contributing Outcome (UNDAF/CPD, RPD or GPD):

Outcome 2.2: Judicial and legal systems, and public institutions, are fair, accountable and accessible to all

people.

Indicative Output(s) with gender marker2: Percentage of citizens reporting satisfaction with the accessibility, accountability and quality of public sector, judicial and law enforcement systems.

Gender marker: GEN2

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Total resources required (in USD):** | 363,286.00 |
| **Total resources allocated (in USD):** | **UNDP TRAC:** | 46,937.00 |
| **Government of Kazakhstan:** | 316,349.00 |

Agreed by (signatures)[[1]](#footnote-1):

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Government | UNDP |
| -----------------------------,Vice-Minister of National Economyof the Republic of Kazakhstan | Yakup Beris,UNDP Resident Representativein the Republic of Kazakhstan  |
| Date:  | Date:  |

# Development Challenge

Kazakhstan has launched a large-scale local and self-governance reform (hereinafter – the Reform) to fulfil the nation’s strategic vision on modernization expressed in the Government’s development strategy until 2050. The Reform was further supported and clarified through the Nation’s Plan “100 steps towards the institutional reforms” (2015).

In line with these strategic documents, the new Law on Local Government and Self-Governance was signed in 2017. The Law came into force on January 1, 2018 - for cities of district subordinance, townships, villages and rural districts with population of more than 2000. On January 1, 2020 the Law came into force for cities of district subordinance, townships, villages and rural districts with population of 2000 and less.

The critical component of the Reform was to re-shape the current budget system by adding a new type of local and self-governance budgeting on the level of a discrete administrative unit (townships, villages and rural districts). This implied also reallocation of some administrative functions to local authorities and significant raise in civic engagement into decision making processes on local level.

Over the two first years of the Reform (2018-2019), these changes were applied to more than 2,000 administrative units (townships, villages and rural districts) with an average population of 2,000 people per unit. Since January 1st 2020, the reform involved 2,353 administrative units (cities of regional significance, villages, towns, rural districts).

The Reform initiated a process of building economic and financial basis of the local public administration and self-government based on local budget (taxes), property assigned to communal legal entities and other property in the communal ownership in accordance with the legislation of the Republic of Kazakhstan.

Besides the financial considerations, the Reform also triggers important institutional changes in the power balance set in the country; it drastically reduces the distance between power and citizenry. For instance, an akim has the right to form revenue sources of local self-government (rental income, voluntary contributions, fines for administrative offences and payment for the placement of outdoor (visual) advertisements). On the other hand, the citizens will be directly participating in decision making process. Thus, for solving issues of their local communities, they can convene a Gathering of local community or an Assembly of local community (representatives of the local community delegated by the gathering of that local community). To date, this is the most direct form of citizens’ participation in the decision-making process across all the systems of governing in Kazakhstan (budgets of all 2,353 rural districts are adopted after mandatory approval of the local community).

To date the Reform can be deemed as successful. After the first wave of introducing the 4th level budgeting, we can identify several important aspects of that success:

* **Raise of the local budgets revenues.** The budget revenues of rural districts in 2019 actually amounted to 163,6 billion tenge, which is by 2.8% more than the planned amount.
* The local authorities **used different tactics for better revenue collection**: more accurate individual income tax identification (Almaty region), collecting vehicle tax for the previous years (all regions), better administration of property and land taxation (Atyrau), utilizing advertising fees (Almaty);
* The residents of majority of the rural districts of the country are **engaged into civic participation practices**, accumulating valuable experience.

However, there are several problems that can be an obstacle to the Reform’s succession during next years. First of all, neither of akims have had used revenue base expansion tactics. There are well developed approaches in the international practices that needs to be adopted for Kazakhstan in order to help the local authorities move from “revenue collection” to community assets based revenue generation.

Secondly, in 2017 UNDP supported the Ministry of National Economy by organizing four republican forums to discuss the implementation of 4th level budget that gathered 1,154 akims of rural districts. In 2018, in cooperation with the Ministry of National Economy and the Academy of Public Administration under the President of the RK, UNDP conducted training seminars in 14 regions for more than 700 rural akims and their employees. Along with the training and sharing experience, the akims were provided with teaching and educational materials. This activity demonstrated a great need for knowledge, skills and social technologies among the local authorities.

Thirdly, the next great opportunity for the development of local self-government is presented by the Government’s work to provide rural districts with high-speed Internet. According to the State Program “Digital Kazakhstan” until 2022, about 1,250 villages will be provided with a fiber-optic communication line guaranteeing a high speed of information transfer. 711 villages (or 485 rural districts) were involved into the Reform with a 4th budget level.

High-speed Internet will allow the akims to establish stable access to the all-government databases. This will reduce the burden on specialists, reduce paperwork, improve tax administration and improve quality of local governance overall.

Thus, this reform, if proceeded successfully further, will have a significant traceable impact on the country’s modernization in terms of (a) promoting financial and economic independence of local governors (akims) by expanding their revenue-generating options at the local level; (b) institutionalizing communities’ participation in the decision-making by strengthening their role in the budgetary and planning processes; (c) creating conditions for a sustainable territorial development and improved livelihoods through accountable management of ‘public goods’ such as natural resources and communal properties.

# Strategy

The strategy of the project will have to take into account several points. First of all, the 4th level budgets are ‘social’ by the expenditures’ structure. The main areas of expenditures of the local government budget are pre-school education - 44%; administrative expenses - 23%; improvements of a settlement’s state - 14%.

Local budgets are heavily dependent on transfers from the higher levels of the budgeting system. Out of the total income of rural districts transfers count up to 80%, leaving only 20% for the local authorities’ own interests.

These are two major limitations that the project must aim to overcome, at least partially.

Participatory development of local communities (CDD, also Assets Based Community Development) is a methodology for ensuring sustainable development of local communities based on their potential and strengths. In our country, in practice, there are no such projects yet. Thus, the UNDP must pioneer in adapting and applying those kind of practices within the project.

Another factor affecting the project’s strategy of intervention is presented by the ongoing work of the Government for establishing high-speed Internet connection to the rural sites, as was mentioned before.

Secondly, along with trainings on managerial practices, there is a need to develop methodology of the civic engagement in the country itself. Besides the trainings of the local authorities on budgeting, they also must be introduced to the theories and tools of civic engagement and participation.

Ability to convene people, conduct local community gathering and facilitate a productive discussion is the foundation of effective engagement. Local authorities should acquire and be able to apply different participatory tactics – from managing public spaces, participatory budgeting to co-production of communal goods and services.

Co-production, or the transfer of part of the state’s functions to groups of citizens, is a very interesting practice when public services are provided or created by the citizens themselves (associations of citizens). For example, the city akimat understands that the current format for trapping stray animals is ineffective, and as part of the partnership transfers this function to a local organization of animal welfare advocates. This organization, under a clear contract, performs a de facto state function - but often much more efficiently, more humane and with greater involvement of citizens (support circle, volunteers, philanthropists).

Thirdly, the project must build up a consensus among the key stakeholders on the further advancement and institutionalization of the reform. Currently, the government is focused on introducing the basics of the self-government in rural sites, however by the end of the project, it will need to have a deeper understanding of the reform’s prospects. Given the projects’ outreach to many akimats practicing the 4th level budgeting, the team of trainers, researchers and administrators must put great effort to collect as many data, cases of successes and lessons learned as possible. This will also require study and adaptation of the developed countries’ best practices in self-governance.

The preliminary results of the 2018-2019 allow us to define three points for the most effective interventions:

(1) Building capacity of the local authorities for effective administration of local budgets, facilitating involvement of the citizenry into decision-making process and increasing transparency;

(2) Development and testing of effective mechanisms for involving citizens in the decision-making process (forms and instruments of civic participation, monitoring and evaluation, and involvement into decision-making process at the local level);

(3) Further institutionalization of the reform in terms of decreasing administrative load of the local authorities, mobilizing additional sources of income for the 4th level budgeting and building up evidence for development of the Concept for the further development of the local government system until 2030.

# Results and Partnerships

***Expected Results***

The whole reform of introducing new instruments of self-governance was meant to have an impact on rural population quality of life, and thus can be measured through changes in their lives and/or behavior. So, changed internal migration dynamics can be a good marker of success.

