



Evaluation Report of the Pakistan SDPD-II project & Recommendations

FINAL REPORT

23-10-2012

-

Franklin De Vrieze, Ruth Beeckmans, Raza Ahmad

Table of Content

Acronyms

Acknowledgments

I. Executive Summary

II. Introduction to the SDPD-project

III. The IPU-UNDP Evaluation Mission in 2012

- 3.1. Evaluation objectives
- 3.2. Structure of the evaluation report
- 3.3. Criteria for the evaluation
- 3.4. Methodology for the evaluation
- 3.5. Challenges to the evaluation

IV. Context: Parliamentary Democracy and Political Processes in Pakistan

V. Project Design

VI. Project Implementation

- Outcome 1. Capacity Development and support to selected Parliamentary Committees
- Outcome 2. Enhance the Skills of the Secretariat Staff that work with Committees
- Outcome 3. Citizens Advocacy; Working with CSOs to create effective advocacy
- Outcome 4. Better Coordination of Aid and Support to the Federal Parliament

VII. Project Management

- 7.1. Project Review Board (PRB)
- 7.2. Project Human Resources
- 7.3. Project's Primary Partners: PIPS and IPU
- 7.4. Project Financial Management
- 7.5. Project Reporting
- 7.6. Project Communication
- 7.7. Relations with UNDP and UN Agencies

VIII. The Way Forward: Challenges and opportunities for parliamentary democracy in Pakistan

IX. Recommendations

- 9.1. Recommendations for SDPD-II
- 9.2. Recommendations for the third phase of SDPD, 2014 onwards

X. Annexes:

- Annex 1. List of interlocutors and persons interviewed
- Annex 2. Bibliography of documents consulted
- Annex 3. Biography of members of the IPU-UNDP evaluation team
- Annex 4. Parliamentary staff questionnaire
- Annex 5. ToR of the evaluation mission
- Annex 6. ToR of the Chief Technical Advisor to SDPD-II

Acronyms

AWP	Annual Work Plan
BDP	Bureau for Development Policy
CO	Country Office
CPA	Commonwealth Parliamentary Assembly
CPAP	Country Program Action Plan
CSOs	Civil Society Organizations
CTA	Chief Technical Advisor
DGG	Democratic Governance Group
ILO	International Labor Organization
IPU	Inter-Parliamentary Union
KP	Khyber Pukhtoonkhwa
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
MP	Member of Parliament
NA	National Assembly
NPD	National Project Director
NPM	National Project Manager
NTA	National Technical Advisor
OPPD	Office for the Promotion of Parliamentary Democracy
PAC	Public Accounts Committee
PCOM	Project Cycle Operations Manual
PEMRA	Pakistan Electronic Media Regulatory Authority
PILDAT	Pakistan Institute of Legislative Development and Transparency
PIPS	Pakistan Institute for Parliamentary Services
PMU	Project Management Unit
PRA	Parliamentary Reporters Association
PRB	Project Review Board
PSDP	Public Sector Development Program
RRF	Results and Resources Framework
SDPD	Strengthening Democracy through Parliamentary Development
TNA	Training Needs Analysis
ToR	Terms of Reference
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
WFD	Westminster Foundation for Democracy

DISCLAIMER

The “*Evaluation Report of the Pakistan SDPD-II project & Recommendations*” has been drafted by Franklin De Vrieze, Ruth Beeckmans and Raza Ahmad. It was developed in the framework of the “Strengthening Democracy through Parliamentary Development” program in Pakistan, funded by the Kingdom of The Netherlands and co-funded and implemented by the United Nations Development Program (UNDP). The views expressed in this report are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of these institutions.

Acknowledgments

The IPU-UNDP evaluation team would like to express its appreciation for the unhindered access to and for the frank and kind discussions held with members of parliament and staff of the National Assembly, Senate and provincial assemblies of Pakistan, the National Program Director, the various experts, representatives of CSOs, the media, development partners and other stakeholders during the time of the project evaluation mission.

The evaluation team is very grateful to the UNDP Deputy Country Director, Assistant Country Director, National Program Manager and all SDPD staff for the information and documentation provided, and for their insights and perspectives on the parliamentary support project.

The evaluation team also appreciates the practical and logistical support provided by the UNDP Country Office, the SDPD team, the federal parliament and the provincial assemblies in support of the mission during the three week evaluation period in September 2012.

Finally, the evaluation team is particularly grateful for the warmth and hospitality extended to it in parliament, at UNDP and with other interlocutors.

Franklin De Vrieze
Ruth Beeckmans
Raza Ahmad

Brussels, New York, Islamabad
October 2012

I. Executive Summary

Cooperation between the Parliament of Pakistan, the Inter Parliamentary Union (IPU) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) started when the project “Strengthening Democracy through Parliamentary Development” (SDPD) was initiated. The first phase of the project started in 2004, followed by a second phase which started in 2009. The project is funded by the Kingdom of The Netherlands and co-funded and implemented by the United Nations Development Program (UNDP).

Because the second phase of SDPD was half-way through its project cycle and as foreseen in the Project Document, an independent review of the project was commissioned. IPU and UNDP engaged three experts to work on this assignment. The evaluation team included an international parliamentary expert proposed by IPU (the Mission Leader, Franklin De Vrieze), a parliamentary development specialist from UNDP Democratic Governance Group - DGG (Ruth Beeckmans), and a national consultant with expertise in governance in Pakistan (Raza Ahmad). The evaluation started on 10 September 2012 and continued in-country until 27 September 2012.

The main objectives of the evaluation were to:

- ◆ Evaluate the results and initial impact achieved by the project;
- ◆ Assess the effectiveness of UNDP support to the project;
- ◆ Identify and critically analyze the relevance of the project activities;
- ◆ Critically analyze the effectiveness of the implementation modalities;
- ◆ Formulate recommendations on the way forward.

During its three weeks assignment in September 2012, the evaluation team conducted a wide range of interviews with stakeholders and interlocutors both within and outside the National Assembly and the Senate. The evaluation team also analyzed the project-documentation, visited the Provincial Assemblies in Punjab and Sindh, met with civil society in Islamabad, Lahore and Karachi, and engaged with other international partners of the parliament.

Based upon the analysis deriving from the assessment, the evaluation team structured the final evaluation report under three headings: (i) project design, (ii) project implementation and (iii) project management. Under the section “Project design” the evaluation team analyzed the extent to which the Project Document provided a solid and workable basis for successful project implementation. The section “Project implementation” evaluated the activities against the stated outputs. The evaluation was based on four criteria: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and impact/sustainability. The section “Project management” reviewed how the implementation and evaluation mechanisms were structured and managed.

The evaluation team identified a number of successes achieved by SDPD-II during the three years of its implementation to date. These included:

- The Women’s Caucus of the Pakistani parliament has become a platform that cuts across party lines which allows building consensus on priority issues concerning women and ensuring that gender concerns are addressed through legislation, policies and programs. The project has provided substantial support by organizing a national conference, developing a web-site, creating the Secretariat of the Caucus and assisting in international outreach.
- The project offered the technical assistance of research assistants to a number of selected Standing Committees. The research assistants conducted legislative research on issues under debate in Committees and monitored the implementation status of recommendations

formulated by the Committee. The research assistants also drafted the annual or multi-annual Committee reports of a growing number of Committees.

- The Project provided substantial input to the orientation session for newly elected Senators on issues such as parliamentary procedures, the Committee system and the administrative structure of the parliament.
- Staff trainings have upgraded the knowledge and skills of Committee staff on legislative drafting, the budget process, research methodology and parliamentary oversight.
- The project has contributed to improve the outreach of parliament towards young people through the launch of the Youth Parliamentary School and the Children's Parliament. CSOs and parliamentary reporters have benefitted from the policy roundtables and workshops offered to them.

The evaluation team also found a number of shortcomings:

- The delayed recruitment of technical expertise to the Project Management Unit (PMU), namely an international Chief Technical Advisor (CTA) and national technical advisors, has considerably reduced the project's ability to offer advice to improve the functioning of parliament and to provide quality input on issues under discussion in the Committees.
- Subsequently, the project has not yet been able to follow-up on structural issues of parliamentary development, such as undertaking a functional review of the Committee system, piloting public hearings and facilitating a procedural review to enable public hearings and consultations.
- Staff trainings revealed the need for longer, comprehensively designed trainings and at a more advanced level.
- There is still scope to enhance coordination with other donors and potential partners, through the Aid Coordination Committee (at parliament) and the Technical Working Group (among donors). Moreover, the UN Coordination Group of Agencies interacting with parliament has still not met. These three forums were envisaged in the project Document.

One of the main chapters of this report is dealing with recommendations. The evaluation team has listed its recommendations under two sections. The first section provides recommendations for the remaining project implementation period of the SDPD-II, including recommendations on the composition of the PRB, the immediate recruitment of a CTA, cooperation with PIPS and IPU, and more detailed recommendations under each of the four project outcomes. The second section provides recommendations concerning the possible design of the third phase of the SDPD, which includes a discussion on a planning and scoping mission to assess future support to the federal parliament and the provincial assemblies.

In short, the IPU-UNDP evaluation team is of the opinion that the SDPD-II project has played an important role in providing support to federal parliament during 2009-2012, but that a number of issues could have been addressed more effectively and more efficiently. The evaluation team hopes that this report will provide both broad and more focused guidance to the Parliament of Pakistan and the UNDP for the continuation of SDPD-II and for the design of the successor project.

In sharing this report with the Parliament of Pakistan, the evaluation team suggests that a special meeting of the Project Review Board be convened to discuss the report, with a particular focus on its recommendations.

II: Introduction to the SDPD project

In 2002, the authorities of the Parliament of Pakistan sought the support of the Inter Parliamentary Union (IPU) and United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) to strengthen its operations. In light of the report of an UNDP/IPU mission in 2003,¹ the *Strengthening Democracy through Parliamentary Development* (SDPD) project was initiated.

The SDPD project was launched in December 2004 and its content closely mirrored the Results Framework published in the UNDP/IPU 2003 mission report. The project lasted three years, finishing in November 2007, with a budget of USD 2,767,095, of which USD 100,000 was allocated by the UNDP and the remainder unfunded at the project start date. The implementing partners were the Secretariats of the Senate and National Assembly with other partners being drawn from civil society, academic institutions, the media, and other donor funded projects. In November 2005 the IPU and the Parliament signed a MoU with a view to the implementation of technical assistance inputs for the project.

Led by Parliament, with support from the UNDP and IPU, the first SDPD Project has provided Parliamentarians with access to a range of orientation and capacity building opportunities offered through national and international sponsored programs. These have afforded participants an opportunity to gain information and to strengthen links with civil society and the media. Technical capacity building and institutional strengthening of the Parliament's Secretariats were undertaken in the hope that progressively enhanced support could be delivered to Parliament and Parliamentarians.

The main outputs of the SDPD-I included the production of the Human Resources Management Reports for both Houses with detailed Job Descriptions of the entire staff, a comprehensive study on joint Research and Library facilities, a publication of rulings of the Chair (1947 - 1997) for the NA, and the establishment of and support to the Women's Parliamentary Caucus Secretariat.

The SDPD-I provided Secretariat staff trainings, orientation sessions for Parliamentarians, IT equipment for 12 Committees in each House, media trainings on parliamentary coverage and training of civil society. In addition, SPDP-I offered training to women parliamentarians, organized the Youth Parliamentary School, two multi-party delegations (Philippines, Thailand) to study the committee system, one staff attachment with the National Parliament of Australia and the publication of orientation materials for members.

In 2009 a Review Team comprising of a representative of the UNDP, the IPU, and a national consultant was tasked with assessing the functioning and outcomes of the first phase of the project and preparing the scope of the second phase of the project. The 2009 mission found that the scope and the ambition of the first phase of the project was daunting, particularly given the limited budget and staff. After reviewing project outputs in detail, a pattern was identified in which subordinate activities, in themselves usually thoroughly worthwhile, generated relatively positive results whereas more fundamental reforms fared less well. This was understandable, as subordinate activity may often be inherently more straightforward to achieve than fundamental reforms.

The 2009 review mission was of the opinion that the SDPD-I was probably under-resourced at the political level to enable it to succeed in the most ambitious of its set outputs i.e. there was insufficient Parliamentary political leadership input at the routine, day to day level. The 2009

¹ UNDP and IPU (2003) 'Report on Joint UNDP/IPU Needs Assessment Mission to the Federal Parliament of Pakistan, 20 – 31 October 2003'.

review mission also stated that *“consideration needs to be given to a significant enhancement of medium to long term, in-country technical capacity within the Project Management Unit (PMU), a resource which is presently virtually non-existent. Such capacity will provide a consistency of day to day technical support to Parliament and raise the present profile of the Project. We have found that the achievement of one key activity was dependent in key aspects upon short term consultant inputs and that these were compromised when the security situation deteriorated. This should be avoided in future wherever possible.”*

The 2009 review team also assessed that Parliament would require support for some years to come, *“possibly as many as eight to ten”*. Consequently the team proposed a ‘phase two’ project extending to four years in the first instance; which should be reviewed in the third year of the new phase.

The 2009 review team then developed a framework for a future UNDP Parliamentary assistance project based on a progress review of the first Phase of the *Strengthening Democracy through Parliamentary Development* Project. It noted that the great strength of the UNDP is its perceived neutrality and inclusive approach. It considered that the UNDP has a major role in coordinating support for the parliament, with the donors, implementers, and most importantly within the UN family where a wealth of technical/subject expertise resides, much probably as yet fully untapped in parliament’s interest.

The 2009 review team saw a major role for SDPD-II in supporting the federal parliament designing and adopting the Strategic Development Plan of parliament. The team identified four strategic interventions for a second phase of the project 1) Support to a limited number of Parliamentary Committees 2) Enhancing the skills of Secretariat staff that work with Committees 3) Working with CSOs to create effective advocacy on behalf of citizens and 4) the Establishment of an Aid Coordination Committee in parliament.

Taking into account the recommendations formulated by the evaluation mission, a second phase of SDPD Project started in 2009, for a period of 4 years. The Strengthening Democracy through Parliamentary Development phase-II project was designed to assist the parliament to strengthen its legitimate role within national governance, enhance its administration, and provide appropriate support for Parliamentarians in discharging their core tasks of executive oversight and law making. The Project focused on the four outcomes as identified by the 2009 evaluation team.

III. The IPU-UNDP Evaluation Mission in 2012

The mid-term review of SDPD-II, upon the request of IPU and UNDP, started on 10 September 2012 and continued its in-country phase until 27 September 2012.

3.1. Objectives of the evaluation

As per the ToR, the evaluation team was requested to assess the progress of the project against stated outputs by June 2012, identify issues and make recommendations for the remaining project period.

The evaluation team has thus assessed the achievements, relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of the project. The team specifically looked at early signs of potential impact of the project. In other words, the task of the team was to point out and document the contribution of the project to the functioning of the parliament of Pakistan during the last three years. The evaluation team put forward recommendations for further support to the parliament of Pakistan which could strengthen and sustain the impact of the project so far.

Upon the suggestion of the Dutch Embassy, the donor of the project, the Project Review Board (PRB) considered in its August 2012 meeting whether the ‘mid-term evaluation’ could be turned into a ‘final evaluation’, since there was only 12 months left before the end of the project implementation period. As a ‘final evaluation’ held in September 2012 would not address the remainder of the project and would thus considerably reduce the impact reported, the IPU-UNDP evaluation team, in consultation with the Dutch Embassy, agreed that the scope of work would be to review progress rather than to undertake a mid-term or final review. Participants also agreed that the ‘review mission’ would produce recommendations for the remaining 12 months of the project and recommendations for a possible new phase of the project, if feasible. Having concluded the review, the 2012 IPU-UNDP evaluation team considers an end-of-project evaluation at the end of 2013 still very valuable in order to capture the project’s achievements during the September 2012 – August 2013 period, based upon the recommendations of our current evaluation.

3.2. Structure of the evaluation report

The evaluation team has structured its review, and the final evaluation report, under three main headings: project design, project implementation and project management.

Under the section “Project design”, the Project Document and the implementation framework as established at the start of the Project were reviewed. The team analyzed to what extent the Project Document has provided a solid and workable basis for successful project implementation.

The section “Project implementation” evaluated the activities against the stated objectives in the four program components:

- ◆ Capacity Development and support to selected number of Parliamentary Committees
- ◆ Enhance the Skills of the Secretariat Staff that work with Committees
- ◆ Citizens Advocacy; Working with CSOs to create effective advocacy on behalf of citizens
- ◆ Aid coordination; Better Coordination of Aid and Support to the Federal Parliament

The section “Project management” reviewed how the implementation, monitoring and evaluation mechanisms have performed. Among other areas, the evaluation team looked at the functioning of the Project Review Board (PRB), the project’s human resources and financial management, project reporting, and cooperation with UNDP and other UN agencies.

Due to the specific national context of early transition to a democratic system in Pakistan, the report includes a contextual chapter on parliamentary democracy and current political processes in Pakistan (next chapter of the report). At the end of the report, there is a conceptual chapter discussing the challenges and opportunities for parliamentary democracy in Pakistan in the years to come. This chapter provides the conceptual framework for the recommendations that are made later in the report.