Impact dynamics (short-term):

- Number of people leaving the administrative units after the Reform vs. Number of people moved out in previous years;

- Number of people moving into the administrative units involved into the project

In terms of governance, it is expected that the new project will contribute into raise of the economic and financial independence of local authorities for the active involvement of the population in solving local issues and laying the foundations for the further development of the institution of local self-government in Kazakhstan.

Expected results cover:

1) Improving efficiency of local self-government at the rural level due to building up capacity of local self-government bodies, increasing financial independence of local self-government budgets and raising of tax and non-tax revenues into the 4th level’ budgets:

- improving efficiency of planning and budget execution measured through the percentage of budget execution and reducing inefficient costs;

- reduction in the number of violations in the field of public procurement and public property management;

- increase in revenues from administrative fines;

- improving sanitary condition of the rural settlements;

- reduction in the number of violations and facts of bringing civil servants at the rural level to disciplinary, administrative and criminal liability.

- reduction in the subvention of local government budgets measured as an increase in the share of own revenues in the total revenue;

- increase in the number of self-sufficient budgets at the 4th level.

2) Promoting an active participation of the population in solving local problems:

- increase in the number of meetings and gatherings of the local community;

- increase in the number of activists at the local level;

- increase in the number of residents of the administrative units participating in the communal gathering;

3) A package of legislative and other incentives for the further development of local government

Simple and understandable manuals, instructions, templates, algorithms and examples for scaling up and distributing among local governments across the country will be developed for activities related building up capacities and training.

***Partnerships***

UNDP will partner with various institutions and involve several stakeholders in the implementation of this initiative. At the national level, the Ministry of National Economy will be a key partner.

It is expected that the project management team will work closely with the key officials of the Ministry for proper and timely implementation of this initiative. The expected project results will provide the basis for the Ministry of National Economy to ensure that the self-governance reform is conducted in an effective and efficient manner.

At the local level, UNDP will partner with akimats of the administrative units (townships, villages and rural districts) to assess their needs and gaps in knowledge and skills for more targeted interventions, as well as for collecting data, cases and insights for managing the project and disseminating best practices.

Another type of partnership has to be installed as an addition with the quasi-governmental and social purpose organizations. For instance, the “Zerde” ICT holding and its subordinate company Astana Hub can be partnered with in order to develop technology decisions for local self-governance and civic engagement at the rural level.

Also, the UNDP must partner with the Atameken National Palate of Entrepreneurs with aim to use the NPE project’s data for communities development. In 2018-2019 the NPE has conducted a country-wide screening of the rural households and small businesses (bottom-up approach, focus on sustainability, identifying existing skills, needs and development potential). The data obtained could be used for CDD and/or ABCD approach in self-governance reform.

***Resources Required to Achieve the Expected Results***

One of the basic activities in strategy implementation is the allocation of resources. These refer to both financial and non-financial resources that are available and are required for strategy implementation. The working plan and the budget of the Project were designed to meet the need of the Project within the framework of the Project lifetime.

***Risks and Assumptions***

There are two level of risks that may substantially affect the project’s implementation. First group of risks has an organizational nature, which makes them more manageable for the implementing team. These are risks related to the participants’ enrolment into the planned training activities, possible conflicts between timeframe of the project’s activities and the villages seasonal life-works schedules.

The second group of risks is mainly connected to the COVID-19 threat and possible counter-actions that government bodies might undertake both on national and regional levels. For now, it is still unclear how the state is going to manage post-quarantine period, however, the implementing team can re-organize the project’s main activities to change dates/places or switch to a web-based format of the events.

Nevertheless, UNDP has the necessary experience and expertise at both the core and operating level to meet the needs of the planned project and make optimal use of the initial resources to achieve the expected results in a timely manner and in accordance with certain standards. Furthermore, it seems that the political dynamics for implementing such a reform exists, which will provide additional and necessary stimulus and impetus for its effective completion in accordance with the deadlines.

***Stakeholder Engagement***

The key interested party to this project is the Ministry of National Economy eager to successfully fulfil the decentralization reform and institutionalize the positive changes. The Ministry will play an active role as a partner and a facilitator along the project duration time to ensure that it is implemented effectively and efficiently. The Ministry will be directly involved into all planning, monitoring activities, as well as into discussions of preliminary and final results of the project. Regional government administration officials are also stakeholders of this project, as it is their duty to support the self-governance reform implementation within their areas of responsibility.

***Knowledge***

Building up expertise and data sources on self-governance across the country is one of the projects main outcomes that will lay ground for recommendations on the self-governance reform’ further advancement. The Ministry of National Economy will use lessons, cases and numbers collected through the project’s activities to deliver reports and assessments on the Five institutional reforms’ implementation to the country’s top-management.

Conclusions and recommendations, as well as methodological guidelines that will result from the activities of this project may be publishable. Furthermore, the Ministry of National Economy may organise workshops through which such information may be disseminated to other interested parties, as well as to a wider audience of academics and practitioners in the area of public administration reform, both from Kazakhstan and other countries of the region.

***Sustainability***

National ownership of the results will be ensured by the continuous and direct involvement of the beneficiary organisations in the process of obtaining the expected results. Critical to sustainability of the expected results will be the willingness of the implementing partner and beneficiaries to implement the recommendations that will be eventually provided.

# Project Management

***Cost Efficiency and Effectiveness***

The project implementation mechanism has been conceived and designed in such a way as to deliver the maximum possible results against the available financial resources throughout the duration of the project. For instance, to ensure a wider coverage of the rural sites with training activities the implementing team will conduct combined trainings for the nearby rural districts. Also, the trainings will used not only for dissemination of information but also for collecting cases and assessing the needs and concerns of participants from local governing bodies and local communities.

***Project Management***

The project management team will operate out of the United Nations common premises in Nur-Sultan, Kazakhstan. The project will also require operational support, i.e. OHRM, procurement, financial, administrative and programme support, which will be provided by the respective UNDP units.