3.3. Criteria for the evaluation

The evaluation team applied the Result Oriented Monitoring and Evaluation approach to assess the implementation of the present project, since many UNDP Country Offices use the Results Oriented Annual Reporting (ROAR). The team conducted the evaluation in an objective, impartial, open and participatory manner. Based upon the guidance provided by the ToR, the team applied the following criteria for the evaluation:

- ◆ *Relevance*: Evaluate the logics and unity of the process in planning and designing the activities for supporting the National Assembly and the Senate.
- ◆ *Efficiency*: Evaluate the efficiency of the project implementation, the quality of the results achieved and the time/political constraints.
- ◆ *Effectiveness*: Conduct an assessment of the management decisions vis-à-vis the cost effectiveness and to which extent project outputs have been effectively achieved; evaluating the extent to which the UNDP CO and project staff effectively managed all inputs (money, staff, human resources).
- ◆ *Impact*: Evaluate the overall impact of the project and its contribution to the development of the parliamentary institution (short term).
- ◆ *Sustainability*: Assess the sustainability of results with specific focus on national capacity and ownership over the process (long term).

Each of these five aspects are rated on a scale from “low” to “very high” and include a narrative justification.

A mark “low” means that the set of activities under that output did not meet the requirements in terms of one of the criteria (relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and impact/sustainability). A mark “medium” means that the set of activities under that output only partially met the requirements in terms of the stated criteria. A mark “high” means that the set of activities under that output fully met the requirements in terms of the criteria reviewed. A mark “very high” means that the set of activities under that output exceeded the requirements for the stated criteria (relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and impact/sustainability).²

The evaluation resulted in an “evaluation chart” for each of the four main program components: Capacity development and support to selected number of parliamentary Committees; Enhance the skills of the Secretariat staff that work with Committees; Citizens advocacy and working with CSOs to create effective advocacy on behalf of citizens; Aid coordination & better coordination of support to Parliament.

In line with the United Nations Evaluation Group’s Standards, the evaluation team reviewed “*what evaluation follow-up mechanisms exist that ensure that evaluation recommendations are*

² An example of ratings given for each of the evaluation criteria to parliamentary strengthening projects, can be found at: MURPHY, Jonathan, *Strengthening Effectiveness and Transparency of the Parliament of Georgia, Project Evaluation and Formulation*, London / Tbilisi, August 2008, 32 pp.; DE VRIEZE, Franklin & MURAPA, Rukudzo, *Evaluation of the UNDP Parliamentary Project in Zimbabwe and Recommendations*, July 2012, Brussels / Harare, 55 pp.

properly utilized and implemented in a timely fashion and that evaluation findings are linked to future activities.” (UNEG Standards for Evaluation in the UN System, pg. 5)³

3.4. Methodology for the evaluation

A multi-dimensional methodology was used for the evaluation.

Desk review. The evaluation team obtained in-depth understanding of the documented contents and activities of the project by reviewing the Project Document, work plans, annual and quarterly reports, research papers, manuals, and assessment reports.

The desk review also considered the relevant legal framework (Constitution of Pakistan, Rules of Procedure of the National Assembly and Senate), the programming documents in the “ONE UN joint programs”, and external assessments of the National Assembly and Senate.

Conceptual back-ground information considered for the evaluation included a number of policy documents on parliamentary development such as the “UNDP Strategy Note on Parliamentary Development” (2009)⁴, the “EC Reference Document on Engaging with Parliaments Worldwide” (2010)⁵, the “IPU Parliamentary Self-Assessment Toolkit” (2008)⁶ and the Standards for Democratic Parliaments (2010)⁷.

Structured interviews. Based upon the desk review of documents, the evaluation team designed a check-list for the interviews, enabling to gather comparative and consistent data on activity results, activity feed-back, parliament performance and suggested future project approaches. The evaluation team conducted structured interviews with key counterparts, such as chairpersons of the Committees involved in the project, Secretariats, the Pakistan Institute for Parliamentary Services (PIPS), etc. Other interlocutors of the project such as authors of the publications, training providers, civil society organizations were interviewed and/or consulted. The evaluation team interviewed the National Project Director and National Project Manager, the head of the Governance Section of the UNDP CO and the IPU focal point for this program.

The representative of the British Council, implementing the new EU-funded parliamentary program in Pakistan, the key-expert which designed the EC-British Council’s inception report and the Westminster Foundation for Democracy (WFD) were interviewed in London. There was also a meeting with a representative of the Office for the Promotion of Parliamentary Democracy (OPPD) of the European Parliament in Brussels. A full list of those interviewed is included as Annex of this report.

Review of quantitative data. The evaluation team attempted to collect quantitative information on the performance of the National Assembly and the Senate in those areas directly addressed by the project’s activities. The evaluation team attempted to collect quantitative data on the number of Committee meetings of those Committees involved in the project.

Validation. Prior to finalizing the report, the evaluation team sought to validate the main findings and recommendations of the mission, with a view to obtain comments and opinions. Validation meetings were conducted with the vice-chairperson of the Senate (and chair of the PRB), the NPD, NPM and the UNDP CO.

³ http://www.uneval.org/papersandpubs/documentdetail.jsp?doc_id=22

⁴ http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/democratic-governance/parliamentary_development/parliamentary-development-strategy-note-.html

⁵ http://www.europarl.europa.eu/pdf/oppd/Page_8/engaging_and_supporting_parliaments_en.pdf

⁶ <http://www.ipu.org/pdf/publications/self-e.pdf>

⁷ <http://www.agora-parl.org/standardsfordemocraticparliaments>

3.5. Challenges to the evaluation

The evaluation team was faced with a number of conceptual and practical challenges.

The first conceptual challenge in evaluating a parliamentary strengthening project is the attribution question: to what extent can one attribute a change in parliament's functioning to an intervention by a project? Experience in other countries and projects indicate that neither the implementation of specific activities nor the resources spent are necessarily or uni-dimensionally correlated with parliamentary strengthening. This is largely due to the large number of intervening variables in parliamentary performance. Political choices by the country's leadership and parliament's decisions can have a decisive impact on project implementation. Given the fragile democratic context in Pakistan, there is no substitute for a nuanced policy and conceptual analysis. The evaluation team has carefully reviewed the context in which the project implementation happened and the way the external environment evolved and impacted upon the project. This has been reflected in the analysis contained in the following pages.

A second challenge for the evaluation was how to accurately review the sustainability of the SDPD project support. In countries with a longer or more stable democratic and parliamentary tradition, project support focus on structures and procedures, beyond individual activities and workshops, in order to achieve a sustainable impact. Lessons learned from the evaluation of such parliamentary projects indicate that specific activities can be sustained by parliament if the project has managed to ensure that the appropriate organizational structures and procedures have been put in place by parliament and are adhered to. In Pakistan, the democratic tradition is still very new. A fair assessment of the sustainability of project interventions requires a longer period of project input, provided there is political and institutional willingness to evolve towards more effective structures and democratic procedures. The evaluation team has addressed the sustainability question by assessing the openness and interest to move towards such structures and procedures and by identifying early signs of potential impact of the project. Again, a nuanced policy and conceptual analysis was required to make any meaningful comments on sustainability of the SDPD project interventions.

A third, more practical challenge for the evaluation was the time-availability of MPs and staff for the structured interviews. The evaluation team received the solid support of the SDPD team to facilitate the appointments and was able to meet the vice-chairperson of the Senate, chairpersons of NA Committees, MPs of the federal and provincial parliaments and the Secretariat leadership and staff from the NA, Senate and provincial parliaments. Unfortunately, it was not possible to meet the vice-chairperson of the National Assembly. Due to demonstrations against an inflammatory anti-Islam video posted on YouTube and the subsequent security-guidance received from the UNDP Security Team, a number of meetings had to be rescheduled. In Karachi, members of parliament, the leadership of the Secretariat and CSOs were kind enough to meet the evaluation team at the hotel.

In summary, the IPU-UNDP evaluation team did meet a sufficient number of interlocutors which allows drafting observations and recommendations on a solid and informed basis.

IV. Context: Parliamentary Democracy and Political Processes in Pakistan

Since gaining independence 65 years ago, Pakistan has experienced 33 years of military rule under four different dictators. Democracy in Pakistan only started to take root despite 28 years of intermittent and quasi-democratic rule before the last coup in 1999.

The executive has always remained powerful, and has subordinated the Judiciary as well as the Legislature, whenever it existed. Pakistan's current parliamentary institutions came into existence after the Constitution of 1973 was passed under the democratic government led by PM Zulfikar Ali Bhutto. However, that democratic experience was short-lived, as Bhutto was overturned in a coup orchestrated by General Zia ul Haq in 1977.

The last four years contrast sharply with the autocratic governance that characterized Pakistan in the last decades. The current government is likely to complete its tenure and it is hoped that there will be a peaceful transition to a new government in 2013. This stability has been propitious to the rise of both the parliament and the judiciary as independent institutions of the state performing their functions as prescribed by the Constitution. The judiciary – especially after the restoration of the incumbent Chief Justice of Pakistan in 2009 – has been pro-active and continually takes up popular causes. At the same time, the parliament has asserted its role as an empowered institution and survives against all odds. In addition, the current parliamentary regime has emphasized and practically displayed the evolution of a consensus on transforming the governance landscape in Pakistan. This is in sharp contrast to previous parliamentary tenures, when national legislatures were mere 'rubber stamps' in approving the policies and orders of the executive, whether it was a nominally civilian government or a military junta in power.

Current Composition of Pakistan's Federal Parliament

	Senate	National Assembly
Last election to the house⁸	2012	2008
Total strength (No. of members)	104	336
No. of standing Committees	30 ⁹	42 ¹⁰
No. of special Committees	-	10
No. of male members	87	259
No. of female members	17 (16.3%)	60 (Reserved Seats) + 17 (Elected) Total = 77 (22.9%)

⁸ The number of party-wise members of National Assembly is a total of elected seats, reserved seats for women, and reserved seats for non-Muslims/minorities that the party has gained in the 2008 general elections. For a breakup, see <http://www.ecp.gov.pk/NAPosition.pdf>

⁹ Does not include 6 other Committees such as: Functional Committee on Government Assurances, Functional Committee on Problems of Less Developed Areas, Committee on Rules of Procedure and Privileges, House Committee, Finance Committee and Library Committee.

¹⁰ Does not include 5 Parliamentary Committees and 1 Select Committee: Parliamentary Committee on Appointment of Chief Election Commissioner and Members of the Election Commission, Parliamentary Committee on Constitutional Reforms, Parliamentary Committee on Judges' Appointment in the Superior Courts, Parliamentary Committee on Kashmir, Parliamentary Committee on National Security, and Select Committee on Information Technology & Telecommunications on Prevention of Electronic Crime Bill, 2010.

The 18th Amendment to the Constitution of Pakistan was a watershed moment in the political history of Pakistan, and represented an essential step in restoring Pakistan's laws and Constitution to the original form as envisaged by its makers in 1973. The most important part of this Amendment was the reduction of Presidential powers and transfer of those powers to the Prime Minister, especially the power to dissolve Parliament as per Article 58(2)b. It was also significant in that the President willingly gave up his powers and transferred them to the parliament, unlike past military rulers and Presidents who issued autocratic Ordinances and monopolized more power and authority into the institution of the Presidency. The 18th Amendment transformed Pakistan from a semi-presidential to a parliamentary democracy, and also renamed the N.W.F.P. province to Khyber-Pakhtunkhwa, removing a colonial vestige and giving important elements of ownership and identity to the citizens of that province. The amendment was promulgated on April 19, 2010. The most critical effect of this amendment has been the devolution of hundreds of administrative, policy and legislative functions to the sub-national units by devolving, among others, 17 important ministries to the provinces, and giving them control and jurisdiction over important matters of governance such as health, education, environment, labor and manpower, agriculture and livestock, etc. The 7th NFC Award also allows for an equitable distribution of financial resources from the federation to the provinces, thereby making it fiscally possible for the provinces to carry out their new functions. In particular, the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) is now a primary responsibility of the provinces. The federation can only steer the process in the direction of a national policy articulated towards the achievement of these goals in all provinces and districts, by providing federal support as well as a monitoring and evaluating mechanisms to measure progress.

During 2011 and 2012, the parliament also passed the 19th and 20th Amendments to the Constitution of Pakistan, further removing sections and articles that had been introduced by Generals Zia ul Haq and Pervez Musharraf, dictators using arbitrary and undemocratic powers to legitimize their rule. The 19th Amendment increased the powers of the parliament in the electoral process. It also mandated a parliament-driven, democratic, consensus-based methodology to set up an independent Election Commission, to appoint the Chief Election Commissioner as well as Election Commissioners for all provinces. The 19th Amendment also contained important clauses pertaining to judicial appointments and for the first time introduced parliamentary input into the selection of judges at the higher courts. The Amendment also reflected the concerns articulated by the judiciary ensuring that a consensus methodology was introduced. The 20th Amendment introduced the mechanisms for a peaceful, rule-based method of transferring power. The amendment introduced clauses which reflect political consensus on the caretaker setup that exists between two parliamentary tenures. As such, these Amendments provided support to the existing democratic setup in Pakistan, and clarified important procedures relating to the process of democratic transition before and during elections. These amendments also contained clauses that enhanced the democratic constituency of Pakistan by allowing expatriate Pakistanis the right to vote in general elections.

The 19th and 20th Amendments are crucial in ensuring a free and independent judiciary as well as the conduct of free, fair and transparent elections in Pakistan, thereby consolidating the process of democratic transition from one parliament to the next. The constitutional provision for a neutral caretaking governance between elections and the consolidation of an independent Election Commission were made possible by these Amendments, which also reflected consensus and impartiality on the part of the legislators who assented to these Amendments.

The current parliamentary regime has other unique and distinct features that separate it from previous democratic and semi-democratic governments. For instance, the current parliament

has the highest number of women parliamentarians who have been elected by popular vote as well as appointed to reserved seats.¹¹ In addition to the 70 seats reserved for women in the National Assembly, 7 women were elected by the general public to sit in the NA? This means that 22.5% of the members of Pakistan's lower house of parliament are women.

In the upper house (i.e. Senate), there are 17 female Senators, representing 16.3 % of the 104-member legislative institution. With these statistics, Pakistan is closer to the global average of 20% membership of parliamentary houses composed of women, and exceeds the regional average of 18% of women in both the upper and lower houses of parliament, although there is still a long way to go to achieve gender equality in Parliament.

The role of women in Pakistan's current parliamentary regime has not been a symbolic representation of affirmative action in terms of women representation. Highly motivated female parliamentarians, such as Farahnaz Ispahani, Sherry Rehman, Fauzia Wahab, Shahnaz Wazir Ali, and many others, have pushed forward important legislation¹² for women's rights and protection of Pakistani women in society at large. They have been dynamic in pushing forward important legislation. This includes the law against sexual harassment of women in society (Criminal Law (Amendment Act) and in the workplace (Protection Against Harassment of Women at the Workplace Act), the law establishing the National Commission of Human Rights, the law criminalizing 'wani' (barter of girls for dispute resolution) and other cultural traditions that act to the detriment of women (Prevention of Anti-Women Practices Bill), the law ascribing harsh jail terms for acid-throwers (Acid Control and Acid Crimes Prevention Bill), the National Commission on the Status of Women (as a Bill which was passed in 2012), and the Women in Distress and Detention Fund Act.

The current parliamentary term has invigorated the process of legislative drafting and the powers of the parliamentary Committees in the due discharge of their Constitutional role, such as the introduction of bills – from private members, treasury members and opposition legislators – in the respective legislative house, their transfer to the relevant Committees for consideration, and the process of building consensus on various legislative items that are of importance to public interest as well as day-to-day governance. The Public Accounts Committee of the National Assembly has taken up various cases of financial maladministration and corruption, targeting various institutions that were seen to be previously unaccountable to the democratic office-holders of Pakistan, including the Federal Board of Revenue, and the National Logistics Cell, a subsidiary of the Pakistan Army. In July 2011, the Public Accounts Committee directed that NLC officials be investigated for illegally investing in the stock market and causing billions of rupees worth of losses. The PAC also examined audit reports from 1996 to 2008 on a fast-track basis and made a record recovery of Rs. 115 billion¹³.

The current parliament has seen a shift in composition from previous times, whereby under a feudal system a majority of elected parliamentarians 'inherited' the assembly seat from their ancestors, to a new generation of politicians who are now consolidating their role as legislators by mobilizing their constituencies on issue-based and solution-oriented politics.