# Results Framework[[2]](#footnote-2)

| **Intended Outcome as stated in the UNDAF/Country Programme Results and Resource Framework:** Outcome 2.2: Judicial and legal systems, and public institutions, are fair, accountable and accessible to allpeople. |
| --- |
| **Outcome indicators as stated in the Country Programme Results and Resources Framework, including baseline and targets:**Indicator: Level of transparency of government policymaking Baseline: 40/144 (2013) Target: 24/144 (Global Competitiveness Index and OECD data)Indicator 5: Percentage of citizens reporting satisfaction with the accessibility, accountability and quality of public sector, judicial and law enforcement systems. Baseline: 68% (2015) Target: At least 80% (2020) |
| **Applicable Output from the UNDP Strategic Plan:** 1.2.1: Capacities at national and sub-national levels strengthened to promote inclusive development |
| **Project title and Atlas Project Number:** Supporting Kazakhstan’s Local Self-government Reform - project number: 00108173 |
| **EXPECTED OUTPUTS**  | **OUTPUT INDICATORS** | **DATA SOURCE** | **BASELINE** | TARGETS (by frequency of data collection) | DATA COLLECTION METHODS & RISKS |
| **Value** | **Year** | **Year 2020****(Jun-Dec)** | **Year 2021****(Jan-Dec)** | **Year 2022****(Jan-Dec)** |  |
| Component 1: Building capacity of the local authorities for effective administration of local budgets, involvement of the citizenry into decision-making process and increasing transparency |
| **Output 1.1*****Capacity-building seminars and trainings conducted in selected rural sites*** | * + 1. Number of akims of the administrative units involved into the 4th level budgeting having participated in the training activities (trainings would be gender mainstreamed by integrating gender concerns in policy decisions and its practical implementation).
 | Lists / registers of participants  | 0 | No baseline (project design implies using target markers instead) | 50 | 50 | 50 | Initial list of participants should be formed by the Ministry of National EconomyActual register of all participants should be collected at the seminars and trainingsRisks: [i] significant changes and/or akims could not be able or interested in participating in person; {ii] not sufficient and/or accurate information provided by the trainings |
| 1.1.2 Number of rural akimats’ employees having participated in the training activities  | Lists / registers of participants  | 0 | No baseline (project design implies using target markers instead) | 50 | 50 | 50 | Initial list of participants should be formed by the Ministry of National EconomyActual register of all participants should be collected at the seminars and trainingsRisks: [i] trained staff to quit the state service after the trainings; [ii] lower level specialists participating in the trainings with no/limited ability to influence managerial practices at the akimat; [iii] not sufficient and/or accurate information provided by the trainings |
| 1.1.3 Markers from the Qualitative assessment of the training activities and distributed gender mainstreamed informational materials (relevance, volume, trainer’s capacity, etc) | Appraisal questionnaires  | Depends on the format of the questionnaire (from 1 to 5 as an example) | No baseline (project design implies using target markers instead) | Possible maximum (5 on the 1 to 5 scale) | Possible maximum (5 on the 1 to 5 scale) | Possible maximum (5 on the 1 to 5 scale) | The managing team must develop an appraisal questionnaire where participants will assess different aspects of the training activities. In order to ensure the maximum level of participants’ satisfaction by organized training, the trainers must to demonstrate high personal, professional level of preparedness. Risks: [i] the questionnaires will not be filled properly; [ii] not sufficient and/or accurate information provided by oblast administrations  |
| Component 2: Development effective mechanisms for involving citizens in the decision-making process and further institutionalization of the reform  |
| **Output 2.1 *Comprehensive report on best practices of local self-governing and self-governance budgeting from developed countries (Member countries of the European Charter of Local Self-Governance)*** | 2.1.1 Report containing set of practical recommendations for developing local self-governing and self-governance budgeting taken from the developed countries practices (including gender analysis). | Laws and by-laws of the visited countries; other relevant legislative acts;Resumes and interviews with officials and other persons from the visited countries;Reports on visiting sites, events related to the study’ s theme. | N/A | N/A | Study visit is completed;Report is submitted and approved by the Project' | N/A | N/A | Preliminary study of the self-governance procedures and practices from the countries chosen for the study visit;A program of the study visit must include various types of activities: collecting documents, describing related procedures and activities, conducting interviews, attending sites and events.Risks: [i] inadequate analysis of relevant legislation and procedures leading to not gathering adaptable and acceptable practices for the Kazakhstani realities;  |
| **Output 2.2*****Media materials promoting local self-governance reform*** | 2.2.1 Two media clips to promote and justify further advancement of the self-governance reform | Study of the international best practices on self-governance;Collecting success-stories during the training activities;Collecting success-stories from first two years of the self-governance reform from other sources. | N/A | N/A | The preliminary scenario is approved by the Project management team | The media clips are prepared | The media clips are disseminated  | Data and stories must be collected in the first year of the project during the abroad study visit and the training activities;Risks: [i] inadequate scenario of the media clips will diminish their us as a promo tools for the self-governance reform;  |
| 2.2.2 One video material on issues and barriers of the self-governance reform | Collecting data, cases and arguments during the training activities and from other sources. | N/A | N/A | The preliminary scenario is approved | The video material is prepared | The video material is disseminated  | Data and stories must be collected in the first year of the project during the abroad study visit and the training activities;Risks: [i] inadequate scenario of the media materials will diminish their us as a promo tools for the self-governance reform;  |
| **Output 2.3 *Report on further advancing local self-governance reform*** | 2.3.1 Report on the progress and problems of the ongoing reform of the local self-government system, with the set of proposals for further strengthening the role of local self-government in terms of formation and use of budget revenues of local self-government, management of communal property, distribution of power and roles; capacities and structure of akim apparatus, the optimization of administrative-territorial units, etc. | Official reports to the Ministry of National Economy;Data, cases and arguments during the training activities;Live and/or phone interviews with the akims, akimat employees, civic activists from rural sites; | N/A | N/A | N/A | The report is prepared and approved | The report is prepared and approved | Analysis of related laws and by-laws Surveys conducted along the training activitiesInterviews with the officials both on the central and local levelsAnalysis of the budgetary documentationAnalysis of the local gatherings’ protocols, transcripts or any other documentsRisks: [i] since the reform works with very new procedures and events, the report might not contain accurate identification of the barriers and issues; [ii] report will not be used properly in further advancement of the reform on self-governance;  |
| **Component 3: Ensuring effective management of the Project** |
| **Output 3.1****Project Management, Operations and Support** | 3.1.1 All planned events are executed timely and in full accordance with the Project substance3.1.2 Trainings deemed as useful by the participants3.1.3 All reports are approved  | Internal reportsPayments and procurement reportsQuestionnaires filled by the participants | Project management standards set by the UNPD  | N/A | Internal documentation and payments are proceeded properly and on time | Internal documentation and payments are proceeded properly and on time | Internal documentation and payments are proceeded properly and on time | Analysis of internal reporting Project plan and set timelines are closely monitoredInternal managerial control measuresRisks: [i] contractors will not deliver adequate outputs; [ii] there will be no cohesive links between outputs; |

# Monitoring And Evaluation

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Monitoring Activity** | **Purpose** | **Frequency** | **Expected Action** | **Partners** **(if joint)** | **Cost** **(USD)** |
| **Track results progress** | Assessment of project implementation progress in achieving the agreed outputs against the results indicators (see results framework table);  | In the frequency outlined for each indicator in the results framework (annually) | Work closely with contractors to assess whether the results of the envisioned activities match the beneficiary’s expectations. Slower than expected progress will be addressed by the project management team. | UNDP / MNE | TBC |
| **Monitor and Manage Risk** | Updated Risk Log in Atlas and off-line risk log. Specific risks are identified in the risk log and suggested mitigating measures provided (see annex 3). Discussion of risks with CO Management and the partners, if any considerate risk arises.  | Annually | Risks are identified by project management team and actions are taken to manage each risk. The risk log is actively maintained and updated to keep track of identified risks and actions taken.  | UNDP | - |
| **Learn**  | Knowledge and good practices contained in the activities’ reports will be captured and encapsulated in policy briefs / assessment reports for selective dissemination.  | Annually  | Preparation of policy briefs / assessment reports. Relevant lessons are captured by the project team and used to inform management decisions.  | UNDP | TBC |
| **Annual Project Quality Assurance** | Annual quality assurance exercise. | Annually | Performance data, risks, lessons learnt, and output quality will be discussed by the project board and used to make modifications, if needed.  | UNDP / MNE |  |
| **Review and Make Course Corrections** | It will be done through collection and analysis of evidence indicating project implementation progress. Development of corrective measures will follow, if required, to achieve the project results.  | Annually | Performance data, risks, lessons learnt, and quality will be discussed by the project board and used to make course corrections. | UNDP / MNE | - |
| **Project Progress Report** | A progress report 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.  | Annually | Consideration and approval of project progress reports by the Project Board.  | Project Board | - |
| **Project Review (Project Board)** | The project’s governance mechanism (i.e., the project board) will hold regular project reviews to assess the performance of the project and review the Multi-Year Work Plan to ensure realistic budgeting over the life of the project. In the project’s final year, the Project Board shall hold an end-of-project review to capture lessons learned and discuss opportunities for scaling up and to socialize project results and lessons learned with relevant audiences. | Annually | Any quality concerns or slower than expected progress should be discussed by the project board and management actions be agreed to address the issues identified.  | Project Board | - |

**Evaluation Plan[[3]](#footnote-3)**

Since the project aims at promoting recommendations and tools for the self-governance reform participants, it is sufficient to conduct two types of M&E activities: (1) assessment of the projects direct outcomes according to the workplan, (2) assessing general impact of the project through tracing changes in the 4th level budgeting outcomes later on. Both of these evaluation activities can be conducted by the implementing team and the Ministry of National Economy; thus this doesn’t require any specific funds to be allocated specifically to evaluation.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Title** | **Partners (if joint)** | **Related Strategic Plan Output** | **UNDAF/CPD Outcome** | **Planned Completion Date** | **Key Evaluation Stakeholders** | **Cost and Source of Funding** |
| Assessing the projects direct outcomes | MNE | 1.2.1: Capacities at national and sub-national levels strengthened to promote inclusive development | Outcome 2.2: Judicial and legal systems, and public institutions, are fair, accountable and accessible to all people. | March 2021 | MNE RKLocal authorities (akimats)Local residents’ representativesLocal NGOs (if present) | N/A |
| Assessing general impact of the project | MNE | 1.2.1: Capacities at national and sub-national levels strengthened to promote inclusive development | Outcome 2.2: Judicial and legal systems, and public institutions, are fair, accountable and accessible to all people. | November 2022 | MNE RKLocal authorities (akimats)Local residents’ representativesLocal NGOs (if present) | N/A |

# Multi-Year Work Plan [[4]](#footnote-4)[[5]](#footnote-5)

|  |
| --- |
| **BUDGET SUMMARY (USD)** |
| **EXPECTED OUTPUTS** | **PLANNED ACTIVITIES** | **RESPONSIBLE PARTY** | **PLANNED BUDGET BY YEAR** | **Total** |
| Funding Source | Budget Description | 2020 | 2021 | 2022 |  |
| Component 1: Building capacity of the local authorities for effective administration of local budgets, involvement of the citizenry into decision-making process and increasing transparencyGender Marker: GEN2 | Output 1.1Capacity-building seminars and trainings conducted in selected rural sites | UNDP MNE RK | Government | 71600Transportation services | 58,000.00 | 17,000.00 | 54,500.00 | 129,500.00 |
| UNDP | 71600Transportation services | 14,000.00 | 8,000.00 | 4,495.00 | 26,495.00 |
| Government | 72100Contractual services | 6,750.00 | - | 5,554.00 | 12,304.00 |
| Government | 75100GMS (8%) | 5,180.00 | 1,360.00 | 4,804.00 | 11,344.00 |
| **Sub-Total for Component**  |   | Government |   | **69,930.00** | **18,360.00** | **64,858.00** | **153,148.00** |
| **Sub-Total for Component 1** |   | UNDP |   | **14,000.00** | **8,000.00** | **4,495.00** | **26,495.00** |
| **Sub-Total for Component 1** |   | Government/UNDP |   | **83,930.00** | **26,360.00** | **69,353.00** | **179,643.00** |
| Component 2: Development effective mechanisms for involving citizens in the decision-making process and further institutionalization of the reform Gender Marker: GEN2 | Output 2.1 Comprehensive report on best practices of local self-governing and self-governance budgeting from developed countries (Member countries of the European Charter of Local Self-Governance)Output 2.2 Media materials promoting local self-governance reformOutput 2.3 Report on further advancing local self-governance reform | UNDP MNE RK | Government | 72100Contractual services | - | 1,890.00 | - | 1,890.00 |
| Government | 74200Production of audio and visual materials | - | 8,900.00 | - | 8,900.00 |
| Government | 71600Transportation services | - | 29,800.00 | - | 29,800.00 |
| UNDP | 71600Transportation services |  | 3,000.00 |  | 3,000.00 |
| Government | 71300Local Individual Consultants | - | 4,000.00 | 2,000.00 | 6,000.00 |
| Government | 75100GMS (8%) | - | 3,567.00 | 160.00 | 3,727.00 |
| **Sub-Total for Component 2** |   | Government |   | **-** | **48,157.00** | **2,160.00** | **50,317.00** |
| **Sub-Total for Component 2** |   | UNDP |   | **-** | **3,000.00** | **-** | **3,000.00** |
| **Sub-Total for Component 2** |   | Government/UNDP |   | **-** | **51,157.00** | **2,160.00** | **53,317.00** |
| **Component 3:**Project Management, Operations and Support | Output 3.1 Ensuring effective management of the Project | UNDP MNE RK | Government | 71400Project Staff | 21,370.00 | 16,473.00 | 33,837.00 | 71,680.00 |
| UNDP | 71400Project Staff | 3,035.00 | 4,447.00 | 8,000.00 | 15,482.00 |
| Government | 73100Rent and office maintenance | 2,650.00 | 2,650.00 | 5,300.00 | 10,600.00 |
| Government | 64397 DPC – programme | 1,931.00 | 731.00 | 1,045.00 | 3,707.00 |
| Government | 64397 DPC – operations | 6,045.00 | 3,963.00 | 4,842.00 | 14,850.00 |
| UNDP | 71600 Transportation Services | 1,160.00 | 400.00 | 400.00 | 1,960.00 |
| Government | 72500Office Supplies | 3,077.00 | 232.00 | 376.00 | 3,685.00 |
| Government | 75100GMS (8%) | 2,806.00 | 1,924.00 | 3,632.00 | 8,362.00 |
| **Sub-Total for Component 3** |   | Government |   | **37,879.00** | **25,973.00** | **49,032.00** | **112,884.00** |
| **Sub-Total for Component 3** |  | UNDP |  | **4,195.00** | **4,847.00** | **8,400.00** | **17,442.00** |
| **Sub-Total for Component 3** |  | Government/UNDP |  | **42,074.00** | **30,820.00** | **57,432.00** | **130,326.00** |
|  |
| **GRAND TOTAL (Government)** |  |  |  | **107,809.00** | **92,490.00** | **116,050.00** | **316,349.00** |
| **GRAND TOTAL (UNDP)** |  |  |  | **18,195.00** | **15,847.00** | **12,895.00** | **46,937.00** |
| **GRAND TOTAL (Government/UNDP)** |  |  |  | **126,004.00** | **108,337.00** | **128,945.00** | **363,286.00** |

# Governance and Management Arrangements

The project will be jointly governed by the Ministry of National Economy and the UNDP. Expected outputs and outcomes will be jointly agreed at regular intervals during the implementation period of the project. Ministry and UNDP representatives will meet monthly for the first six months of the project implementation period and then bi-monthly to assess progress made, as well as results achieved, and provide recommendations for corrective action, if needed.

The senior beneficiary of this Project will be the Ministry of National Economy, which plans to formulate policy recommendations for the consideration of the Government, that will, in turn, prepare and promote appropriate legislation in due course to achieve the goals of its policies in these domains.

UNDP will assume the role of the coordinator of project implementation. As this project entails activities which are of high priority for the Government, it will also ensure that the best available professional expertise will be engaged to produce the substantive work required by the project in achieving its expected results.

UNDP will hire a project manager to oversee and coordinate the day-to-day work involved in this project, as well as a project assistant to help with the day-to-day work involved in implementing the project in a timely and efficient manner.

Furthermore, UNDP will take the lead in procuring specialised services provided by professional firms in the fields of functional analysis and organisational management to deliver high-quality results.

Last, but not least, UNDP will engage its project assurance mechanism and/or occasionally engage an international consultant to monitor progress and evaluate results at regular intervals during the project implementation period, to ensure that good and robust results are produced upon completion of the envisioned activities.

It is critical that all actors involved develop good lines of communication to resolve issues that may come up during the implementation of the project and hinder its timely completion, especially with respect to tight deadlines for some activities, imposed by the Beneficiary. In this context, the project manager will play a vital role in resolving issues, confronting and mitigating risks and liaising with the beneficiary and other stakeholders in moving forward as smoothly as possible with the project implementation.

**UNDP**

**Project Assistant**

**Project Manager**

**Ministry of National Economy**

**Ministry of National Economy / UNDP Governance Unit**

**Project Governance Structure**

**Project Quality Assurance**

**UNDP**

# Legal Context

Kazakhstan has signed a Standard Basic Assistance Agreement (SBAA) with UNDP. Thus, this project document shall be the instrument referred to as such in Article 1 of the Standard Basic Assistance Agreement between the Government of Kazakhstan and UNDP, signed on October 4, 1994. All references in the SBAA to “Executing Agency” shall be deemed to refer to “Implementing Partner.”

This project will be implemented by the Ministry of National Economy (“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.

# Risk Management

**Option a. Government Entity (NIM)**

1. 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:
2. 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;
3. assume all risks and liabilities related to the Implementing Partner’s security, and the full implementation of the security plan.
4. 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.
5. 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/aq_sanctions_list.shtml>.
6. The Implementing Partner acknowledges and agrees that UNDP will not tolerate sexual harassment and sexual exploitation and abuse of anyone by the Implementing Partner, and each of its responsible parties, their respective sub-recipients and other entities involved in Project implementation, either as contractors or subcontractors and their personnel, and any individuals performing services for them under the Project Document.

(a) In the implementation of the activities under this Project Document, the Implementing Partner, and each of its sub-parties referred to above, shall comply with the standards of conduct set forth in the Secretary General’s Bulletin ST/SGB/2003/13 of 9 October 2003, concerning “Special measures for protection from sexual exploitation and sexual abuse” (“SEA”).

(b) Moreover, and without limitation to the application of other regulations, rules, policies and procedures bearing upon the performance of the activities under this Project Document, in the implementation of activities, the Implementing Partner, and each of its sub-parties referred to above, shall not engage in any form of sexual harassment (“SH”). SH is defined as any unwelcome conduct of a sexual nature that might reasonably be expected or be perceived to cause offense or humiliation, when such conduct interferes with work, is made a condition of employment or creates an intimidating, hostile or offensive work environment.