Pakistan is affected by natural disasters, as well as poverty, inequality, extremism, regional conflicts, allegations of corruption and terrorist threats. Yet, the parliament must be commended for the legislation that it has passed thus far. In addition to the affirmative-action legislation for the protection of women, which has been mentioned above in detail, the current

¹¹ <http://www.ipu.org/wmn-e/classif.htm>

¹² <http://www.af.org.pk/PDF/Newsletters/nl%202011/NLE%20English%20-%2038.pdf>

¹³ <http://www.na.gov.pk/pac/sites/default/files/reports/2008-09.pdf>, p. iii

parliament has also passed major laws¹⁴ such as The Pakistan Institute for Parliamentary Services Act (2008), The Election Laws (Amendment) Bill (2009) and Act (2011), The Public Defender and Legal Aid Office Act (2009), The National Command Authority Act (2009) institutionalizing Pakistan's nuclear security framework, The Islamabad High Court Act (2010), The Competition Act (2010), The National Disaster Management Act (2010), The Earthquake Reconstruction and Rehabilitation Authority Act (2010), The Representation of the People (Amendment) Act (2011), The Special Economic Zones Act (2012), among many others.

Despite these efforts and the significant improvements in democratic governance, the parliamentary Secretariats – the main institutions providing procedural support to the National Assembly and Senate - are in need of reform to ensure they are capable to support a strong democratic parliament.

In 2010, a strategic plan for the parliament was prepared with the support of USAID. The Plan includes three parts: legislative/oversight; public participation and building effective institutions. A group of parliamentarians worked on the draft and agreed on the objectives and activities. The implementation of the plan has been uneven and its full ownership by all the parliamentarians remains questionable.

The current parliamentary regime should be credited with trying to seek democratic solutions to unlock the challenges created from confronting other institutions, such as the judiciary or even the military. This is an encouraging sign for the perseverance of democratic culture in Pakistan. Pakistan's parliamentary institutions must be supported by acknowledging the challenges they face and by assisting them in developing sustainable supportive structures that allow the parliament to carry out its duties and functions effectively at the provincial and federal levels.

Pakistan has been in the political limelight since 2001 when it became a 'frontline ally' of the U.S.A. in the 'War on Terror', giving its strategic location to route supplies for NATO/ISAF forces in Afghanistan. Following democratic elections and a regime change in 2008, Pakistan has aggressively pursued normalization of its relations with its neighbors, particularly with India. Both countries are moving forward in the field of economic relations, and while Pakistan is in the process of granting MFN status to India, both countries are considering a liberal visa regime as well as facilitation of investment from one country to another. Pakistan is playing its role in stabilizing Afghanistan in a bilateral as well as multilateral context. Along with preparing for the upcoming elections, Pakistan is refocusing on the regional security situation post-2014, when international forces withdraw from Afghanistan and securing the country will be the sole responsibility of the Afghan National Security Forces. The rise of terrorism and extremism in Pakistan itself has led to spectacular attacks on the country's security installations and on many ethnic groups and religious minorities.

¹⁴ <http://www.na.gov.pk/en/bills.php?status=pass>

V. Project Design

The section on project design reviews the degree to which the SDPD-II Project Document provided a solid and workable basis for successful project implementation. The point of reference for the evaluation of the project design is UNDP Pakistan’s Project Cycle Operations Manual (PCOM)¹⁵.

1. Situation analysis

In contrast with the Project Document of the first phase of the SDPD Project (signed in 2004) the Project Document for the second phase does not include a “Situation analysis”. Given the rapidly changing political environment (due to the outcome of the parliamentary elections in 2008) and new international organizations initiating parliamentary development projects following the elections, the IPU-UNDP 2012 evaluation team considers the absence of a comprehensive situation analysis to be an important shortcoming of the SDPD-II Project Document. A thorough analysis should be the basis to position the project better and it could have resulted in a more strategic planning of different project interventions.

For instance, the Results and Resources Framework (RRF) mentions that the project will support public consultations and public hearings organized by the Committees. The Situation Analysis could have provided an insight into the procedural framework and the political interest in holding such consultations and hearings, in particular since this is a key component of the project design.

The Situation Analysis should have elaborated more on the capacity of the staff, based upon the 2006 Training Needs Assessment, and the staff delivery challenges related to the very large number of Committees. The Situation Analysis should have also addressed the research capacity of parliament, since the technical advice and research assistants were a key output of the project. The mission report of the 2009 IPU-UNDP review mission, which is also referenced further in this report, had many useful observations which could be included in the Situation Analysis.

2. Strategy and outputs

The UNDAF outcome to which this project contributes, is ‘*Support to institutional Capacity Building for improved governance, particularly at the local government level*’. The Project Document also refers to the Country Program and the Country Program Action Plan (CPAP). The overall outcome of SDPD II is identified as “Strengthening governing institutions and public sector organizations for effective, accountable and participatory governance”. The project identified 4 expected outputs:

1. Select number of Parliamentary Committees strengthened
2. Capacity of Secretariat Staff to support the functioning of Committees developed
3. Effective CSO advocacy on behalf of citizens enhanced
4. Aid coordination mechanism for support to the Federal Parliament established.

The Senate and the National Assembly are two sister-chambers of the same parliament, although they are considerably different in size and in functioning. The evaluation team questions whether it would have been more effective if the project could have been designed

¹⁵ UNDP Pakistan, Project Cycle Operations Manual, Islamabad, 2005; 36 p. (part I) and 74 p. (part II).

differently by structuring some of the outputs of the Project Document in separate program components for the Senate and the National Assembly, in addition to some common program components.

The Project Document identified three operational components:

1. Capacity Development (parliamentarians, parliamentary staff and Civil Society)

- 1.1 Support to a selected number of Parliamentary Committees.

The Project Document does not specify which Committees should be supported. The only specification given is the recommendation that the project identifies Committees within the core areas of UN work, MDGs and key development issues; which remains rather vague. Since the support to Committees is a central pillar of the project, the evaluation team considers that it would have been better if the criteria and the procedure for selecting Committees were established in the Project Document.

- 1.2 Enhancing the skills of Secretariat staff that work with Committees

The Project document mentions support in three areas: Committee work, research and legal drafting, but does not specify how the support will be organized. It would have been better if the Project Document had included a paragraph on which strategy will be used to support staff in order to avoid an assumption that support to Staff should be done through separate, short-term activities only. Moreover, it would have been useful for the Project Document to establish how the recommendations of the first phase of the project in the area of human resources policy of parliament had provided the basis for the SDPD-II initiatives to enhance the skills of the staff.

2. Citizens advocacy

- 2.1 Working with CSOs to create effective advocacy on behalf of citizens

The Project Document vaguely states how the Project will cooperate with CSOs. It reads: *“it is recommended that support and information be provided to civil society and the citizens of Pakistan to ensure they are able to engage in a fruitful, sustainable dialogue with the Parliament.”* The Project Document does not provide a strong framework on how the Project should engage with CSOs to support their capacity to articulate their concerns to parliament, for instance through civil society platforms, regular and institutionalized consultations, piloting public hearings with civil society, or any other way.

3. Aid coordination

- 3.1 Better coordination of Aid and support to the federal parliament

The mandate of the Aid Coordination Committee as described in the Project Document is to *“review the support and aid being directed to the Parliament; and to produce an annual report”*. A link is made to a future Strategic Development Plan of parliament, on which the Aid Coordination Committee can take a leadership role. Annex 4 on pg. 20-21 of the Project Document outlines more concretely the three layers of coordination: the Aid Coordination Committee which includes the Speaker of the National Assembly and the Chairperson of the Senate; the Technical Working Group which would conduct monthly meetings at staff level; and the Group of U.N. Agencies working with parliament. The three layers of coordination make sense and are well conceptualized.

The Project Document is rather vague in outlining who is responsible for implementing this outcome. It mentions *“Parliamentary Authorities through PMU”*. To achieve results, it would have been better to clarify who is the responsible project person to ensure that the three layers of coordination get off the ground, e.g. NPD for the Aid Coordination Committee, Governance

Unit at the Country Office or CTA for the Technical Working Group, and the UNDP Country Director or Deputy Country Director for the UN Agencies Coordination.

3. Project baselines

The baseline and targets should be clearly aligned with the indicators, using the same unit of measurement. Baseline data establishes a foundation from which to measure change. Without it, it is very difficult to measure change over time or to monitor and evaluate retrospectively. Baseline data allows progress to be measured against the situation that prevailed before an intervention.¹⁶ The evaluation team considers the baselines as developed in the M&E framework rather weak, since they make it very hard to measure impact of project interventions. Specifically, we refer to baseline output 1 “*Comparative analysis of Committee system for similar legislatures completed*”, baseline output 2: “*Human resource Assessments study completed*”; baseline output 3: “*mechanism of Roundtable discussion with civil society and parliamentarians introduced*”; baseline output 4: “*Institutionalized mechanism to be developed*”.

4. Indicators and annual targets

The Results and Resources Framework (RRF) is a comprehensive overview matrix, outlining the intended outputs, targets for the four project years, indicative activities and responsible parties, and is based on a UNDP standard format.

Each of the four outputs has a set of indicators and annual targets. Indicators help to determine the extent to which the project is achieving the expected results. They are a means of measuring what actually happened against what was planned in terms of quantity, quality and time. PCOM recommends that, through a consultative process, all partners should agree on how progress towards achieving the outcome should be measured, and how to determine the indicators of success.¹⁷

The SDPD-II Project Document includes measurable indicators. The IPU-UNDP evaluation team appreciated that both the indicators related to project activities (e.g. the number of manuals prepared and disseminated) as well as to parliamentary performance (e.g. No. of proposals Amendments to draft laws) are quantitatively formulated, which makes measuring impact of the activities on the performance of parliament possible.

The project design and expected results are to a large extent driven by advisory staff inputs and budgeted at approximately 1.8 million USD. Success and measurement of results achieved in this regard rests to a large extent on the quality advice of staff recruited, timeliness of recruitment and absorption capacities and attitudinal behavior of beneficiaries in parliament. The evaluation team concludes that the delays in recruitment of national staff and the obstacles the project faced in the recruitment of a CTA impacted to a large extent on the achieved results.

5. Description of project activities

A narrative paragraph describing each of the project activities is part of most UNDP parliamentary project documents. The current Project Document only has a Results and Resources Framework, which provides some information, but is not sufficiently to enable the reader to have a correct understanding of the different activities under each of the four outcomes. The report of the 2009 IPU-UNDP review mission offered well-elaborated

¹⁶ UNDP Handbook on planning, monitoring and evaluating for development results, New York, p. 69.

¹⁷ UNDP Pakistan, Project Cycle Operations Manual, Islamabad, 2005; part I, p. 20.

descriptions for each of the four outcomes, which could have been included in this Project Document.

6. Assumptions and risks

The “Risk Analysis” contained in the Project Document’s Annexes is an important instrument to assess in advance what can hamper project implementation, and what mitigation measures the project needs to take. Most UNDP parliamentary project documents have a well-elaborated risk-log annexed to the Project Document. The risk-log for this Project Document mentions four risks: a) lack of political support for outputs and activities; b) change in government; c) outputs that do not produce concrete results; d) and national implementing partner that is unable to deliver.

While it is positive that the Project Document has foreseen in a risk-log, it is also noted that the proposed mitigation measures, in retrospect, could have been more specific. For instance the risk “outputs that do not produce concrete results” has as a stated countermeasure “the selection of exceptionally capable international and national staff”, without addressing how to overcome any potential problems or delays with this recruitment.

7. Cross cutting issues

In contrast to the Project Document of the first phase of the Project, SDPD II does not emphasize enough the cross cutting issue of gender. Although support to the Women’s Caucus is foreseen under the RRF of Output 1, there is no distinct approach to gender-mainstreaming in the project activities in terms of support to legislation, oversight or research priorities. Outreach to CSOs, another cross cutting issue, is covered through designated output three ‘civil society and media’.

Given the political context of Pakistan (limited experience with involvement of civil society in public hearings, consultations and newly elected and appointed women in Parliament after the 2008 elections), it would be preferable for the Project Document to mainstream such cross-cutting issues in project activities, as is the case in most other UNDP Project Documents for parliamentary strengthening.

8. Management arrangements

The Project Document foresees that the “Project Review Board” (PRB) provides project oversight and strategic advice on project components. The composition of the PRB includes the Deputy Chairperson of the Senate, representatives of the Secretariats of the Senate and the National Assembly, Director PIPS, the UNDP Country Office, NPD and the Focal Point, Economic Affairs Division¹⁸ and the donor (the Embassy of The Netherlands). A representative from civil society was envisaged, though not included in the meetings of the PRB so far.

Taking into account the experience of other parliamentary programs, one could have considered the advantages of a more inclusive PRB with several chairpersons of NA and Senate Committees and the Women’s Caucus. This would have secured better sensitization of the main beneficiaries to achieve enhanced parliamentary performance. Currently, there is only one Member of Parliament in the PRB, the vice-chairperson of the Senate.

¹⁸ The Economic Affairs Division is a government agency. It is UNDP’s counterpart agency responsible for strategic oversight of UNDP-funded development cooperation in Pakistan within the framework of the Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) signed between EAD and UNDP, adopted in accordance with Government of Pakistan policies. (See: PCOM, p. 3).

The Project Document is silent on the issue of the minimum number of PRB meeting per year; which is an omission in the project design.

The main innovation of the second phase as compared to the first phase is the technical assistance to the parliament through a senior international Technical Advisor and four National Technical Advisors. Detailed TOR for these positions were included in the annexes of the Project Document.

The Project Document mentions PIPS and a 'partner CSO' as 'implementing partners' of specific components of the project; and the IPU as 'responsible party' for specific components. However, the Project Document does not clearly outline what are the roles and responsibilities of the 'implementing partners' and the 'responsible party' and does not provide more information on how to structure the relationship between the SDPD team and the 'implementing partners'.

9. Budget

The Project Document mentions a total budget of 4,917,120 USD for the project. Total allocated resources are 500,000 USD as Trac Funds of UNDP, and 4,417,120 USD as unfunded budget. The contribution of the bilateral donor (The Netherlands) is not mentioned in the Project Document. As the cost-sharing agreement was probably only finalized after the Project Document was signed between UNDP and the Parliament, an early revision of the Project Document was justified to capture the Dutch contribution of 2,500,000 USD.

Many Project Documents of UNDP parliamentary projects in other countries also indicate a specific monetized in-kind contribution by parliament, along-side providing working space for the project staff. The Project Document here does not make any reference to a financial contribution from the Parliament or Government of Pakistan. A financial contribution of the beneficiary country to the project further enhances the national ownership and commitment to the project.

10. Exit strategy and sustainability

Best practice in project design requires a discussion on the issue of the project's exit-strategy, that is how the project expects to wrap-up at the end of its scheduled closing date, and what that means for the different project partners. Discussing an exit-strategy also implies detailing how the sustainability of project results will be assured. The IPU-UNDP evaluation team found that a sustainability policy is not explicitly discussed in the Project Document.

Conclusion on project design

- The Narrative of the Project Document is rather limited, without a situation analysis, strategy and a summary of planned activities.
- Overall, the Results and Resources Framework (RRF) is a comprehensive overview matrix, outlining the intended outputs, targets for the four project years, indicative activities and responsible parties – as per the UNDP standard format. The evaluation team recommends improving the baselines so they become more useful in measuring the impact of the Project.

VI. Project Implementation

As mentioned above, the project has four main project outcomes: 1) Support to a limited number of Parliamentary Committees 2) Enhancing the skills of Secretariat staff that work with Committees 3) Working with CSOs to create effective advocacy on behalf of citizens and 4) Establishment of an Aid Coordination Committee in Parliament.

Under each outcome, we provide a description of the initiatives taken, followed by an evaluation commentary and the evaluation chart. The evaluation of the implementation of the project outcomes is based on four criteria: relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, and impact/sustainability:

- **Relevance:** Evaluating to what extent the project addressed the existing and changing needs of Parliament and how well the project displayed a coherent set of activities.
- **Efficiency:** Evaluating to what extent the project inputs delivered the desired outputs in an efficient way, with minimum waste of time, human, financial and other material resources.
- **Effectiveness:** Evaluating how much the project outputs influenced the institutional capacity of Parliament to become a more democratic, functional, accountable and inclusive institution.
- **Impact/Sustainability:** Evaluating to what extent the results of the project will last, in the short run (impact) and long run (sustainability), with focus on structures, strategies and national ownership.

At the end of each outcome section, a rating for each of these criteria between “low” and “very high” has been given, for all activities within the specific outcome.

Outcome 1: Select number of Parliamentary Committees strengthened.

1.1. List of main activities

- Placement of Research Assistants with selected Committee chairpersons
- Orientation Session for new Senators on Parliamentary Procedures, Committee System and Administrative Structure of Parliament
- Compilation/Printing of Committee Reports¹⁹
- Development of Publications for Committees: e.g. MPs role in the budget process; Rules of Procedure & Conduct of Business in the Senate 2012; Handbook on Question Hour; Backgrounders and Analysis on Foreign Relations; Impact of 18th Amendment on NFC Award
- Support to the Woman Parliamentary Caucus, organization of Conferences for Caucus, support to development of Strategic plan for the Women Caucus
- Policy consultations with provincial and federal level Committees on Labor and Human Rights.

¹⁹For instance, the Senate Standing Committee on Law, Justice and Parliamentary Affairs (2003-2006, 2006-2009, 2009-2011), Senate Standing Committee on Health (March –June 2011), Senate Standing Committee on Religious Affairs (August 2009- November 2011), Senate Standing Committee on Women Development (2009-2011), Senate Standing Committee on Housing and Works (2009-2011), NA Standing Committee on Human Rights (2009-2011).