1. a) In the performance of the activities under this Project Document, the Implementing Partner shall (with respect to its own activities), and shall require from its sub-parties referred to in paragraph 4 (with respect to their activities) that they, have minimum standards and procedures in place, or a plan to develop and/or improve such standards and procedures in order to be able to take effective preventive and investigative action. These should include: policies on sexual harassment and sexual exploitation and abuse; policies on whistleblowing/protection against retaliation; and complaints, disciplinary and investigative mechanisms. In line with this, the Implementing Partner will and will require that such sub-parties will take all appropriate measures to:
2. Prevent its employees, agents or any other persons engaged to perform any services under this Project Document, from engaging in SH or SEA;
3. Offer employees and associated personnel training on prevention and response to SH and SEA, where the Implementing Partner and its sub-parties referred to in paragraph 4 have not put in place its own training regarding the prevention of SH and SEA, the Implementing Partner and its sub-parties may use the training material available at UNDP;
4. Report and monitor allegations of SH and SEA of which the Implementing Partner and its sub-parties referred to in paragraph 4 have been informed or have otherwise become aware, and status thereof;
5. Refer victims/survivors of SH and SEA to safe and confidential victim assistance; and
6. Promptly and confidentially record and investigate any allegations credible enough to warrant an investigation of SH or SEA. The Implementing Partner shall advise UNDP of any such allegations received and investigations being conducted by itself or any of its sub-parties referred to in paragraph 4 with respect to their activities under the Project Document, and shall keep UNDP informed during the investigation by it or any of such sub-parties, to the extent that such notification (i) does not jeopardize the conduct of the investigation, including but not limited to the safety or security of persons, and/or (ii) is not in contravention of any laws applicable to it. Following the investigation, the Implementing Partner shall advise UNDP of any actions taken by it or any of the other entities further to the investigation.

b) The Implementing Partner shall establish that it has complied with the foregoing, to the satisfaction of UNDP, when requested by UNDP or any party acting on its behalf to provide such confirmation. Failure of the Implementing Partner, and each of its sub-parties referred to in paragraph 4, to comply of the foregoing, as determined by UNDP, shall be considered grounds for suspension or termination of the Project.

1. 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).
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. 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.
6. In the event that an investigation is required, UNDP has the obligation to conduct investigations relating to any aspect of UNDP projects and programmes in accordance with UNDP’s regulations, rules, policies and procedures. 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.
7. 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.

1. The Implementing Partner agrees that, where applicable, donors to UNDP (including the Government) whose funding is the source, in whole or in part, of the funds for the activities which are the subject of 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.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. 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.