1.2. Evaluation Comments

In any effective parliament, Committees are the key focal points of parliamentary activity; and are often portrayed as being the work horses of parliament. The Pakistani parliament has an extremely high number of Committees. There are 104 Committees (49 Senate Committees; 55 NA Committees) in order to match the many ministries of the Pakistani government. Some of these Committees are active and at the center of political activity, others are not. It was therefore vital for the SDPD project to target its support to a selected number of active Committees. The project envisaged that the support be cross-cutting, addressing the law-making, oversight and representation functions. Each year throughout the project period four Committees would be selected (for the NA and the Senate). The first year, eight Committees were thus selected. For the second year, these eight Committees were confirmed and two more Committees were added.²⁰

The selected Committees from the Senate that received SDPD support were:

- Standing Committee on Inter-Provincial Coordination
- Standing Committee on Law, Justice, Human Rights and Parliamentary Affairs
- Functional Committee on Government Assurances
- Special Committee on the Problems of Less Developed Areas
- Standing Committee on Defense

The Senate Standing Committees were dissolved before the Senate Elections in March 2012 and were reconstituted in May 2012. As far as the National Assembly is concerned, the following Committees were selected for SDPD support:

- Standing Committee on Cabinet Division
- Standing Committee on Finance, Revenue, Planning and Development
- Standing Committee on Human Rights
- Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs
- Standing Committee on Law, Justice, Human Rights & Parliamentary Affairs

The project envisaged long-term technical support for knowledge sharing and skills building. Through long-term technical advisers (national and international) who are able to build a trustful relationship with the Chairpersons and members of the selected Committees, the Committees would benefit from support and advice. The concept was to have one national technical adviser (NTA) for each Committee identified and one international senior technical adviser who would provide backstopping for the NTAs in their work with the Committees. Such an approach was considered to be more effective and sustainable than the traditional concept of trainings and seminars, which is finite in its timing and its capacity for delivering information. To a large extent, this approach has not worked out. The main reason was the inability to identify or recruit the national and international technical advisors (see chapter on 'Project Management'). Alternative approaches were developed to support the Committees.

On the one hand, the project went for the more familiar approach of organizing seminars and workshops for MPs and staff. On the other hand, the project offered the services of 'research assistants' to the chairpersons of the selected Committees. The project also invested

²⁰ In 2010, both the NA and the Senate had identified their respective Standing Committees on Women Development to receive project support. However, after the 18th Constitutional Amendment, this subject matter was devolved to the provinces and the Committees at federal level were dissolved. SDPD continued to support them their dissolution and assisted in preparing their final report. The NA Committee got the approval of the House and the report was published and disseminated, while the approval of the report in the Senate is still pending.

considerably in knowledge products (Committee reports, research publications, briefing papers) for the MPs.

To date, the seminars and workshops for staff and MPs are one of the main outputs of the SDPD project. The project organized workshops and consultations with MPs on the implementation of the 18th constitutional amendment, the federal budget and Pakistan's Public Sector Development Program (PSDP).

The mentioned workshops have contributed to the enhanced role of parliamentarians in the budget process. The NA Committee on Budget and Finance has been very active during the time of review of the annual state budget, and the budget debates in plenary session became much more meaningful. Members of the Committee on Budget and Finance appeared in the 2011 debates with thorough homework and objective critical analysis of various budgetary aspects. The number of motions on the 2011 budget was considerably higher than it was couple of years ago. Similarly, the Committee on Finance has been actively monitoring the projects carried out by the government under the Public Sector Development Program (PSDP), working closely with the Planning Committee. These improvements can, in part, be attributed to the capacity enhancement activities initiated by the SDPD-II project.

While the workshops on budget, policy and legislative issues were greatly appreciated by all parliamentarians whom the evaluation team interviewed, the evaluators were however cautioned that some of the workshops faced a lack of participation by MPs due to engagements in their constituency. Alternative new training modalities can be found on line.²¹

A group of six SDPD research assistants are working for five Committees: the NA Standing Committee on Finance, Revenue, Planning & Development, the NA Standing Committee on Human Rights, the Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Senate Functional Committee on Government Assurances and the Senate Special Committee on Problems of Less Developed Areas. They have done valuable work by supporting the Committees in drafting minutes of Committee meetings and press releases, writing Committee progress reports and fact sheets, conducting specific legislative research on issues under debate in Committees, and monitoring the implementation status of recommendations formulated by the Committee.

For instance, the evaluation team had an extensive meeting with the chairperson of the NA Committee on Human Rights, who explained how the SDPD research assistants have helped his Committee to address children rights, minority rights, women rights and prisoner rights. The Committee, with the help of the project, closely watched the government's progress in preparing Pakistan's Country Report on Human Rights to be presented to the United Nations in 2012. Despite the support of the research assistants, the Committees remain in need of experienced and senior consultants who can provide policy advice to the Committees, as was envisaged in the Project Document.

While the six research assistants are working currently from the offices of PMU, the IPU-UNDP evaluation team recommends relocating them to either PIPS or the parliament, where they will be more accessible for Committee members and staff. This should also facilitate more regular access to the parliamentary libraries and give the SDPD Project more visibility in Parliament.

Knowledge products are one of the most visible outputs of the SDPD-II. The project published policy guidelines on various themes relevant to the mandate of the Committees, thematic brochures, briefing papers on post budget orientation series for the parliamentarians, a Handbook on the budget process and content, publications with an economic analysis of Pakistan, an Orientation Kit for New Senators and Committee annual or multi-annual reports.

²¹ <http://einstitute.worldbank.org/ei/course/parliamentary-Committees>

The project's support to publish Committee reports deserves proper mentioning. Under the Standing Orders of both houses, parliamentary Committees are required to submit a yearly account of their performance to the House. However, many Committees had not presented any report since 2008. SDPD offered its assistance to the Committee chairpersons to work with the Committee staff to prepare and then publish such reports. In 2011, around a dozen such reports were prepared, presented to the House and disseminated. Five more reports were published in the first half of 2012.

The above overview of the type of knowledge products which the project publishes reveals a distinct project strength, which was already in place during the first phase of SDPD and continued to be a strength in the second phase. However, the evaluation team recommends that the quality review process for the content of the publications be enhanced, for instance by requesting feed-back on draft texts from thematic experts at the UNDP CO or at other UN agencies, and recommends to conduct an evaluation of the use of the knowledge products to measure effectiveness/impact of published knowledge products.

In the absence of the NTAs (except one) and the CTA, the evaluation question becomes to what extent the mentioned three alternative approaches (seminars, research assistants, knowledge products) achieved the project's main objective to provide more high level technical expertise to Committees?

The answer is: only partly so. On the one hand, the research assistants do provide useful input and are appreciated by the Committee chairpersons, as mentioned above. On the other hand, the research assistants cannot substitute the NTAs and a CTA and be expected to deliver at the same quality level. As a result, the SDPD-II missed out in providing technical advice on a number of policy and legislative questions on the Committees' agenda.

For instance, due to a lack of technical capacity, SDPD-II has not yet managed to make a substantial step forward on the issue of public hearings and public consultations. One of the envisaged results under SDPD-II was the development of a sustainable practice of holding public hearings and public consultations. While the Committee members and chairs of SDPD partner Committees are generally supportive of public hearings, the staff normally resists organizing them. For the public hearings, the Standing Orders remain silent on any detailed procedure regarding the preparation and organization of public hearings, although there is a general provision saying that there is no bar (limit) on the Committee holding hearings. In the absence of explicit procedures, the staff is reluctant to work on any proposal for such hearings. In addition, there is no budget item for public hearings and consultations in the overall budget of parliament, making it very hard to invite experts or witnesses from around the country and cover their travel and accommodation expenditures. In this context, the project rightly proposed to have a comparative study on hearing mechanisms in similar parliaments. The evaluation team was surprised that no consultant could yet be identified to prepare such comparative study, and recommends that an international parliamentary development expert be solicited for this task in the coming weeks.

For public consultations, members of Committees seem keen to get feed-back from experts on legislative proposals and oversight issues. However, due to the lack of experience of parliament staff in supporting such consultations, the SDPD project was asked to support a pilot consultation of the Committee on Problems of the Less Developed Areas, including drafting the final reports. The pilot consultation requires follow-up.

The 2012 IPU-UNDP evaluation team considers that the comparative study on public hearings and the experiences with public consultations can become the basis to propose amendments to the parliament's Standing Orders, outlining the appropriate procedural framework to facilitate

hearings and consultations as regular mechanisms for public input into the work of the Committees. As is the case in other UNDP parliamentary programs, SDPD can prepare a “Public Hearings Manual” for MPs and staff, taking on board the experience on this topic collected at the portal for parliamentary development, AGORA.²²

Due to the mentioned lack of technical capacity, SDPD-II did not manage to follow-up on the suggestion of the 2009 IPU-UNDP mission for a comprehensive review of the Committee system. The SDPD-II project initiated a capacity building needs assessment for all Committees, based upon the IPU Self-Assessment Toolkit for parliaments. However, it is understood that the response rate was considered too low to enable any meaningful findings. The 2012 IPU-UNDP evaluation mission is still supportive of a comprehensive review of the Committee system, which would look into streamlining mandates, reviewing the number of Committees, public access to hearings, amendments to relevant Standing Orders, and suggests to initiate this review prior to the 2013 elections and the creation of new Committees in the newly elected NA. Although the work of the research assistants is valuable in the short term, the 2012 IPU-UNDP evaluation team recommends to initiate or to strengthen the parliament’s cooperation with academic institutions to ensure more sustainability to the research input for Committees. Today, universities are very rarely called upon to provide expertise to parliament. To prepare for such cooperation, the SDPD-II should initiate consultations to prepare a “road map” to strengthen the Committees.

The success and the measurement of results achieved for Output 1 rest to a large extent on the quality advice of staff recruited. The evaluation team is of the opinion that due to the delays in recruitment of national and international technical advisors, the project only managed to provide limited support to Committees through the research assistants but was not able to develop a more strategic approach to strengthen Committees.

One of the success stories of SDPD-II and of the Pakistani Parliament as a whole is the Women’s Parliamentary Caucus. In 2009, the project supported the creation of the Secretariat of the Women Caucus, which has become the focal point for women parliamentarians for matters relating to basic research and information gathering. In 2010 the project supported the Women Caucus by organizing the National Convention of Women parliamentarians, bringing together over 300 elected women from the federal and provincial level to discuss the role of women in conflict resolution. The Convention’s Declaration was a milestone in policy setting on gender issues in Pakistan. With the help of the project, the Women’s Caucus has become the platform that cuts across party lines to build consensus on priority issues concerning women and to ensure that gender concerns are addressed through legislation, policies and programs. In 2011 the project supported the Women’s Caucus by organizing a national conference on strengthening women’s representation in the political and legislative process, which aimed to assess the impact of the existing quota for women in the political system. The project also assisted in the outreach of the Women’s Caucus by developing its website²³, publishing a brochure and newsletter on the Women’s Caucus and providing secretarial support. The Women’s Caucus had planned to hold two international events in Islamabad, for women parliamentarians from Asia-pacific countries and for Women Speakers. Due to security considerations, both events have been postponed.

Case-study of best practices: Women’s Parliamentary Caucus
at next pages of this report.

²² <http://www.agora-parl.org>

²³ <http://www.wpcp.org.pk/wpcp/Home.aspx>

1.3. Evaluation Chart

- ◆ **Relevance:** The project’s research support to Committees and Women Caucus addressed the need to strengthen Committee work in the Parliament of Pakistan. The UNDP project activities under this outcome reflect a coherent set of activities. Their relevance is thus “very high”.
- ◆ **Efficiency:** Activities under this outcome could have been run more efficiently. Research assistants have many responsibilities, including writing minutes of Committee meetings. If their tasks were more focused, they could work more on in-depth analysis. To conduct their work in an efficient manner, research assistants depend on the chairpersons’ full understanding of the role of the research assistants. The project contributed to initial initiatives of oversight by the Committees, including in the budget process. The overall efficiency of activities is considered to be “high”.
- ◆ **Effectiveness:** The effectiveness of the project activities under this output is considered to be “medium”. The fact that the project was missing technical experience from NTAs and CTA, and has still not yet managed to fill this gap, hindered the project implementation considerably.
- ◆ **Impact and sustainability:** The impact and sustainability is uneven. While the Project had a real impact on the effective functioning of e.g. the Women’s Caucus, the Human Rights Committee and the Budget and Finance Committee, the Project did not have a major impact on other Committees. The sustainability of the support by the research assistants requires a research strategy, research resources and research guidelines. The Project did not have the capacity to work on reforming the structures of the Committees. The impact and sustainability of outcome 1 activities is therefore considered to be “medium”.

EVALUATION OUTCOME 1	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	VERY HIGH
Relevance				X
Efficiency			X	
Effectiveness		X		
Impact / Sustainability		X		

Case-study of best practices: Women's Parliamentary Caucus

The Women's Parliamentary Caucus of Pakistan was established on November 21, 2008, as the result of a long consultative process, initiated by SDPD in 2006-2007.

When introducing the idea of a Women's Caucus in the federal parliament, the SDPD project initially did not find a favorable reception, neither from the parliament authorities, nor from the women members themselves, which were strongly polarized along party-lines. Only after the General Elections of 2008, which saw the first ever woman Speaker taking office in March 2008, the need to have a functioning cross-party Women's Caucus was widely recognized.

The idea gained momentum by the initiatives of the Honorable Speaker, and SDPD started working closely with the Speaker and a group of motivated women parliamentarians. SDPD commissioned a comprehensive study about the idea of caucusing, various models practiced in different parliaments of the world and a general idea about the possible organizational structure of the Women Caucus in Pakistan. This study provided the baseline for the current organizational structure of the Caucus.

SUPPORT IN STRATEGIC PLANNING & PROGRAM EXECUTION

Soon after the formation of the Caucus, the SDPD project focused its assistance towards developing a strategic plan for the Caucus.

Within a week of the Caucus' establishment, a project of women police stations' monitoring and evaluation was launched. On November 29, 2008, a delegation of Caucus, lead by the Honorable Speaker, visited Islamabad Women Police Station. This was followed by similar visits by other women parliamentarians in Lahore, Karachi, Multan and Peshawar. A comprehensive report, drafted by SDPD, was published. The report contained concrete recommendations to the Federal and Provincial Governments, as well as to the Standing Committee on Interiors. This Report has been widely quoted and it's on record that many improvements in terms of facilitating women police officials were brought as a result of this exercise.

This practice has continued and similar assistance has been provided on issues like acid-throwing incidences, home-based workers, reproductive health etc during the last four years. Senior level Consultants and junior assistants were regularly provided to the Caucus, who were instrumental in keeping the Caucus' approach on target.

ESTABLISHMENT OF CAUCUS OFFICE

Unlike the Standing Committees, the Caucus is an informal body and hence does not draw any institutional support from the parliament Secretariats. The project therefore provided logistical support as well. A befitting Secretariat for the Caucus, with committee rooms, office and all needed facilities was funded by the SDPD. This Secretariat is now the biggest strength of women parliamentarians. They have their own working space to conduct meetings, to write, edit, scrutinize and debate proposed bills, to establish effective networks with national and international CSOs, development bodies and other parliamentary groups.

The fact that almost all important bills, related to women, were drafted in this room is a manifestation that equipping the women parliamentarians in this manner has gone a long way in improving their efficiency.

As a result, the National Assembly of Pakistan has been able to pass more than 28 bills, related to women and children, making it the most effective Legislature in Pakistan's history to have focused on a social reforms agenda.

Outcome 2: Capacity of Secretariat Staff to support the functioning of Committees developed

2.1. List of main activities

- Training on Legislative Drafting
- Workshops on the budget process
- Training on research methodology and skills
- Training on Computer skills, graphic design, office management
- Training on report writing and minutes taking
- Training on "Parliamentary Oversight" for Ministry & Division staff
- Publications for parliament staff²⁴

2.2. Evaluation Comments

The second outcome of the project, building the capacity of staff, recognizes the parliament Secretariat's pivotal role as the institutional, long-term component of Parliament. Members of parliament come and go, but the staff, when recruited in a professional and non-partisan way, remains as the focal point for the various parliamentary groups, Committee chairpersons and the parliament leadership. Therefore, the Secretariat must develop into a professional and dedicated bureaucracy serving the work of all elected representatives.

The 2009 IPU-UNDP review mission recommended that the Secretariats of the NA and the Senate receive long-term training with regard to key issues and skills that are required to ensure parliamentarians can do their jobs effectively. The mission identified three priority areas for training, which were also included in the Project Document for SDPD-II: skills to support the work of Committees, research for members of parliament, and legal drafting of amendments to draft laws and motions. The 2009 IPU-UNDP review mission recommended that there be a needs assessment conducted to identify the specific training and skills development required for staff in each of these three areas. In addition, the project would produce manuals and publications, as required, to support the training provided.

During SDPD-II, parliamentary staff received so far 25 training workshops aimed at ensuring that they have the capacity to support the work of MPs. Training to a large extent focused on the three areas identified in the Project Document. However, in addition to what was foreseen in the Project Document, apparently there was a need for training on other issues also, such as computer literacy, how to be effective in the work place, and protocol. For the purpose of this evaluation, the IPU-UNDP evaluation team prepared a questionnaire for parliamentary staff on the SDPD-II trainings received. Consolidated responses from the questionnaire to parliamentary staff can be found in annex 3. At the start of SDPD-II in 2010, the NPM proposed at the PRB meeting to undertake a comprehensive new Training Needs Assessment (TNA). However, the PRB decided to continue to rely on an earlier TNA conducted in 2006.

The 2012 IPU-UNDP evaluation team received feedback from different participants that the trainings were of high quality. However, they were mostly limited to one or two days only. Staff interviewed by the evaluation team claimed that training was often introductory in nature and lacked follow-up through more advanced sessions. To the extent that more advanced training has not been provided, the training impact on the performance of the parliamentary staff might have been limited. Therefore the evaluation team endorses that future training be of longer

²⁴ For instance: Handbook on Office Management Skills, Handbook on Report Writing, Handbook on Graphic Designing & Report Formatting, Booklet on How to Understand A Bill, Handbook on Parliamentary Question Hour.

duration, based upon a well-identified training plan for the staff and foresees a follow-up through advanced training.

The evaluation team questions whether basic introduction trainings on computer literacy – while useful and necessary – should still be organized by the SDPD Project. The evaluation team is of the opinion that PIPS or the parliament Secretariats themselves should be able to provide basic introduction trainings for staff as part of the Human Resources Development Policy of parliament. The first phase of SDPD, following extensive consultations with all stakeholders, made a comprehensive proposal for the Human Resources Development Policy of parliament.

The 2012 IPU-UNDP evaluation team also considers that PIPS should be the lead agency for staff training. PIPS was envisaged to become the project's implementing partner for component 1 and 2, even though PIPS delivery on trainings is still limited as its in-house capacity remains low. Recognizing that PIPS has a strong potential, the evaluation team recommends a functioning partnerships with the SDPD project [see chapter on Project Management]. The future role of SDPD is to provide guidance on staff trainings from the perspective of international standards and best practices. Once the CTA is on board, s/he is best placed to review the training proposals and training requests from the international quality perspective. The CTA will give input in the comprehensive staff training calendar as prepared by PIPS and provide advice to the parliaments Secretariats on their Human Resources Development Policy, taking into account the proposals made under SDPD-I.

The 2012 IPU-UNDP evaluation team was told that the SDPD-I proposed Human Resources Development Policy and the comprehensive range of proposed new Job Descriptions for Secretariat staff are still pending with the Secretariats. The evaluation team is of the opinion that the sustainability of trainings and workshops offered to staff will, to a large part, depend on the Human Resources Development Policy and the learning trajectory developed for each staff person or group of staff persons. As soon as the Human Resources Development Policy and the Job Descriptions for staff are approved, a solid basis for future staff capacity building will be in place.

The SDPD-II Project Document had foreseen that the NTAs assigned to the selected Committees work with the parliamentary staff to ensure that they apply the trainings they receive in their regular work with the Committees. In the absence of NTAs assigned to specific Committees, the staff coaching after the trainings could not be organized.

During meetings with the 2012 IPU-UNDP evaluation team, representatives of the Secretariat repeatedly requested financial support from the project for international working visits and staff placements abroad. Practices in other countries have proven that international working visits and staff placements abroad contribute to better performance at the Parliament when part of a broader human resources policy and strategy. The evaluation team is of the opinion that an effective modality for international exposure of parliamentarians and staff -- either through exchange visits/placements and/or by inviting international experts and parliamentary representatives for maximum exposure within Pakistan – needs to be designed carefully; and since this was not included in the SDPD-II Project Document it can be considered for a future phase of the program. The experience in other parliamentary strengthening programs shows that, in the absence of a clear concept, international visits and exchanges tend to provide a rather modest learning experience for the individuals involved and have a very limited impact on the functioning of parliament as an institution. In order to make sure that the learning experience is substantial and the impact on the functioning of parliament is real, the evaluation team recommends that the future CTA prepares a conceptual framework and quality guidelines for the different modalities of international exposure. The quality guidelines can address issues

related to preparing, conducting, reporting and sharing experiences on the various modalities of international exposure. Such guidelines would need to be developed, discussed and endorsed prior to any decision on future staff placements in a next phase of the project. In addition, a lot of knowledge can be gained by offering e-courses for staff, as developed by the CPA, World Bank Institute and others.²⁵

The SDPD-II project has provided a limited number of workshops on the budget process for staff. Considering the interest of staff and MPs to further strengthen the role of parliament in the budget process, it would be worthwhile in the next phase of SDPD to explore establishing a Budget Office to secure budget expertise for MPs. A concept note on best international practices and examples for a parliamentary budget office would be a first step in exploring such a structural initiative. It is suggested that the Budget Office should work primarily for the Budget and Finance Committee and the Public Accounts Committee but would also be open to requests from other Committees of both the National Assembly and the Senate. It should furnish the other Committees with knowledge of financial and budgetary processes that could then be used when discussing the national budget with the ministries they oversee. The Budget Office should become the technically competent resource center, in line with “Strategic Goal 1.3” of the Strategic Plan of the National Assembly, that also regularly interacts with the Ministry of Finance. It would make sense to establish the Budget Office at PIPS. Best international practices indicate that the parliamentary Budget Office should be staffed with highly qualified and sufficiently remunerated professionals and be allowed to set its own agenda on a non-partisan and professional basis. When designing the next phase of the SDPD project, support for the creation of a parliamentary Budget Office should be given high consideration.

The UNDP-IPU evaluation team had an extensive meeting with a group of researchers and legal staffers. They were well versed in addressing some of their capacity needs and providing feedback on the trainings received so far. They mentioned that the project could strengthen the parliament’s research function by assisting the development of a comprehensive research strategy, outlining objectives, methodology, partnerships, research guidelines and human and financial resources for research. The project’s future CTA could eventually provide valuable guidance and implementation support to the parliamentary research strategy.²⁶

However, there remains an unresolved question as to the place of the parliamentary research function in the parliament’s structure. The evaluation team is aware of the 2006 SDPD-I report [from the consultant Janet Seaton] which, following extensive consultations, proposed a joint library and research service for the National Assembly and the Senate. The proposed joint service was named PILARS, *Parliamentary Information, Library and Research Services*. It is understood that the proposal for such joint service for the National Assembly and Senate was not acceptable due to reluctance from the side of Secretariat(s). The 2012 IPU-UNDP evaluation team took note that there are today three different parliamentary centers looking for resources and research expertise: the National Assembly, the Senate and the PIPS. As SDPD contemplates the most appropriate way to support parliament in the area of research, the question of the rational use of parliament’s human and financial resources in the Research Departments remains open for discussion.

²⁵Quality trainings for staff can be found at: <http://einstitute.worldbank.org/ei/course/parliaments-fragile-states> ; <http://einstitute.worldbank.org/ei/course/parliamentary-budget-office>

²⁶It is worth noting that SDPD-I in 2007 proposed to provide a Legal Advisor to each House, sponsor the positions for the SDPD-I project cycle with the commitment from the parliament to incorporate the positions in the regular parliament staffing table and self-finance them after the project. Unfortunately, the 2007 SDPD-I proposal, as prepared by Jannet Seaton, did not get any response from either of the two Houses.

2.3. Evaluation Chart

- ◆ **Relevance:** The project’s research support to parliamentary staff addressed the need to strengthen the staff support to Committees. The UNDP project activities in 2011 and 2012 under this outcome reflect a coherent set of activities. Their relevance is thus “high”.
- ◆ **Efficiency:** The evaluation team had no particular indication that activities under this output were not run in an efficient manner. Trainings were well prepared, participants selected through the Secretariats and invitations sent out in a timely fashion. Training materials mostly included handbooks and staff manuals. The efficiency of activities under output 2 is considered as “high”.
- ◆ **Effectiveness:** The effectiveness of the activities is considered to be “medium”. Although the activities organized under this outcome were of high quality, they were often stand-alone trainings with insufficient follow-up by advanced trainings. The basic trainings (computer, writing skills) could have been organized by PIPS or parliament itself. The parliament’s Human Resources Development Policy should form the basis to develop the curriculum and the follow-up to the training programs.
- ◆ **The impact and sustainability:** The impact and sustainability is rather “low” given the fact that ad hoc trainings were not clearly embedded in the SDPD-II Project Document and the Strategic Plan of the Parliament and were not based on an agreed and endorsed Human Resources Development Policy of parliament.

EVALUATION OUTCOME 2	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	VERY HIGH
Relevance			X	
Efficiency			X	
Effectiveness		X		
Impact / Sustainability	X			

Outcome 3: Effective CSO advocacy on behalf of citizens is enhanced

3.1. List of main activities

- Needs assessment of CSOs (capital and provinces)
- Launch of Youth Parliamentary School and Children's Parliament
- Training workshops for CSOs on parliamentary Rules, Committee system and legislative bills
- Training Workshop on budget process and parliamentary Rules for parliamentary reporters
- Training workshop on the legislative process & legislative bills for CSOs (Karachi & Peshawar)
- Directory for eight Standing Committees with details of relevant CSOs
- Compilation of media list
- Dialogue on Public Spending on Education
- Publications on "Youth Inclusion and Democracy", CSOs Need Assessment Report, and "Understanding Legislative Process and Bills" (for CSOs)

3.2. Evaluation Comments

While the previous two outputs aim at building the capacity of MPs and staff to be able to support a democratic institution, the third output relates to a stronger demand for such a democratic institution by citizens. Strengthening the skills of citizens and CSOs to articulate such demands and enhancing the capacity of parliament to engage with the public are thus the key objectives of the third outputs.

Strengthening the demand for democratic institutions in Pakistan takes place in a context where there is a big distance between civil society and the administration of the state. The reason is that, following frequent interruptions to democratic regimes by martial-law governments, Pakistan's civil society has mostly struggled against an oppressive state to fight for people's rights. As a result, CSO did not have the opportunity to interact with Parliament.

In this context, SDPD undertook a basic capacity needs assessment of CSOs, and designed a training program based upon the needs assessment. One example of the training program is the SDPD basic workshops on Parliamentary Rules and Procedures for CSOs in Peshawar and Karachi. CSOs discovered avenues of engagement with parliament under the current rules, while the representatives of the Secretariats discovered the human resources and knowledge available in civil society. Although this was a useful activity in itself, further follow-up by the project will determine if the mutual interest will lead towards the start of regular public consultation processes on policy issues discussed in parliament, and thus lead towards a higher demand for a democratic institution by the public.

The IPU-UNDP evaluation team met with CSOs in Karachi, Lahore and Islamabad. CSOs expressed the need for a more open and inclusive policy making process, and for clear mechanisms to engage CSOs in policy making processes, including the possibility to include more people from grassroots level at policy debates. CSOs suggested that the project pay more attention to trade unions and religious groups to engage these groups more actively in the law making processes.

The IPU-UNDP evaluation team learned about the successful experiences of women CSOs working together with the Women's Caucus in the federal parliament and the extensive outreach campaign on the drafting of the 18th Amendment. The evaluation team recommends that the project builds upon these experiences to develop a more institutionalized approach to involve CSOs in law making and implementation processes. One of the best ways to do so is to

institutionalize public hearings and public consultations, as discussed under Output 1. Given the fact that the concept of public hearings is not yet rooted in the parliamentary culture of Pakistan and no comprehensive communication and outreach plan of parliament exists, the IPU-UNDP evaluation team recommends that the project, in the current of the future phase, support the Parliament in developing such public outreach plan, as part of/linked to the revised Strategic Development Plan of parliament.

Following an earlier needs assessment of media in terms of their knowledge and working relationships with parliament, SDPD-II organized a limited number of activities with journalists. For instance, a training session on the budget process helped parliamentary reporters better understand the different stages in the budget cycle, the role of the parliament in the budget process and that of the media in overseeing the process. The workshop enabled reporters to jointly discuss problems of access to information. Following the workshop, the journalists created the Parliamentary Reporters Association (PRA) to better advocate for rights and interests of parliamentary reporters. The IPU-UNDP evaluation team had a meeting with a group of journalists belonging to the PRA and it is advisable that SDPD now further engages with the PRA for an advanced capacity building program during the remaining 12 months of the project.

In addition to CSOs and journalists, a third target group under this output are youth and children. “Youth Parliamentary Schools” was a project initiated by SDPD to enhance the democratic understanding of the youth, which is needed considering Pakistan’s experience with undemocratic interventions through military coups. Since 2009, many sessions of the “Youth Parliamentary Schools” in different cities of Pakistan have been organized, with an overwhelming response from youth. SDPD took a lead role in developing a curriculum for the “Youth Parliamentary Schools” and in preparing a team of trainers among the participants which will form the core group for future sessions of the “Youth Parliamentary School”. In a similar way a “Children Parliament of Pakistan” was formed to provide children with a platform to promote the rights and needs of children and introduce them to democratic values. Up to ten regional assemblies of the “Children Parliament of Pakistan”, distributed over the 30 districts in the four provinces, were established in 2010. SDPD established a partnership with the Center for Policy Studies to organize these meetings.

SDPD-II organized 20 policy roundtables and workshops bringing together Committees and civil society representatives on a policy question under review in parliament. Many of these policy roundtables have been useful, though it is worth mentioning in particular the roundtables on labor laws and policies in 2010. Members of the National Assembly and Senate’s Standing Committees on Labor engaged in a debate on the Industrial Relations Act 2010, draft labor policy and laws with members of various trade unions and labor federations. Members of Parliament committed themselves to review the Industrial Relations Act 2010 based upon the recommendations received at the SDPD policy round table and to ask the Ministry to give ample time to the Committee to review the Act and the labor policy before it is presented before parliament. The final outcome has been encouraging. In the Sindh Provincial Assembly, the Amendment was passed in 2011. In the Punjab Provincial Assembly, it came in 2012. In Khyber Pakhtunkhwa the Bill was moved in 2010-11 and in Balochistan, the inconsistencies of the IRA were removed through an Ordinance in 2011.

Under the “One UN” program, SDPD in collaboration with the ILO organized a series of briefing seminars for members of provincial assemblies and Federal Parliament. In this regard, joint SDPD and ILO session were held in Punjab, Sindh, KP, Baluchistan and Gilgit-Baltistan on Literacy and Decent Work Agenda.

The project to a large extent implemented this Outcome as foreseen in the Project Document, although more initiatives should be implemented in order to institutionalize the interaction between CSOs and parliament. More time and efforts will be required to ensure that CSOs are given the opportunity to input into legislative and policy discussions in parliament. To the extent it is not yet the case, the project can provide a platform for regularly scheduled consultations between CSOs and Standing Committees which the project is supporting through the research assistants. The Project Document envisaged that one national CSO, or a consortium of CSOs, with the technical and administrative support from PMU, would facilitate this institutionalized interaction. Such mechanism can still be created in the remaining period of project implementation.

3.3. Evaluation Chart

- ◆ **Relevance:** As Pakistan has an active and highly educated civil society and Parliament is in the process of opening-up to CSOs, the project rightly addressed the need to bridge the gap between Parliament, citizens and CSOs. The relevance of the activities under this outcome is “very high”.
- ◆ **Efficiency:** Activities under this outcome were run efficiently. The Civil Society Needs Assessment, the workshops for CSOs and media were of high quality. The feed-back on the Youth Parliamentary School and Children’s Parliament confirm the efficient way to contribute to the project objectives under this outcome. The overall efficiency of activities is considered “high”.
- ◆ **Effectiveness:** The effectiveness of the project activities under Outcome 3 is considered “medium to high”. The CSO’s interaction with the Women’s Caucus has contributed to the adoption of legislation on violence against women. Members of the Standing Committees on Labor committed themselves to review the Industrial Relations Act 2010 as part of the debate with trade unions and labor federations. But many of the other workshops with CSOs have not yet visibly influenced the institutional capacity of parliament. In order to be effective, CSOs requested further follow-up in the remaining project period.
- ◆ **Impact and sustainability:** The extent to which the results of the project will last depend largely on the structures and strategies put in place and the national ownership of activities. Under output 3, there seems to be only one institutional CSO partner in place who can take the achievements of the project further, the newly established Parliamentary Reporters Association. CSO interaction with parliament is not embedded institutionally. The sustainability of the project’s activities under outcome 3 is thus considered “medium”.

EVALUATION OUTCOME 3	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	VERY HIGH
Relevance				X
Efficiency			X	
Effectiveness		X	X	
Impact / Sustainability		X		

Outcome 4: Aid coordination mechanism for support to the Federal Parliament established

4.1. List of main activities

- ToR's of Aid Coordination Committee
- ToR's of Technical Working Group
- UNDP CO organized one donor coordination meeting

4.2. Evaluation Comments

Coordination between the parliament, donors and major support programs has hardly taken place in the last years, although it should be done as detailed in the fourth component of the SDPD-II Project Document. Three years ago, a number of bilateral meetings took place between SDPD and the scoping team preparing the ToR for the new EC program. However, it seems that there was no sufficient leadership from the side of the parliament's Secretariats to ensure that various projects would be designed in a complementary way.