# XII. ANNEXES

1. **Project Quality Assurance Report**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Project title: | Supporting Local Self-Governance (LSG) Reform in Kazakhstan |
| Project number:  | 00108173 |
|  |
| 1. **Strategic – Quality Rating:**
 |
| 1 | Does the project’s theory of change specify how it will contribute to higher level change?  | The project has a theory of change with some explicit assumptions describing how the project will contribute to outcome level change as specified in the CPD, backed by some evidence of what works effectively in this context. The project document clearly describes why the project’s strategy is the best approach now. (3) |
| Evidence | The project responds to the following areas of development: sustainable development pathways; enabling environment for expansion of decent livelihoods in the policy, legal, regulatory and institutional framework; and national and sub-national governments have improved capacities to perform their functions in an effective and efficient manner.  |
| Management response |  |
| 2 | Is the project aligned with the thematic focus of the UNDP Strategic Plan? | The project responds to one of the three areas of development work as specified in the Strategic Plan. The project’s RRF includes at least one SP output indicator. (2) |
| Evidence | The project contributes to strengthened and innovative public institutions: public institutions are fair, accountable, and accessible to all people. Capacities of government at national and sub-national levels strengthened to promote inclusive development is the most relevant SP output indicator for this project. |
| Management response |  |
| 3 | Does the project have strategies to effectively identify, engage and ensure the meaningful participation of targeted groups / geographic areas with a priority focus on the excluded and marginalised? | The target groups/geographic areas are appropriately specified, prioritising the excluded and/or marginalised. The project document states how beneficiaries will be identified, engaged and how meaningful participation will be ensured throughout the project. (both must be true to select this option). (2) |
| Evidence  | The project aims to engage local residents and local authorities of the settlements and town directly involved into the LSG reform (50 each year). |
| Management response |  |
| 4 | Have knowledge, good practices, and past lessons learnt of UNDP and others informed the project design? | The project design mentions knowledge and lessons learnt backed by evidence / sources, which inform the project’s theory of change but have not been adequately used to justify the approach selected over alternatives. (2) |
| Evidence | The project’ intervention strategy is based on analysis of the Reform outcomes in two previous years of implementation (2018-2019).  |
| Management response |  |
| 5 | Does the project use gender analysis in the project design and does the project respond to this gender analysis with concrete measures to address gender inequities and empower women? | A gender analysis on the project has been conducted. This analysis reflects on the different needs, roles and access to/control over resources of women and men. Gender concerns are integrated in the development challenge and strategy sections of the project document. The results framework includes outputs and activities that specifically respond to this gender analysis, with indicators that measure and monitor results contributing to gender equality. (all must be true to select this option). (2) |
| Evidence | The Project might have a gender focus through promoting gender budgeting at the local level as a part of best practices.  |
| Management response |  |
| 6 | Does UNDP have a clear advantage to engage in the role envisioned by the project vis-à-vis national partners, other development partners, and other actors?  | 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. It is clear how results achieved by relevant partners will contribute to outcome level change complementing the project’s intended results. (3) |
| Evidence | UNDP is the partner of choice for the government. Prior work of UNDP in this development area is considered an additional advantage.  |
| Management response |  |
| 1. **Relevance – Quality Rating:**
 |
| 7 | Are project objectives and expected results consistent with national needs and priorities? | Yes, they are fully consistent with national needs and priorities. (3) |
| Evidence | Its objectives are consistent with national priorities. Its expected results are consistent with national needs, considering the on-going decentralization process.  |
| Management response |  |
| 1. **Social and environmental standards – Quality Rating:**
 |
| 8 | Does the project seek to further the realisation of human rights using a human rights based approach? | Some evidence that the project aims to further the realization of human rights. 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. (2) |
| Evidence | The activities that are going to be implemented within the project will definitely contribute to the improvement of the system of public administration, the quality of public services provision, the effectiveness of state executive bodies at national and regional levels. This, for sure, will bring strong positive influence on recipients in receiving public services of a high quality, access to information, increase opportunities, etc. |
| Management response  |  |
| 9 | Did the project consider potential environmental opportunities and adverse impacts, applying a precautionary approach? | Credible evidence that opportunities to enhance environmental sustainability and integrate poverty-environment linkages were fully considered as relevant, and integrated in project strategy and design. Credible evidence that potential adverse environmental impacts have been identified and rigorously assessed with appropriate management and mitigation measures incorporated into project design and budget. (all must be true to select this option). (3) |
| Evidence | The project will contribute to expanding people's rights for receiving social and economic benefits, i.e. to receive public services timely and in a proper way, at a high level. Also, communities’ participation practices might have an environmental character. people engagement in allocating 4th budgeting might contribute to more firm prioritization of ecology and local environmental issues. |
| Management response |  |
| 10 | Has the Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) been conducted to identify potential social and environmental impacts and risks? | Yes  |
| Evidence | SESP was conducted. There are no risks identified. |
| Management response  |  |
| 1. **Management and Monitoring – Quality Rating:**
 |
| 11 | Does the project have a strong results framework? | The project’s selection of outputs and activities are at an appropriate level and relate in a clear way to the project’s theory of change. Outputs are accompanied by SMART, results-oriented indicators that measure all the key expected changes identified in the theory of change, each with credible data sources, and populated baselines and targets, including gender sensitive, sex-disaggregated indicators where appropriate. (3) |
| Evidence | Outputs and activities are at the appropriate level. Outputs are accompanied by specific results-oriented indicators (see also RRF). |
| Management response  |  |
| 12 | Is there a comprehensive and costed M&E plan with specified data collection sources and methods to support evidence-based management, monitoring and evaluation of the project?  | Yes |
| Evidence | The project implementation is in line with the M&E plan of the project document (see section VI of the project document). M&E will be reviewed and regularly updated within the Atlas project management module. Systematic reporting on the project results will be conducted regularly (as specified in the plan). The results will be reflected in the annual progress reports.  |
| Management response |  |
| 13 | Is the project’s governance mechanism clearly defined in the project document including planned composition of the Project Board?  | The project’s governance mechanism is defined in the project document; 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 manager and the quality assurance roles. (2) |
| Evidence | The governance mechanism is defined at the level of the project partners, i.e. UNDP GU and MNE. However, individuals have not yet been specified. The Project Board will monitor and analyse the project implementation process and its outputs and will provide recommendations on the most effective implementation strategy to ensure that the project results are achieved. Important responsibilities of the Project Board are included in the Project Document (see section 4.1 in annex 4). |
| Management response |  |
| 14 | Have the project risks been identified with clear plans stated to manage and mitigate each risk?  | Project risks related to the achievement of results are fully described in the project risk log, based on comprehensive analysis drawing on the theory of change, Social and Environmental Standards and screening, situation analysis, capacity assessments and other analysis. Clear and complete plan in place to manage and mitigate each risk. (both must be true to select this option). (3) |
| Evidence | Project risks are identified, and suggested mitigation measures provided in annex III of this project document. |
| Management response |  |
| 15 | Have specific measures for ensuring cost-efficient use of resources been explicitly mentioned as part of the project design?  | Yes.  |
| Evidence | Cost of activities has been estimated based on market data. Project management team membership has been kept to essential personnel only. |
| Management response |  |
| 16 | Are explicit plans in place to ensure the project links up with other relevant on-going projects and initiatives, whether led by UNDP, national or other partners, to achieve more efficient results?  | No. |
| Evidence | Not at this point in time, although this project’s results may prove useful when the Government will announce further plans on decentralisation reforms. |
| Management response  |  |
| 17 | Is the budget justified and supported with valid estimates?  | The project 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. Costs are supported with valid estimates based on prevailing rates. (2) |
| Evidence | The project budget is justifiable and valid. The budget is broken down to activity level and funding sources are identified. Costs are estimated based on a recent market survey (see also section VII – multi-year work plan). Resources are distributed efficiently. The size and scope of the project is consistent with resources available and planned to be mobilised.  |
| Management response  |  |
| 18 | Is the Country Office fully recovering the costs involved with project implementation? | The budget fully covers all direct project costs that are directly 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.). (3) |
| Evidence | The budget fully covers all DPC and other costs in accordance with prevailing UNDP policies (see also section VII – multi-year work plan and budget). |
| Management response |  |
| 1. **Effective – Quality Rating:**
 |
| 19 | Is the chosen implementation modality most appropriate?  | The required implementing partner assessments (capacity assessment, HACT micro assessment) have been conducted and the implementation modality chosen is consistent with the results of the assessments. (2) |
| Evidence | This is a NEX project, thus its operational modality was determined a priori. It is a modality that is utilised widely in implementing such projects.  |
| Management response |  |
| 20 | Have targeted groups, prioritising marginalised and excluded populations that will be affected by the project, been engaged in the design of the project in a way that addresses any underlying causes of exclusion and discrimination?  | Some evidence that key targeted groups, prioritising marginalized and excluded populations that will be involved in the project, have been engaged in the design of the project. Some evidence that their views, rights and any constraints have been analysed and incorporated into the root cause analysis of the theory of change and the selection of project interventions. (2) |
| Evidence | This project will provide an excellent opportunity to further streamline public administration system in the country that will lead to empowerment of citizens of Kazakhstan, will create favourable environment, and will provide additional opportunities for recipients, especially for marginalized and excluded populations.  |
| Management response  |  |
| 21 | Does the project conduct regular monitoring activities, have explicit plans for evaluation, and include other lesson learning, timed to inform course correction if needed during project implementation?  | Yes |
| Evidence | Yes, the project governance mechanism is assigned to monitor implementation progress of activities frequently. Every six months for the first year of implementation and annually thereafter. The Resource Monitoring and Evaluation Unit will also monitor progress annually. The Project Board has the authority to take corrective action if needed.  |
| Management response |  |
| 22 | 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 |
| Evidence | The activities to be implemented within the project will create an opportunity to used tools of gender budgeting on the 4th level budgeting across the country. |
| Management response  |  |
| 23 | Is there a realistic multi-year work plan and budget to ensure outputs are delivered on time within allotted resources?  | The project has a realistic work plan & budget covering the duration of the project at the activity level to ensure outputs are delivered on time and within the allotted resources. (3) |
| Evidence | The project has a realistic work plan and budget prepared (see section VI – multi-year work plan and budget for details).  |
| Management response |  |
| 1. **Sustainability and National Ownership – Quality Rating:**
 |
| 24 | Have national partners led, or proactively engaged in, the design of the project?  | National partners have full ownership of the project and led the process of the development of the project jointly with UNDP. (3) |
| Evidence  | The national partners are fully engaged into the decision making and monitoring of the project through their active participation in the project board, working consultations and assessment of the work plans. The initial terms of reference for this project were prepared by the Ministry of National Economy, keen to proceed with its implementation in partnership with the UNDP Country Office. UNDP provides the support in project operations and oversight activities as indicated in the LoA between UNDP and the implementing partner as set out in the project document.  |
| Management response  |  |
| 25 | Are key institutions and systems identified, and is there a strategy for strengthening specific / comprehensive capacities based on capacity assessments conducted?  | The project has a comprehensive strategy for strengthening specific capacities of national institutions based on a systematic and detailed capacity assessment that has been completed. 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. (3). |
| Evidence | The project falls within the strategic priorities of UNDP in Kazakhstan, outlined in the current CPD, including the approach to monitor regularly national capacities using pre-defined and clear indicators.  |
| Management response  |  |
| 26 | Is there 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  |
| Evidence | Operationally the project will adhere to UNDP modalities with respect to procurement, monitoring and evaluation. This is in full agreement with the beneficiary, |
| Management response  |  |
| 27 | Is there a clear transition arrangement / phase-out plan developed with key stakeholders to sustain or scale up results (including resource mobilisation strategy)? | Yes |
| Evidence | It has explicitly been discussed with the beneficiary that completion of this project will culminate to others, which will delve into more specific capacity development activities and know-how transfer.  |
| Management response  |  |

##

## 2. Social and Environmental Screening

**Project Information**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Project Information***  |  |
| 1. Project Title
 | Supporting Local Self-Governance (LSG) Reform in Kazakhstan |
| 1. Project Number
 | 00108173 |
| 1. Location (Global/Region/Country)
 | Kazakhstan |

**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 activities that are going to be implemented within the project will definitely contribute to the improvement of the system of public administration, the quality of public services provision, the effectiveness of state executive bodies at national and regional levels. Moreover, the self-governance reform and the related project activities imply the most direct civic participation in decision making process within the governing system of Kazakhstan. |
| ***Briefly describe in the space below how the Project is likely to improve gender equality and women’s empowerment*** |
| The project creates opportunities to introduce gender budgeting in practice across the country. The akims and key staff of the local state authorities will be educated on preparing budgets or analysing them from a gender perspective. Furthermore, several participatory tools might be adapted to defining needs of women in rural areas anonymously which is important for tackling sensitive problems (hygiene issues, domestic violence, opportunities for women, etc). |
| ***Briefly describe in the space below how the Project mainstreams environmental sustainability*** |
| Budgeting with engaging local people will help prioritize local environmental issues, thus contributing to environmental sustainability. Related training topics will be included into the training program. Participatory practices for the local communities might be also designed to discussing and searching for environmental solutions. |