A new EC project is now under way and is implemented by the British Council. Thus, it looks as though this project will be very similar and will partly overlap with the SDPD project (e.g. focus on Committees, work with interns / research assistants, facilitating civil society interaction with parliament). Earlier coordination under the auspices of parliament could probably have prevented the current overlap and possible duplication. Coordination and alignment will now be required at the level of implementation of the two main projects, at least for the remaining 12 months of the SDPD.

The question of early coordination at the level of designing future programs resurfaces as the EC has started the scoping process for a future program with the provincial assemblies, and the UNDP CO and NPD foresees that the next phase of the SDPD also prioritizes the work of provincial assemblies.

The IPU-UNDP evaluation team therefore suggests an extensive scoping and programming mission for the next phase of the SDPD, identifying the project support needed for the federal parliament and the provincial assemblies. The mission team needs to include (at least) one international parliamentary development expert, one national governance expert and the CTA. Such a mission will need to start by mapping current and envisaged support to the provincial assemblies, including from the EC, Westminster Foundation for Democracy, USAID, AUSAID and others. An effective Aid Coordination Committee is still required to take a leadership role on this issue on behalf of the beneficiary country, Pakistan.

A Parliament Strategic Plan, outlining development priorities and responsibilities, is one of the best tools to coordinate donor input. The IPU-UNDP evaluation team recommends that the Strategic Plan of the National Assembly be reviewed, endorsed and implemented following discussions with the Deputy Speaker of the National Assembly and the parliamentary groups. Taking into account that a multi-party group of MPs constituted the steering group discussing and drafting the Strategic Plan in 2009-2010, the IPU-UNDP evaluation team recommends that a similar group be constituted and, with the advice of the CTA, revisits and adjusts, where necessary, the Strategic Plan. Once endorsed, this document should provide firm guidance for the implementation of current programs and the design of future assistance programs. The scoping and programming mission for the next phase of the SDPD also needs to look into the question of Strategic Plans for the provincial assemblies as one priority area of assistance for the next phase of the SDPD.

As mentioned above, parliamentary groups need to be consulted on the future institutional development of the parliament, as they are one of the main stakeholders of the institution. Parliamentary groups have an important function in determining the role which the parliament plays in the institutional development of the country. Parliamentary groups are the platform where different ideas on key questions emerge, to find their ways through the work of the Committees. Parliamentary groups have thus a key interest in ensuring that the parliament is well equipped, in terms of human resources and parliamentary procedures, in order to become the main forum for policy debates in the country. Revisiting the Strategic Plan of the National Assembly is thus a key responsibility for members of parliament across party-lines. The IPU-UNDP evaluation team recommends that the group of MPs which will revisit the Strategic Plan, together with the Deputy Speaker, will continue to provide guidance to the implementation of the Strategic Plan, for at least 2 years after its adoption. The new CTA of SDPD can provide policy advice to the cross-party group revisiting and implementing the Strategic Plan.

Analyzing the SDPD-II Project Document for the fourth outcome, it is worth noting that coordination at three levels was envisaged. The IPU-UNDP evaluation team considers that this three level coordination is still very useful and recommends its enactment.

Firstly, there is the “Aid Coordination Group”, in which the federal parliament takes the initiative to bring together all donors and projects to discuss the design and implementation of programs and ongoing needs of parliament. Detailed ToRs for the Aid Coordination Group are in annex to the Project Document. Despite repeated suggestions from the PMU to call this meeting, the Secretariats have not yet managed to do so. The evaluation team therefore suggests that the NPD takes responsibility for the agenda of the Aid Coordination Group, identifies the dates of the meetings and ensures that invitations are sent out.

Secondly, the Project Document envisages a “Technical Working Group”, where donors and projects meet among themselves. Despite the agenda and invitations prepared by PMU, no such meeting has taken place yet. The evaluation team suggests that the UNDP Assistant Country Director for Governance, and later on the CTA, calls this meeting. Considering UNDP’s long relationship of cooperation with the parliament of Pakistan and UNDP’s recognition worldwide as a neutral organization supporting parliamentary development, UNDP is best placed to lead the “Technical Working Group”. In addition, the evaluation team recommends that the two program managers, of the EU-project and of SDPD, meet regularly to exchange information and align their work as much as possible.

Thirdly, there is the meeting of all UN agencies interacting with parliament to coordinated UN’s interaction with the parliament. No such meeting has been organized yet. The evaluation team suggests that the UNDP (Deputy) Country Director take the lead calling for this forum.

Finally, lessons learned from other parliamentary programs indicate that donor coordination is time-consuming but essential for quality assistance to parliament.²⁷ Next to exchanging information on ongoing activities and sharing the projects’ assessments on the functioning of parliament, the joint preparation of key capacity building initiatives can galvanize the donor coordination. Next year’s induction program for newly elected members of the National Assembly and the provincial assemblies provides an opportunity for different parliamentary support projects in Pakistan to work together. Bringing together the best human resources of PIPS, UNDP-SDPD, EC-British Council, the European Parliament-OPPD and national actors for a quality induction program, will also achieve an example of high quality donor coordination.

²⁷ De Vrieze, Franklin, OSCE Coordinates Parliamentary Support Programs, Helsinki Monitor, The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 03-2007, p. 57-63.

4.3 Evaluation Chart

- ◆ **Relevance:** The project’s output to enhance aid coordination is vital to avoid duplication among different organizations and projects working with the Parliament in Pakistan. The relevance is “very high”.
- ◆ **Efficiency:** Considering the fact that 3 years after the start of SDPD-II, the Project is still working on the establishment of structures for aid coordination, the efficiency is “low”.
- ◆ **Effectiveness:** The limited initiatives taken so far have not prevented potential substantial overlap between the UNDP and EU program in parliament. Effectiveness so far is “low”.
- ◆ **The impact and sustainability:** Same as above.

<i>EVALUATION OUTCOME 4</i>	LOW	MEDIUM	HIGH	VERY HIGH
Relevance				X
Efficiency	X			
Effectiveness	X			
Impact / Sustainability	X			

VII. Project Management

This chapter evaluates the management of the project since 2009. Particular attention will be given to the management structures as foreseen in the Project Document, particularly the Project Review Board (PRB), the project's human resources, the project's financial management, project reporting and monitoring, project communication, and the relationship with the UNDP and the UN. The next chapters outline the proposed way forward for the management of a future phase of the parliamentary support project and summarizes recommendations from this evaluation.

7.1. Project Review Board (PRB)

The aim of the "Project Review Board" (PRB) is to provide guidance on the implementation of the project. The 2012 evaluation team observed gaps and challenges in terms of the composition of the PRB, frequency of PRB meetings and the decisions taken at the PRB meetings.

The current composition of the PRB includes the Deputy Chairperson of the Senate, representatives of the Secretariats of the Senate and the National Assembly, the UNDP Country Office, the NPD, the NPM, the donor (the Embassy of The Netherlands) and the Economic Affairs Division. Because of the substantial project objective to work with civil society and media, the Project Document also mandates for participation of a representative from civil society in the PRB but such person has not been invited to the meetings of the PRB. At its April 2010 meeting, the PRB decided to invite the Executive Director of PIPS to the next meetings of PRB.

The 2009 UNDP-IPU review mission identified that there is need for more political and senior management leadership of the project, and therefore recommended that the Office of the Speaker of the National Assembly be invited to join the PRB, alongside the Office of the Chairperson of the Senate. The minutes of the meetings of the PRB indicate that the Office of the Speaker of the National Assembly did not participate in the meetings of the PRB. The vice-chairperson of the Senate is currently the only parliamentarian at the meetings of the PRB. Thus, one of the main recommendations of the 2009 UNDP-IPU review mission for a stronger MP guidance of the project has not been implemented.

The current IPU-UNDP 2012 evaluation team recommends that consideration should be given to the advantages of a more inclusive PRB by inviting a selected number of chairpersons of Committees of the National Assembly and the Senate which receive support from the project, alongside the Women's Caucus. This will secure better sensitization of the beneficiaries for enhanced parliamentary performance.

The evaluation team recommends that, as of October 2012, three MPs from the National Assembly and two more MPs from the Senate be included in the PRB, upon the recommendations from the Speaker of the NA and chairperson of the Senate. Each group of three MPs (from the NA and the Senate) should include at least one person from an opposition party, and the MPs should preferably be selected among the group of chairpersons of Committees receiving support from the project.

A second challenge of the PRB is related to the frequency of its meetings and the availability of its members. In 2010, 2011 and 2012 the PRB met only once. At its annual meetings, the PRB is expected, amongst others, to discuss and approve the project's Annual Work Plan. However, as the PRB did not manage to meet at the beginning of the calendar year, the delay in approving the Annual Work Plan has negatively affected the implementation of the project. In 2012, the

PRB met as late as 31 August, which resulted in SDPD's team inability to access project funds until that date, since approval of the Annual Work Plan precedes access to funds. The Senate elections in March 2012 seem a too limited explanation for the delay in holding the meeting, since also in 2011 the PRB met as late as mid August.

The evaluation team therefore recommends that the PRB meets at least twice a year and sets its meeting dates at the start of the year. The first meeting should take place in January and approve the annual work plan and review the annual report of the previous year. The second meeting should take place in July/August to review and give guidance to project implementation.

The evaluation team has considered the question of the chairmanship of the PRB. Having analyzed the role of the PRB during the first phase of SDPD, the 2009 UNDP-IPU review mission recommended that the UNDP Country Office should chair the PRB during the second phase of the SDPD, as is the established practice in other UNDP governance projects (Elections, Rule of Law). When the Project Document of SDPD-II was drafted, it was decided to continue the existing practice that parliament chairs the PRB, and entrusted the chairmanship for the second phase to the vice-chairperson of the Senate. The 2012 IPU-UNDP evaluation team considers that the PRB during the SDPD-II has not played its quality assurance role as comprehensively as envisaged in the Project Document, as outlined above.

The 2012 IPU-UNDP evaluation team therefore recommends that, in a future, third phase of the project, the PRB be co-chaired by the UNDP Country Office, while respecting the national ownership of the project at the same time. This will enhance better planning and agenda setting, in particular when the future project will have more interlocutors due to the support provided to the provincial assemblies as well. To improve working practices during the third phase of the project, the NPD and the co-chair of the PRB should be from the same house, alternating between the National Assembly and the Senate for half of the project period each. In case the NA / Senate co-chair is not in a position to attend the meeting on the agreed date, another MP (member of PRB) can be asked to take over.

A third challenge of the PRB during SDPD-II relates to the decisions taken at annual meetings. A review of the minutes of the PRB-meetings seems to indicate that there was little verification of follow-up by the PRB of decisions taken at previous meetings.

PRB meeting	Main decisions taken at PRB meeting	Follow-up to PRB decision	Verification of follow-up by PRB
April 2010	Commissioning a detailed needs assessment of the Committees to be selected for support	Partly done as needs assessment of refurbishment of Committee rooms	No verification by PRB
April 2010	Request to expedite creation of Aid Coordination Committee by drafting ToR	Not yet done	Discussed at the 2012 PRB meeting
April 2010	Request to the Secretariats to follow-up on the main studies and reports from the first phase of the project such as the Human Resources Management policy, Job Descriptions for all staff, report on joint Library and Research Services and the creation of an independent parliamentary information service	Senate Secretariat provided feed-back on report on Library and Research Services. No other feed-back from NA or Senate Secretariats	No verification by PRB
August 2011	Initiate capacity building activities for the	Initial steps have	No info if verified

	members and staff of the provincial assemblies through PIPS	been taken	by PRB
August 2011	Creating a roster of consultants for research assistants	Roster created, researchers hired	No info if verified by PRB
August 2011	Study on the aftermath of the 18 th amendments in the provinces	Study conducted by CO	No verification by PRB
August 2011	Request to the Country Office to amend the Project Document related to support to the provinces	Project Document not amended	No verification by PRB

Partly because of the annual character of its meetings, the PRB did not provide any meaningful follow-up to and verification of decisions taken at previous meetings. The 2010 decision for a detailed needs assessment of Committees was not discussed at the next meeting, as was the case for the study on the impact of the 18th constitutional amendment in the provinces (requested at the 2011 meeting of the PRB), the request to the Country Office to amend the Project Document related to support to the provinces (PRB meeting 2011), the request to the SDPD team to expedite the creation of the Aid Coordination Committee by drafting the ToR (PRB meeting in 2010), the request to the Secretariats to follow-up on the main studies and reports from the first phase of the project such as the Human Resources Management policy, Job Descriptions for all staff, report on joint Library and Research Services and the creation of an independent parliamentary information service (PRB meeting 2010). The minutes of the next annual PRB meeting show that the topics discussed at a previous meeting were rarely touched upon again.

In order to improve the quality and transparency of decision making, the IPU-UNDP evaluation team recommends that the minutes of the PRB meeting include a summary list of all decisions taken, including the timeframe for implementation and the person responsible for overseeing the implementation of the decision. Overall, the verification of implementation of the list of previous decisions needs to be put on the agenda of the next PRB meeting.

The evaluation team was informed that, on some occasions during the past 2 years, there was a different understanding between the parliamentary Secretariats and the PMU on the required tools and instruments for capacity building. In line with best practices in parliamentary development, the NPM proposed to make use of national experts active in think-tanks or civil society and of international parliamentary experts. The parliament's Secretariats instead wanted to see the available financial means allocated directly to Pakistani MPs and staff, on their working visits abroad, staff placements or new equipment for parliament. Questioning the Secretariats' preferences, the NPM told the IPU-UNDP evaluation team that the recent experience of hiring parliamentary staff as project resource persons, e.g. as authors of Committee progress reports, has not always ensured quality results at a satisfactory level. Practices in other countries have proven that international working visits and placements abroad enable sustainable results only if framed within a broader human resource policy/strategy and taking into account specific guidelines for preparation, reporting and follow-up of recommendations of such working visits. The PMU's reluctance towards project support for material investments is apparently based upon the observation that video conferencing and other equipment (for the Women's Caucus), paid for by the first phase of the project, is hardly being used and is now partly out of order due to the absence of staff capable to manage and maintain the investment. As far as the evaluation team could identify, the PRB did not address these diverging views on what are the most appropriate tools and instruments for capacity building of the parliament of Pakistan (which was also not explicitly covered in the Project

Document of SDPD-II). Prior to the project design of a new program, an in-depth discussion with all stakeholders would be useful, possibly assisted by the Chief Technical Advisor (CTA) sharing experiences from other countries and parliaments.

In summary, the evaluation team is of the view that the PRB, until mid 2012, has not yet played its role as systematically as envisaged in the Project Document, and has not yet provided the needed quality guidance to the SDPD project as required. However, nothing prevents from changing course over the next 12 months along the suggestions mentioned above.

Being aware that the National Assembly and the Senate are considerably different in size and in functioning, the evaluation team took note of the request by the Secretariat of the National Assembly to have its own project and a separate PRB, while the Senate Secretariat stressed the need for parity in support to the two chambers.

Since the Secretariats of both chambers find it hard to overcome their differences, the IPU-UNDP evaluation team considers it possible to develop clearly distinct program components for the National Assembly and Senate, in addition to some common program components, for a future phase of the SDPD project, while maintaining a joint management framework under the PRB. Creating entirely different projects and PRBs might result in higher management costs and more extensive administrative procedures for the project in its entirety.

7.2. Project Human Resources

The main innovation of the design of the second phase of SDPD as compared to the first phase was the technical assistance and knowledge which the project would bring to parliament through medium and long-term technical capacity in the project management Unit (PMU). The project has made less progress than anticipated in delivering technical assistance and knowledge. Challenges occurred in relation to the recruitment of the CTA and the four National Technical Advisors (NTAs). The lack of sufficient technical expertise at PMU has been the main weakness of SDPD-II so far; though there are ways to overcome it in the last year of the project.

The 2009 UNDP-IPU review mission and the SDPD-II Project Document envisaged that a CTA would provide strategic and policy advice to the implementation of the project, provide quality assurance to the NTAs on their support to the selected Committees, offer comparative and technical knowledge on best practices in parliamentary development, support Research & Development as well as aid coordination and raise the profile and quality output of the SDPD-II. In September 2009 the draft ToR for the position was finalized and IPU was asked to propose suitable candidates for the position. The evaluation team learned that IPU submitted three CV's of candidates, but that, due to security reasons, the candidates declined the offer. The evaluation team was surprised that no further attempts were made to identify a suitable candidate, including by advertising the position on the website of parliamentary development organizations including UNDP.

During its consultations in September 2012, the IPU-UNDP evaluation team found a favorable environment in parliament to work with a CTA. The research director at PIPS expressed the need for SDPD-II to bring an international CTA on board to scale-up the delivery capacity of the project in terms of technical knowledge and international parliamentary experience, research capacity and substantive inputs to PIPS programming. The Secretary of the Senate expressed his interest for a CTA who could enhance the possibilities for international cooperation of the Pakistani parliament and contribute to advanced trainings for parliamentary staff. The NPD from the National Assembly endorsed the recruitment of a CTA and expressed an interest for someone with sufficient legislative and Committee expertise and with a background from a Commonwealth parliament.