**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 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 Description*** | ***Impact and Probability (1-5)*** | ***Significance******(Low, Moderate, High)*** | ***Comments*** | ***Description of assessment and management measures as reflected in the Project design. If ESIA or SESA is required note that the assessment should consider all potential impacts and risks.*** |
| Risk 1 Marginalised groups of people might be excluded from participation in local gatherings, thus not being able to bring up their needs and concerns | I = 5P = 5 | **High** | **Regions vary in terms of tolerance to marginalized population. Poverty is stigmatized as well as several illnesses.**  | **For training program in rural areas (especially southern and western parts of the country) a special module on Participatory Needs Assessment should be included with focus on sensitive topics and specific target groups** |
| Risk 2 Women might be excluded from participation in local gatherings due to several cultural setting | I = 5P = 3 | **High** | **Regions very differentiate on strengths of traditional values and power balance between men and women in society.** | **For training program in rural areas (especially southern and western parts of the country) a special module on Participatory Needs Assessment should be included with focus on sensitive topics and specific target groups** |
| Risk 3 People might not be aware of environmental and societal issues enough to choose them as priorities for budgeting | I = 4P = 2 | **Low** | **Analysis of Community development plans from previous years demonstrated that people and akimats are tended to keep ‘business as usual’ (include staple expenditures and tools), thus not benefitting enough from opportunities of self-governance** |  |
|  | **QUESTION 4: What is the overall Project risk categorization?**  |
| **Select one (see** [**SESP**](http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/operations1/undp-social-and-environmental-screening-procedure.html) **for guidance)** | **Comments** |
| ***Low Risk*** |  **x** | **Risks are clearly defined and preventable** |
| ***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 | **Comments** |
| ***Principle 1: Human Rights*** | **☐** |  |
| ***Principle 2: Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment*** | **x** |  |
| ***1. Biodiversity Conservation and Natural Resource Management*** | **☐** |  |
| ***2. Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation*** | **☐** |  |
| ***3. Community Health, Safety and Working Conditions*** | **x** |  |
| ***4. Cultural Heritage*** | **☐** |  |
| ***5. Displacement and Resettlement*** | **☐** |  |
| ***6. Indigenous Peoples*** | **☐** |  |
| ***7. Pollution Prevention and Resource Efficiency*** | **☐** |  |

**Final Sign Off**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Signature*** | ***Date*** | ***Description*** |
| QA Assessor |  | 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 |  | 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 |  | 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? [[6]](#footnote-6)  | 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 accessing environmental goods and services? | No |
| **Principle 3: Environmental Sustainability:** Screeningquestions regarding environmental risks are encompassed by the specific Standard-related questions below |  |
|  |  |
| **Standard 1: Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable** [**Natural**](#SustNatResManGlossary) **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? | 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? | 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? | No |
| **Standard 2: Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation** |  |
| 2.1 Will the proposed Project result in significant[[7]](#footnote-7) 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](#CCVulnerabilityGlossary) now or in the future (also known as maladaptive practices)? | 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 accountability)? | No |
| **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?[[8]](#footnote-8) | 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)?  | 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, resources, territories and traditional livelihoods of the indigenous peoples concerned? | No |
| 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](#TransboundaryImpactsGlossary)?  | 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?  | 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 |

**3. Risk Analysis**. Use the standard [Risk Log template](https://intranet.undp.org/global/documents/ppm/FINAL_Risk_Log_Template.doc). Please refer to the [Deliverable Description of the Risk Log](https://intranet.undp.org/global/documents/ppm/FINAL%20Risk%20Log%20Deliverable%20Description.doc) for instructions

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Type** | **Description** | **Date Identified** | **Probability[[9]](#footnote-9)** **&** **Impact[[10]](#footnote-10)** | **Countermeasures / Management response** | **Owner** | **Submitted / updated by** | **Last Update** | **Status** |
| 1 | Environmental | No environmental risks identified | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 2 | Financial | Project possesses sufficient funds to implement all activities | March 2020 | Activities will cover all settlements for trainings and other work P = 1 / I = 5 | UNDP will work closely with the Ministry of National Economy to provide wide participation in trainings and other activities | Project Manager | Project Manager | - | - |
| 3 | Operational / Organizational | Large scale of the self-governance reform might lead to excessive demand for the project activities | March 2020 | Beneficiary’s requirement to involve significant number of participants into training activities in a rather short period of time may hinder the quality of expected resultsP = 2 / I = 4  | UNDP and the MNE will facilitate access to information and trainings via online tools to ensure high quality of results and wider access to the project’ activities | Project Manager | Project Manager | - | - |
| Some seasonal works may diminish ability of akimats to participate in the project due to high workload | March 2020 | There are several seasonal works and conditions that require akims and key staff constant attention. They vary from region to region.P = 2 / I = 4  | UNDP will ensure that project activities timeslots take the seasonal workload of akimats into account | Project Manager | Project Manager | - | - |
| Selection of most experienced consultants to carry out research activities | March 2020 | Off target selection and engagement of most suitable consultancy firms/experts may influence the quality of the outputs and resultsP = 1 / I = 4 | UNDP will use precise and detailed evaluation criteria in selecting the most experienced consultancy firm / experts | Project Manager | Project Manager | - | - |
| 4 | Political | Frequent turnover of key decision making personnel (akims) | March 2020 | Change in key beneficiary personnel may hinder timely progress of activities and further use of resultsP = 3 / I = 3 | Engage mid-level beneficiary personnel and key staff from participating akimats in acquiring new knowledge and skills | Project Manager | Project Manager | - | - |
| 5 | Regulatory | Project results may not lead to legislative initiatives | March 2020 | Recommendations culminating from findings may not progress in the legislative process, since the project is aimed at practical implementation of new mechanisms of self-governance introduced by the new law “On local government and self-government in the Republic of Kazakhstan”. P = 2 / I = 2 | Work closely with the Government to highlight benefits of legislating findings and recommendations | Project Manager | Project Manager | - | - |
| 6 | Health and Safety | Local and international travel restrictions due to the spread of coronavirus may affect key project activities | March 2020 | If there will be evidences of further COVID-19 spread in Kazakhstan and abroad in 2020, most of the project activities must be revised due to security reasonsP = 3 / I = 5 | UNDP will prepare an online training tools and approaches. For international travel UNDP will prepare an option of conducting desk research, online communications and requesting needed materials from foreign partners | Project Manager | Project Manager | - | - |

**4. Project Board Terms of Reference**

***Overall Responsibilities***

To ensure UNDP’s ultimate accountability, a Project Board (PB) is established with the ultimate responsibility for making sure that the project remains on course to deliver the desired results. The Board is responsible for making management decisions for the project consensually: [i] at designated decision point during the implementation of the project, in line with the specific responsibilities below; [ii] when guidance is required by the Project Manager; and [iii] when project tolerances – normally in terms of budget and time – have been exceeded.

The PB reviews and approves the annual work plans (AWP) and authorises any major deviation from these plans. It ensures that the required resources are available, arbitrates on any conflicts within the project and negotiates a solution to any problems between the project and the external bodies involved. In addition, it approves the appointment and responsibilities of the Project Manager. It may also decide to delegate its Project Assurance responsibilities to a designated staff member of UNDP and/or of the Implementing Partner.

***Composition and organization***

The Senior Beneficiary – the Ministry of National Economy – heads the Project Board and is ultimately responsible for the project. The Ministry’s appointed representative has to ensure that the project remains focused on achieving its objectives and is cost-effective by conducting regular reviews with respect to project implementation progress and results achieved.

The Implementing Agent – the UNDP Kazakhstan Governance Unit – is ultimately responsible for providing guidance regarding the technical feasibility of the project. The UNDP’s appointed representative is accountable for the quality of the resources provided to implement the project, as well as for ensuring that all activities are carried out in accordance with UNDP rule, regulations and processes.

***Specific responsibilities***

When the project in initiated the Project, Board should:

* Agree on the Project Manager’s responsibilities, as well as the responsibilities of the Project Associate;
* Delegate any project assurance functions as appropriate;
* Review and appraise the detailed project plans and annual work plans, including the risk log and the monitoring plan;

During the implementation of the project:

* Provide overall guidance and direction to the project;
* Decisions by consensus are essential to reflect the dual accountability of the Government and UNDP in accordance with applicable regulations, rules, policies and procedures;
* Address project issues as raised by the Project Manager;
* Provide guidance and agree on possible management actions to address specific risks;
* Agree on Project Manager’s tolerances within the AWP;
* Conduct regular meetings to review the project progress report and provide direction and recommendations to ensure that the agreed deliverables are produced satisfactorily according to plans;
* Review Combined Delivery Reports (CDR) prior to certification by the implementing partner;
* Appraise the project annual review report, make recommendations for the next AWP;
* Provide ad hoc direction and advice for exceptional situations when the project manager’s tolerances are exceeded;
* Assess and decide on project changes through revisions.

When the project is being closed:

* Assure that all Project deliverables have been produced satisfactorily;
* Review and approve the Final Project Review Report, including Lessons-learned;
* Make recommendations for follow-on actions to be submitted to the Outcome Board;
* Commission project evaluation if it is required;
* Notify operational completion of the project to the Outcome Board.