In view of the time still available to SDPD-II, the evaluation team recommends that a CTA should be hired immediately under a consultancy contract.

The CTA should contribute to the project in the following areas:

- ✓ Conduct consultations and establish a functioning system of donor coordination in the area of parliamentary development, which includes the federal parliament and provincial assemblies;
- ✓ Prepare and follow-up to the findings of the proposed Identification and Programming mission for the next phase of the SDPD project, in particular with the provincial assemblies; develop the Project Document, liaise with development partners and take the lead in resource mobilization;
- ✓ Liaise with Speakers, political parties and parliamentary groups at federal and provincial level in relation to their interest to engage in drafting, revising, implementing and evaluating a Strategic Development Plan for parliament (federal parliament and provincial assemblies);
- ✓ Provide substantive inputs to PIPS programming, in particular the induction program for newly elected members of the National Assembly and the provincial assemblies;
- ✓ Assist in developing a research strategy and implementation framework for parliamentary research at federal and provincial level.
- ✓ Provide a comparative perspective on the parliament's functioning and bring best practices to upgrade the functioning of the Pakistani parliament;
- ✓ Enhance the international cooperation of the Pakistani parliament, in particular in the region of South East Asia; and develop guidelines and a policy framework for a possible future staff placement at another parliament;
- ✓ Provide quality control on the programming and activities of SDPD-II during the coming year.

In order to hire the CTA in the shortest possible time, the evaluation mission suggests hiring the person as an international consultant for an initial period of 6 months. It is worth noting that during the last two years, the Democratic Governance Group (DGG) at BDP-UNDP in New York has created an expert roster of over 70 vetted parliamentary experts. This will enable a swift identification of one or more suitable candidates for this CTA consultancy position.

In line with the current practice in other UNDP Pakistan projects, the CTA will work under the overall supervision of the Assistant Country Director, UNDP Governance Unit, with support from the NPM and will be fully integrated in the PMU. We suggest a regular (e.g. every second week) meeting between the NPD, NPM, CTA and the Assistant Country Director Governance to discuss the strategic direction of the project on the above mentioned areas of work of the CTA.

Considering the main innovation of the second phase of SDPD to ensure medium and long-term technical capacity at the PMU, the opportunities for strategic assistance within the time remaining under the SDPD-II, the requirements to prepare the next phase of the program and the possibilities to swiftly identify a suitable person, the evaluation team attaches great importance to engaging a Chief Technical Advisor as soon as possible (see ToR in annex to the report).

To support the work of the Committees, the Project Document envisaged four NTAs: one NTA for each identified Committee, with the international CTA backstopping the NTAs in their work with the Committees. In reality, this would mean that 4 NTAs cover 8 Committees since both the National Assembly and the Senate had selected each 4 thematic Committees.

The 2009 UNDP-IPU review mission had two equal requirements for the NTA: knowledge of the functioning of the parliament and expertise in the technical area of the Committee for which the NTA would work. In drafting the Project Document, these requirements were modified and the primary role of the NTA became to work on the parliamentary functioning of Committees and, secondly, to provide information (rather than expertise) on substantive topics. Due to this shift in the profile, the pool of qualified persons to recruit from became considerably smaller, since there were fewer good candidates with primary knowledge on parliamentary functioning as compared with technical expertise in the area of the work of Committees. Another main reason for the inability to hire NTAs is the fact that the pay structure of the project is not at par with the current market trends. The IPU-UNDP evaluation team was told that the salary being offered to the NTAs is too limited for a professional subject matter expert willing to join the project. In the end, the project did not manage to recruit the four NTAs at the senior expert level as envisaged.

Four different interlocutors each play a separate role in the recruitment of the NTAs and other UNDP project staff: the PMU (drafting ToR, short listing candidates), the UNDP Country Office (approval ToR), the Economic Affairs Division (conducting interviews), and the national implementation unit (hiring and issuing the contract). This rather complicated system is one of the reasons for the lengthy recruitment procedure, which explains that, on occasions, a candidate was no longer available when notified of his/her selection following the long review process. The system was on occasion also hampered by different views among the four interlocutors on who to select. Therefore, the UNDP Country Office is currently discussing with the Economic Affairs Division a new arrangement to create one recruitment agency by the end of 2012.

From mid 2010 to mid 2012, there was one NTA in the PMU, the former NPD, who was hired in 2010 upon the recommendation of the Deputy Chairperson of the Senate and chair of the PRB. The NTA provided general capacity building support through various workshops and publications, but was not able, on his own, to provide quality technical advice to more than 8 Committees selected by the parliament. The PRB decision in August 2012 to extent the project's support to two more Committees is rather surprising, considering the lack of sufficient technical advisors and thematic experts. On the last day of its in-country presence in September 2012, the IPU-UNDP evaluation mission learned that the one NTA had resigned from the project to take up a senior position at PIPS.

In the absence of more NTAs, the Country Office proposed hiring research assistants to work with the Committees. The PRB agreed to this proposal during its meeting in August 2011. There are currently 6 research assistants at PMU, who came on board during the last 12 months. The evaluation team learned that the research assistants draft minutes of Committee meetings, write Committee progress reports and fact sheets and conduct research for selected Committees. Most research assistants work in regular interaction with the chairperson of the Committee(s). As many Committee staff apparently do not have the capacity to write the minutes of the Committee meeting or a Committee press release, the Committee chairperson requests the UNDP research assistants to do it for them. Research assistants' sources of information include various publications, the internet, ministry archives and ministry staff and - when allowed access - the parliament library and archives, even though the institutional memory at parliament is very weak.

To facilitate on-the-job-training for Committee staff, it would be useful that the research assistants get access to Committee documents and minutes and work with Committee staff to create a document database for the Committee.

In the short run, Research assistants need more quality assurance of their work from the PMU. The research assistants need opportunities for trainings and further professional development in terms of research skills and on their technical area of work. The IPU-UNDP evaluation team was surprised to learn that the research assistants don't have access to the parliament libraries (National Assembly and Senate). In addition, they need access to on-line legislative data bases and international parliamentary library networks.

While the research assistants have become the main instrument of support to Committees, the project could do more at the strategic level to develop a "road map" to strengthen the Committees.

7.3. The project's primary partners: PIPS and IPU

The Project Document outlines how the project should be implemented by designated partners for each output. The work with the Parliamentary Committees (Output 1) would be implemented by PIPS. The support to the Secretariat staff (Output 2) would be implemented by PIPS, with the support of the Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU).

PIPS was created under an Act of the Parliament in 2008. During 2009 and 2010, PIPS was still in the process of its establishment and remained an inactive partner to SDPD. As of 2011, PIPS regularly hosted capacity building activities, often co-organized with SDPD; although the in-house staff capacity at PIPS was still very low. SPDP's quarterly progress report for April-June 2012 notes that the planned training schedule had to be amended 3 to 4 times and eventually events had to be executed at external venues due to PIPS unavailability for planned trainings. During meetings with the evaluation team, Members of the National Assembly and of provincial assemblies expressed impatience with PIPS' slow progress in providing concrete support.

By mid 2012, PIPS moved to a new and prestigious building, financed by USAID. The IPU-UNDP evaluation team was told that PIPS is currently in the process of recruiting professional staff to work in different areas: Legislation and Legislative Drafting Capacity; Budget Oversight Capacity; Parliamentary Diplomacy; Research Capacity and Data Accumulation, Sorting and Storage. The PIPS research director expects that, as of January 2013, PIPS will have 20 own programmatic staff on board, alongside 20 student-interns recruited through the new European Union-funded parliamentary support project.

During the meeting with the IPU-UNDP evaluation team, the Executive Director expressed PIPS' intention to address all capacity, technical and strategy needs of the Pakistani legislatures, both staff and MPs. In order to access the required expertise at the international level, he asserted that PIPS must cooperate with various international and regional organizations, such as IPU and CPA, and with all programs that aim at strengthening the Pakistani Parliament. He requested that international programs provide assistance to provincial assemblies "under the PIPS umbrella". Particular project support was asked for the development of the PIPS library and research resources.

Strengthening synergies, PMU suggested to move the SDPD research assistants to the PIPS building. However, the PIPS leadership considers the lack of technical in-house expertise at PMU as a major concern hampering the possibilities to deepen the cooperation between PIPS and SDPD-II. If placement of the research assistants at PIPS is not possible, one can consider the research assistants working side-by-side of Committee staff in parliament, facilitating more intense transfer of skills and knowledge.

The evaluation team noted that, more than three years into the implementation of SDPD-II, the role of PIPS towards the project still needs to be formalized in a way that project activities are developed in a more coherent and focused way. The PMU suggested that the project signs an

MoU with PIPS, outlining roles and responsibilities of both SDPD and PIPS. The Executive Director of PIPS does not support this idea as he considers the Project Document a sufficient basis for cooperation.

Recognizing that PIPS has a strong potential, the 2012 IPU-UNDP evaluation team recommends a functional and practical partnership between PIPS and SDPD. The evaluation team suggests that SDPD and PIPS develop a joint Work Plan for the remaining project implementation period of SDPD-II, outlining the activities to be implemented together, the timeline, resource persons and budget. Such Work Plan will be the most practical way to plan the delivery of results in a mutually satisfactory and predictable way. To ensure proper follow-up to the Work Plan, the evaluation team suggest a regular, monthly meeting between the NPD, NPM, CTA and PIPS.

Taking into account the evaluation team's suggestion that the project should focus more on strategic interventions in parliamentary development and referring to PIPS' priorities, SDPD through the CTA can work with PIPS in developing a research strategy for parliament, provide a mapping of required intellectual and academic resources (in-country, internationally and on-line) and, as an example, support an PIPS policy roundtable on parliamentary research with the contribution of international resource persons from the UNDP and IPU network of experts.

The IPU is the other primary partner for SDPD-II, in addition to PIPS. The Project Document states that the IPU has an excellent record of producing training courses and materials and a good reputation with the Secretariat; and its use of short-term expertise and interventions is thus best suited to the work with the Secretariat (Output 2). IPU undertook the initial assessment mission in 2003 that led to SDPD-I, followed by a MoU between IPU and the parliament to support SDPD-I. The decision to engage IPU in SDPD-II was based upon the experience in the first phase, the discussions between the IPU Secretary General and the Speaker of the National Assembly of Pakistan on 14 April 2008 at the 118th IPU Assembly in South Africa, and upon the recommendations of the 2009 review mission at the end of the first phase of SDPD.

In August 2010, the IPU and the parliament of Pakistan signed a MoU to provide the framework for IPU support to the implementation of SDPD-II. The MoU foresaw support for capacity building activities with the Women's Caucus, Secretariat staff knowledge to support Committees in scrutinizing draft laws and overseeing the work of the executive, research needs of members of the National Assembly and Senate, and legislative drafting needs of Members of the National Assembly and Senate. The MoU mentions that the schedule of implementation of activities will be determined through the annual work plans agreed on in advance with the Parliament of Pakistan, UNDP and IPU in accordance with the budget estimate. The MoU with IPU was revised in 2012, increasing the amount earmarked for IPU technical expertise from 58,383 USD to 81,053 USD.

The 2012 IPU-UNDP evaluation team found that the project has benefitted very little from IPU expertise so far. The main reason is that the annual work plans have not foreseen the IPU input and that, until now, the project did not request any IPU expertise. The main interaction between SDPD-II and IPU occurred in the preparation for hiring the IPU consultant for the 2012 evaluation mission.

Considering the need for quality technical expertise at the project level, the 2012 IPU-UNDP evaluation mission recommends that the PMU and the PRB look at the partnership with IPU in a more dynamic way. The NPM should regularly consult the IPU focal point for the Pakistan project on the project's progress and on identified areas for technical assistance. The four areas of IPU support mentioned in the MoU can still, to a large extent, benefit from IPU expertise. The

IPU could introduce more clearly to the SDPD its resource persons in terms of areas of specialization.

The IPU-UNDP 2012 evaluation team understands that the NPM has recently prepared a number of proposals to request IPU support; and encourages the NPM and the IPU focal point for Pakistan to discuss them at the earliest time.

The Executive Director of PIPS informed the IPU-UNDP 2012 evaluation team that he wishes to directly call upon IPU expertise for PIPS capacity building events. Since an established mechanism for IPU support to the Pakistani parliament is already in place through SDPD, and in order to avoid duplication, the evaluation team recommends that the IPU support be channeled through SDPD, as envisaged by the Project Document signed by the parliament of Pakistan. The evaluation team recommends that the delivery of IPU expertise through SDPD be discussed with PIPS with a view to include it in the proposed joint work plan of PIPS and SDPD.

In the same spirit to strengthen inter-institutional cooperation, the SDPD team, in particular the future CTA, should reach out more regularly to the UNDP DGG parliamentary team and to UNDP parliamentary programs in South East Asia region with a view to bring external parliamentary expertise to Pakistan and to engage in regional exchanges of best practices. As an issue of “quick delivery”, IPU and UNDP can make their books and publications on parliamentary strengthening available to the libraries of the NA, Senate and PIPS.

During its meeting with the chairperson of the NA Committee on Human Rights, the 2012 IPU-UNDP evaluation team learned that the chairperson is also the substitute vice-president of the IPU third Committee. So far, no synergies have been generated to make the parliamentarian’s membership at IPU structures beneficial to the SDPD. For future IPU meetings, the participation of MPs from Pakistan can provide an opportunity for international outreach of the project, and to ensure that their participation provides input into identifying priorities for UNDP project support to the Committees selected by the project.

The possibilities to bring on board more technical international expertise, through IPU and UNDP, will only contribute to more sustainable results if there is a clearly expressed political will for reforms by the parliament’s Secretariats. The technical expertise offered to parliament through the first phase of SDPD resulted in 2009 in four landmark reports with recommendations: Human Resources Management policy, Job Descriptions for all staff, report on joint Library and Research Services and report on the creation of an independent parliamentary information service. The 2012 IPU-UNDP evaluation mission learned that these four reports received hardly any reply from the Secretariats and no follow-up to its recommendations has been noted.

The Secretariats will need to clearly communicate their responsiveness and openness to institutional reform if they want to make a credible case that the parliament wants to strengthen its role at an institutional and sustainable level, rather than only conduct individual training activities. Technical international expertise from IPU and UNDP, for instance on strengthening the parliament’s research capacities, would make sense in a context of openness to institutional reform. This will thus contribute to implementing key components of the Strategic Plan of parliament.

7.4. Project Financial Management

SPDP-II is a NIM implemented project with a total budget of 4,417,120 USD. The Project Document mentions a UNDP contribution of 500,000 USD, but does not foresee a figure for the donor contribution by The Embassy of the Netherlands. The Project Document does not make any reference to a financial contribution from the Parliament or Government of Pakistan.

The financial management of the project has suffered from two major challenges. Firstly, as mentioned above, the PRB did not meet at the beginning of the year to approve the Annual Work Plan. This approval is required to enable UNDP to release the funds. While sufficient funds were available for project activities, they were not accessible due to the inability of the Secretariats to schedule the PRB meeting early in the year.

Secondly, the project has been requested occasionally to approve expenditures or purchase equipment not foreseen in the Project Document. While the Project Document has only outputs and activities in the areas of skills and knowledge for MPs and staff, the parliament's insistence to refurbish Committee rooms and to finance this from the project budget materials investments was outside of the scope of the Project Document. It therefore put the NPM and NPD in a difficult position vis-à-vis the PRB, and even affected considerably the project's ability to move forward during 2011.

After an evaluation of the expenditure reports from 2009-2010-2011 and part of 2012, the IPU-UNDP evaluation team noted an uneven delivery over the 4 years, which can mainly be attributed to the delays in PRB meetings, resulting in delays in releasing funds, and the difficulties to recruit the project staff in a timely manner. The following breaks-down the financial analysis according to each project output:

Output 1. In 2009, output 1 had a very low delivery rate of 2.25 %, due to the fact that funds were budgeted for the recruitment of international and national consultants, but no staff was recruited, and the start of the Project was delayed by 3 months. In 2010 and 2011, output 1 had a higher delivery rate, respectively 93.66 % and 94.64 %. One of the reasons for a higher rate is that funds for international consultants were not budgeted in 2010 and 2011. The evaluation team questions if this major shift in budgeting resulted from a decision taken by the PRB.

Output 2. This Output has uneven delivery rates over the last four years (52.70 % in 2009; 62 % in 2010, 99.15 % in 2011 and 29.43 % in 2012). The low delivery rate in 2012 is mainly the result of fewer workshops organized in 2012. Only 8 % of budgeted funds for workshops were spent by September 2012.

Output 3. As with the other outputs, output 3 has a low delivery rate in 2009 (23.39 %) but has a higher delivery rate in 2010 (95.3 %) and in 2011 (98.21 %).