***Meetings of the Project Board***

* On a quarterly basis to review and approve the regular project reports;
* At any other time a meeting is requested by one of its members, the Project Manager or the Project Assurance because guidance is required, tolerances have been exceeded, or a particular issue or risk requires the intervention of the Project Board.

***Project Assurance***

Project Assurance is the responsibility of the UNDP Resource Monitoring and Evaluation Unit. The following list includes the key elements that need to be checked for assurance purposes throughout the project.

* Maintenance of thorough liaison throughout the project between the members of the Project Board;
* Beneficiary needs and expectations are being met or managed;
* Risks are being controlled;
* Adherence to the Project Justification (Business Case);
* Projects fit with the overall Country Programme;
* The right people are being involved;
* An acceptable solution is being developed;
* The project remains viable;
* The scope of the project is not “creeping upwards” unnoticed;
* Internal and external communications are working;
* Applicable UNDP rules and regulations are being observed;
* Any legislative constraints are being observed;
* Adherence to monitoring and reporting requirements and standards;
* Specific responsibilities of the assurance function.

During the implementation of the project:

* Ensure that funds are made available to the project;
* Ensure that project outputs definitions and activity definition including description and quality criteria have been properly recorded in the Atlas Project Management module to facilitate monitoring and reporting;
* Ensure that risks and issues are properly managed, and that the logs in Atlas are regularly updated;
* Ensure that critical project information is monitored and updated in Atlas, using the Activity Quality log in particular;
* Ensure that Project Quarterly Progress Reports are prepared and submitted on time, and according to standards in terms of format and content quality;
* Ensure that CDRs and FACE are prepared and submitted to the Project Board and Outcome Board;
* Perform oversight activities, such as periodic monitoring visits and “spot checks”.
* Ensure that the Project Data Quality Dashboard remains “green”.

When the project is being closed:

* Ensure that the project is operationally closed in Atlas;
* Ensure that all financial transactions are in Atlas based on final accounting of expenditures;
* Ensure that project accounts are closed, and status set in Atlas accordingly.

## 5. Standard letter of agreement between UNDP and the Ministry of National Economy of the Republic of Kazakhstan for the provision of support services

Reference is made to consultations between officials of the Ministry of National Economy of the Republic of Kazakhstan (hereinafter referred to as “the MNE”) and officials of UNDP with respect to the provision of support services by the UNDP country office for nationally managed programmes and projects. UNDP and the MNE hereby agree that the UNDP country office may provide such support services at the request of the MNE through its institution designated in the relevant project document of the joint project of the UNDP and the MNE.

The UNDP country office may provide support services for assistance with reporting requirements and direct payment. In providing such support services, the UNDP country office shall ensure that the capacity of the MNE -designated institution is strengthened to enable it to carry out such activities directly. The costs incurred by the UNDP country office in providing such support services shall be recovered from the administrative budget of the office.

The UNDP country office may provide, at the request of the designated institution, the following support services for the activities of the project:

(a) Identification andrecruitment of project personnel; handling administrative issues related to the project personnel;

(b) Identification and facilitation of training activities, seminars and workshops;

(c) Procurement of goods and services;

(d) Processing of direct payments.

The procurement of goods and services and the recruitment of project personnel by the UNDP country office shall be in accordance with the UNDP regulations, rules, policies and procedures. Support services described in paragraph 3 above shall be detailed in an annex to the project document, in the form provided in the Attachment hereto. If the requirements for support services by the country office change during the life of a project, the annex to the project document is revised with the agreement of the UNDP resident representative and the designated institution.

The relevant provisions of the Standard Basic Assistance Agreement (SBAA) betweenwith the MNE of Kazakhstan and the UNDP, signed by the Parties on 5 October 1992, including the provisions on liability and privileges and immunities, shall apply to the provision of such support services. The MNE shall retain overall responsibility for the nationally managed project through its designated institution. The responsibility of the UNDP country office for the provision of the support services described herein shall be limited to the provision of such support services detailed in the annex to the project document.

Any claim or dispute arising under or about the provision of support services by the UNDP country office in accordance with this letter shall be handled pursuant to the relevant provisions of the SBAA.

The manner and method of cost-recovery by the UNDP country office in providing the support services described in paragraph 3 above shall be specified in the annex to the project document.

The UNDP country office shall submit progress reports on the support services provided and shall report on the costs reimbursed in providing such services, as may be required.

Any modification of the present arrangements shall be effected by mutual written agreement of the parties hereto.

If you are in agreement with the provisions set forth above, please sign and return to this office two signed copies of this letter. Upon your signature, this letter shall constitute an agreement between the MNE and UNDP on the terms and conditions for the provision of support services by the UNDP country office for nationally managed project the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the MNE of Kazakhstan (Ministry of National Economy of the Republic of Kazakhstan) “Supporting Local Self-Governance (LSG) Reform in Kazakhstan”.

Attachment to the Annex 5:

DESCRIPTION OF UNDP COUNTRY OFFICE SUPPORT SERVICES

Reference is made to consultations between the Ministry of National Economy of the Republic of Kazakhstan, the institution designated by the Government of Kazakhstan, and officials of UNDP with respect to the provision of support services by the UNDP country office for the nationally managed project of UNDP and the MNE of Kazakhstan “Supporting Local Self-Governance (LSG) Reform in Kazakhstan”, Project ID 00108173, or “the Project”.

In accordance with the provisions of the letter of agreement signed and the project document, the UNDP country office shall provide support services for the Project as described below.

Support services to be provided, including:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Support services** | **Schedule for the provision of the support services** | **Cost to UNDP of providing such support services (where appropriate)** | **Amount and method of reimbursement of UNDP (where appropriate)** |
| Payment Process | Ongoing throughout implementation when applicable | As per the UPL- US$ 38.49 for each  | UNDP will directly charge the project upon provision of services, on a quarterly basis. |
| Vendor profile entry in ATLAS | Ongoing throughout implementation when applicable | As per the UPL- US$ 20.66 for each | As above |
| Staff HR & Benefits Administration & Management (one time per staff including the issuance of the contract and separation) | Ongoing throughout implementation when applicable | As per the UPL-US$ 205.66 for each  | As above |
| Recurrent personnel management services: Staff Payroll & Banking Administration & Management (per staff per calendar year) | Ongoing throughout implementation when applicable | As per the UPL- US$ 448.67 for each  | As above |
| Position and Budget Management (Updates of COAs in Atlas) | Ongoing throughout implementation when applicable | As per the UPL- US$ 23.53 for each | As above |
| Consultant recruitment  | Ongoing throughout implementation when applicable | As per the UPL- US$ 234.26 | As above |
| Issue/Renew IDs (UN LP, UN ID, etc.) | Ongoing throughout implementation when applicable | As per the UPL- US$ 38.20 for each | As above |
| Travel claim or F10 settlement | Ongoing throughout implementation when applicable | As per the UPL-US$ 23.12 for each  | As above |
| Travel Ticket processing | Ongoing throughout implementation when applicable | As per the UPL-US$ 31.74 for each  | As above |
| UNDP car use within Nur-Sultan | Ongoing throughout implementation when applicable | As per the UPL-US$ 40.00 per hour  | As above |

Total amount for support services shall not exceed 15,000 USD.

1. Note: Adjust signatures as needed

2 The Gender Marker measures how much a project invests in gender equality and women’s empowerment. Select one for each output: GEN3 (Gender equality as a principle objective); GEN2 (Gender equality as a significant objective); GEN1 (Limited contribution to gender equality); GEN0 (No contribution to gender quality) [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. UNDP publishes its project information (indicators, baselines, targets and results) to meet the International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI) standards. Make sure that indicators are S.M.A.R.T. (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant and Time-bound), provide accurate baselines and targets underpinned by reliable evidence and data, and avoid acronyms so that external audience clearly understand the results of the project. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Optional, if needed [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Cost definitions and classifications for programme and development effectiveness costs to be charged to the project are defined in the Executive Board decision DP/2010/32 [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Changes to a project budget affecting the scope (outputs), completion date, or total estimated project costs require a formal budget revision that must be signed by the project board. In other cases, the UNDP programme manager alone may sign the revision provided the other signatories have no objection. This procedure may be applied for example when the purpose of the revision is only to re-phase activities among years. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. 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. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. 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.] [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. 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. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Probability scale: 1 (low) to 5 (high). [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Impact scale: 1 (low) to 5 (high). [↑](#footnote-ref-10)