Output 4: This output has a delivery rate of 0 % in 2009, 27.55 % in 2010, 2.41 % in 2011 and 0 % in 2012. Although output 4 does not demand the same funds as the other outputs, the fact that almost none of the funds available under this outcome have been spent is significant as it highlights the slow progress the Project is making on the issue of aid coordination.

Output 5: Project Operations and Implementation has a delivery rate in 2009 of 50.87 %, 86.63 % in 2010, 92.86 % in 2011 and 42 % in 2012. The evaluation team has questions about the high expenditures for rental, maintenance, equipment & furniture (In 2010 the expenditures for rental & maintenance is 99,851 USD and for equipment & maintenance 148,127 USD).

7.5. Project Reporting

Since the start of the SDPD-II, the PMU has produced quarterly, bi-annual and annual progress reports. The evaluation team has observed a gradual improvement in the quality of reporting.

The quality of the first annual progress report, covering the period from October 2009 to December 2010, was not up to mark. It was not structured according to the four project outputs. It provided information on a series of activities, including number of trainings and number of participants, the purpose of the activity and a summary of the content of the

discussion. However, the report did not include an executive summary, list of acronyms or systematic review of achievements and challenges.

The second annual progress report, covering the period from January to December 2011, was of better quality. The document provided information on key results achieved according to the four outputs of the Project Document and discussed the project risks and issues, the lessons learnt and the strategic priorities for the next year. The text attempted to quantify its activities by indicating the number of participants, trainings and percentage of progress as compared to the work plan. However, the text still reflected a very activity-oriented reporting rather than results or outcome oriented reporting.²⁸ Reading the information on support given to Committees, no insight is given on how Committees have worked with the recommendations and technical assistance provided to them. The chapter on “lessons learnt” gives an uneven view on the projects outcomes in terms of parliamentary performance. While some observations remain at the level of impressions, other observations on the impact of the project are more focused when referring to the implementation of the 18th and 19th amendment, laws passed by the Committee on Law and Justice, policy debates in parliament and the national budget debate.

The bi-annual progress report for the period July to December 2011 includes an Executive Summary and graphs on participants’ feed-back on the training activities. The report rightly addresses the limitations of the project reporting, mentioning the complexity of measuring the pre and post skills levels of participants over a short period of time. The report clarifies that a self evaluation method for knowledge, skills and attitude (KSA) has been applied, but admits that at least six months to a year are required to measure how much changes in KSA have taken place.

As donor for this project, the Dutch Embassy expressed concern on the quality of reporting so far and requested that reporting goes beyond stating the completion of activities and draw linkages with outputs and objectives. As an example, the Embassy mentioned the recent fundamental constitutional reforms and legislation promulgated. The Embassy stated that the project interventions in these constitutional developments are not visible from the progress reports. While we agree with the request of the Dutch Embassy to improve the quality of the progress reports, we are not convinced that the project team as a whole is yet sufficiently trained and ready for such analytical reporting task today.

The UNDP Country Office has a task to provide quality training for project staff to upgrade its reporting and analytical skills. This is in line with UNDP’s corporate policy which establishes the Results-Oriented Annual Report (ROAR) as UNDP’s primary corporate tool for program performance and development results data extraction at the country, regional and global levels. The evaluation team recommends that the Country Office extends reporting and analytical skills training to project staff as soon as possible with a view to capture the required data and analysis for a high level annual 2012 progress report.

The Project conducted a series of successful activities, for instance in support of the Women’s Caucus, the Committee on Human Rights, and the budget process. Each of these series of activities could have resulted in a more comprehensive thematic report, bringing together the findings and lessons learned in a particular area. Such thematic reports would have helped the

²⁸ PCOM explains that monitoring and evaluation (based upon reporting) takes place at two distinct but closely connected levels. One level focuses on the outputs, which are the specific products and services that emerge from processing inputs through program, project and other activities. The other level focuses on outcomes of UNDP development efforts which are the changes in development conditions that UNDP aims to achieve through its projects and programs. PCOM, Part II, p. 64

project team in its communication of results beyond individual activities and enhance visibility. It would have encouraged SDPD's reflection on how to secure sustainability of what had been achieved. The evaluation team suggests that the PMU drafts a couple of thematic reports over the next months.

7.6. Project communication

The SDPD parliamentary project is more than a collection of stand-alone activities to which either MPs or staff are invited. The parliamentary project has overall objectives to strengthen the functioning of parliament and has resources to realize them. Good project management requires the possibility for MPs and staff to call upon the support of the project for the capacity needs they would like to see addressed. In order to do so, comprehensive information on the objectives, timeline, human resources and areas of expertise need to be available to all stakeholders and beneficiaries.

Overall, the project has good outreach and communication tools at its disposal, such as a dedicated web-site on the project and the regular stream of publications which are distributed to all members of parliament and other interested stakeholders. The project website is comprehensive, including information on activities, services, publications, documentaries and outcomes of the project. The project is active on Facebook and Twitter.

However, the 2012 IPU-UNDP evaluation team is of the view that more can be done to inform MPs on the UNDP project and what it had to offer. Neither at the start of the project nor throughout the life cycle of the project so far was a circular, signed by the Speaker of the National Assembly / Chairperson of the Senate, on the overall UNDP project distributed to all MPs.

The evaluation team considers that it is not yet too late for such circular to be distributed to all MPs. Next year's induction program for newly elected members of the National Assembly and the provincial assemblies will be an additional opportunity to comprehensively inform MPs on what the project has to offer. The project can also consider creating an electronic mailing list to send publications and other information on project activities to interested interlocutors.

7.7. Relations with UNDP and UN Agencies

In order to engage in parliamentary development at a strategic level (rather than at an activity-based level), the SDPD team will need stronger support of the Country Office (CO). The IPU-UNDP evaluation team learned that during the current project period the UNDP CO has been left without a proper functioning Governance Team for 1.5 years, leaving the SDPD team without much guidance or support. Important moments in the project cycle have passed without input from the UNDP CO, such as the selection of the Committees to be supported by the Committee. While the 2009 review and programming mission recommended that the SDPD team would support those Committees which are directly relevant to key program areas of UNDP (such as MDGs) and would discuss the selection of the Committees with parliament, in practice the Secretariats of the NA and the Senate decided on the Committees to be supported. The UNDP CO has played a minor role in quality assurance for most of the project period. Under the current Assistant Country Director and Governance Program manager, the cooperation with the SDPD team has grown.

The evaluation team recommends the CO to enhance its role in quality assurance in terms of advocating for timely meetings of the PRB, timely recruitment of project staff, and quality review of work plans, reporting and publications.

The United Nations Country Team in Pakistan, coordinated by the Resident Coordinator, brings together a number of organizations and programs dealing with policy areas relevant to the work of the MPs. These include FAO, ILO, OHCHR, UNAIDS, UNICEF, UN Women, UNFPA, WHO, etc. So far, the UNDP parliamentary project has worked together with UNIFEM / UN Women in terms of gender mainstreaming and support to the Women Caucus in the parliament (in 2008-2009). SDPD has worked with ILO on advocacy workshops on illiteracy for provincial assemblies of Punjab and Khyber Pukhtoonkhwa (KP). For a number of other policy areas, the UNDP parliamentary project hardly liaised with other UN agencies in Pakistan.

The IPU-UNDP evaluation team considers that parliament Committees can receive substantial policy support through UN in-house expertise. This can become a potential growth area over the next 12 months of the SDPD-II project as well as for the next, third phase of the project. The SDPD project can function as a “resource center” for other UNDP programs and other UN agencies which need to engage with the political leadership and with parliament in order to make progress in their area of work.

The UN work on climate change and ecological matters, MDGs, gender or human rights, for instance, will be well served when liaising with the UNDP parliamentary project. Investment in a parliamentary project can benefit programs outside of the UNDP Democratic Governance cluster. The investment in a parliamentary program would be spent even better if it involved the UN work as a whole.

Likewise, the IPU-UNDP evaluation team considers that the SDPD parliamentary support program should not be a stand-alone set of activities and needs to be more aligned with other UNDP program units and UN agencies in-country. They should contribute to the project design of the next phase of the program (e.g. if there are components related to Human Rights, Climate Change, MDGs, anti-corruption, elections), and ensure parliamentary mainstreaming in their programming.

Parliamentary mainstreaming means that all agencies and projects of a UN Country Team consider and include possibilities and requirements for engagement with parliament, thus enhancing the instruments to achieve program objectives. The budget of the UNDP parliamentary program can then include contributions from other UN agencies in relation to the project outputs relevant to their respective work, and to support the role of the parliamentary project as “resource center” for other UNDP programs and UN agencies.

VIII. The Way Forward: Challenges and Opportunities for Parliamentary Democracy in Pakistan

Following the review of the design, implementation and management of SDPD-II so far, the current chapter of this report provides a broad analysis on the way forward. This chapter analyzes the enabling context for parliamentary democracy in Pakistan, across parliamentary tenures. It gives the conceptual framework, prior to the detailed recommendations for SDPD in the next chapter of the report.

Committees

The role of standing Committees has been effectively realized for the first time in Pakistan's democratic history. There are cases of motivated and driven standing Committees (such as the Human Rights Committee and the Budget and Finance Committee, under its former chair) which have pushed legislation forward and undertaken hearings on matters under their jurisdiction. The standing Committees play an important role in receiving items of legislation from the National Assembly (or Senate) and then transforming them into bills for the consideration of the respective House – to be passed or amended. However encouraging that may be, *“vigilance and oversight as a key function of the Parliament becomes questionable with the nomination of standing Committees heads on the basis of party affiliation alone or as a means of rewarding allies”*²⁹, rather than on the basis of expertise of the nominated Committee chairperson. This debilitates the functioning of other standing Committees, which have not performed as well. There is room for developing a democratic procedure for the nomination of the chairs of standing Committees on the basis of experience and expertise as well as on that of party affiliation, so that Committees reflect a meritocratic and effective side of the legislative branch of government.

Women's political participation

As a measure of parliamentary progress and performance, it must be noted that *“the participation of the women members in discussions was higher than their male counterparts... [and] were particularly more active in bringing agenda items and participating in debates. Active participation of the women members is evident from the number of Private Members' Bills, Questions, Resolutions, Motions and Calling Attention Notices submitted by them”*³⁰. Pakistan's women parliamentarians – active and organized around Women's Caucus supported by SDPD - are leading parliamentary development and progressive legislation on key issues of national importance. For instance, during 2010, most of the private members' bills were introduced by women members: *“in fact, there was only one male member among those who had introduced private members bills. There were nine bills which were tabled by a single woman member whereas five other bills were jointly moved by the male and female MNAs”*³¹. The performance of women in Pakistan's parliament today, representing approximately 22% of the National Assembly is an important development in terms of overall strengthening of parliamentary traditions.

²⁹ Shaikh, Hina. “Three years of the legislature”, *The Friday Times*, 23:7 (April 1-7, 2011). Web. <http://www.thefridaytimes.com/01042011/page8.shtml>

³⁰ Annual Performance Appraisal of the 13th National Assembly (March 2009-April 2010). *FAFEN Parliament Monitor*, November 2010. Web. http://www.fafen.org/site/v5/admin/contents/PDF/504_798.pdf, p. 05

³¹ Annual Performance Appraisal of the 13th National Assembly (March 2009-April 2010). *FAFEN Parliament Monitor*, November 2010. Web. http://www.fafen.org/site/v5/admin/contents/PDF/504_798.pdf, p. 58.

Provincial Assemblies

The 18th Amendment Bill devolved 17 federal ministries to the provinces. Key areas of legislation have moved to the provinces such as health, education, environment, labor, agriculture, environment, population welfare and others. This is a vanguard step in empowering the provincial legislatures and giving them jurisdictional control over many important subjects of erstwhile 'national' prerogative. The performance review of provincial assemblies is a needed effort and requires a comprehensive study to assess their capacity to develop effective measures for modern parliamentary processes. In a sense this is an opportunity to explore and develop in the short to medium terms.

As the IPU-UNDP evaluation team found out during a visit to some of the provincial assemblies, there is room as well as a need to build capacity of the provincial legislators, the provincial Committees, and of the staff that assists the legislators in drafting laws, understanding and modifying the lacunae contained in legislative items, carrying out research and analysis, etc. So far, only PILDAT has developed constructive documentation regarding the creation of a curriculum for strengthening the legislative drafting capabilities of provincial assemblies – however, it has focused only on the provincial assembly of the Punjab³². The London-based Westminster Foundation for Democracy (WFD) is about to start an assistance program for the Punjab provincial assembly as well.

Furthermore, it would be vital to ensure that provincial legislation is in accordance with various international commitments that the state of Pakistan has made in terms of human rights, gender empowerment, environmental sustainability and climate change to name a few. Civil society groups. The federal government can only provide support and assistance to the provinces vis-à-vis international obligations in the health, education, environment, and other sectors pertaining to living standards as per the UN's Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) or per Pakistan's international treaty obligations at other forums or multilateral organizations.

Outreach

One of the most important changes required to make legislatures more accountable to the people of Pakistan is to make the proceedings of the respective house public via TV and/or video conferencing. From 2002 to 2008, the Punjab Assembly broadcasted its proceedings via a live webcast on the internet.³³ Now, access to information is an obligation of the state under the right to information clause of the constitution. Article 19-A of the Constitution of Pakistan states that "*every citizen shall have the right to have access to information in all matters of public importance subject to regulation and reasonable restrictions imposed by law*"³⁴. Most importantly, contact between the Parliament and people needs to be improved, which can be achieved through timely dissemination of the Parliament's proceedings. The parliament lags behind in civic engagement and addressing the needs of the general public, even though they are democratically elected representatives of the people of Pakistan.

³² Developing a Curriculum for Legislative Strengthening of the Provincial Assembly of the Punjab. *PILDAT Consultative Session Report*, October 2010. Web.

<http://www.pildat.org/Publications/publication/PAP/DevelopingACurriculumForLegislativeStrengtheningOfThePAPReportOctober2010.pdf>

³³ <http://www.pap.gov.pk/index.php/home/en>

³⁴ Constitution (Eighteenth Amendment) Act, 2010. *Pakistani.org*. Web.

<http://pakistani.org/pakistan/constitution/amendments/18amendment.html>

Focus on parliamentary groups

The parliamentary groups of political parties play an important role in the decision making process in parliament. After years of experience in the legislatures, the political parties and their parliamentary groups should develop technical expertise in terms of their roles as legislators and lawmakers, and should be able to identify the gaps existing in the performance of legislators as well as the legislature as a whole.

The IPU-UNDP evaluation mission considers that the SDPD project should put greater focus on the parliamentary groups of political parties. Parliamentary groups of political parties should also be able to identify the structural challenges and impediments faced by the existing parliamentary structures and staff. Engagement with political parties' parliamentary groups therefore becomes vital for long-term sustainable reform, leading to optimal parliamentary performance.

Assistance to parliamentary groups should be offered in a fair and even-handed manner for all groups represented in parliament, and could, for instance, focus on the structures and planning of parliamentary groups, the development of policy platforms or a thorough understanding of oversight practices. SDPD can play a vital role to work with all parliamentary groups in revitalizing the Strategic Plan of parliament.

Parliamentary groups can also chose to create their own research think-tanks³⁵ that aid and assist them in addressing their constituents' needs and carrying out their functions in the legislatures.³⁶

Parliamentary research

The emergence of the Pakistan Institute of Parliamentary Services (PIPS) as a national institution has been facilitated by an act of parliament. The PIPS Act passed in December 2008³⁷ mandates the organization to assist parliamentarians in making informed policies by conducting research on topical issues, by carrying out capacity development and orientation programs for elected parliamentarians as well as the staff of the national parliament and provincial assemblies, by providing complete, accurate, timely and relevant information to facilitate parliamentarians in their work, and by providing technical support and various intellectual and knowledge resources to parliamentarians. PIPS envisions the establishment of a representative forum to equip parliamentarians with cutting-edge strategies and tools to perform their representative, legislative and oversight functions effectively and efficiently. In order to achieve its goals, PIPS endeavors to provide high-quality, accurate and result-oriented services to elected members and staff of Pakistan's national and provincial legislatures to promote parliamentary excellence. PIPS needs to reorient itself towards the capacity building of parliamentary support staff, especially at the provincial level, and also needs to develop databases and metrics for legislative progress at various levels of governance.

Despite the establishment of PIPS, there is an abject absence of strategic goals and roadmaps for the capacity development of parliamentary staff and the functioning of the Secretariats.

³⁵ A Blue Print for Creating Think Tanks in Political Parties of Pakistan. *PILDAT Discussion Paper*, Sept. 2012. Web. <http://www.pildat.org/publications/publication/CMR/BluePrintforCreatingThinkTankinPoliticalPartiesinPakistan.pdf>

³⁶ "Policy Roundtables: Political Parties Policy Formulation; and Media in Pakistan". *Jinnah Institute*. Web. <http://jinnah-institute.org/events/465-policy-dialogue-on-political-parties-policy-formulation-and-media-in-pakistan>

³⁷ The Pakistan Institute of Parliamentary Services (PIPS) Act, 2008, was passed by the National Assembly on December 15, 2008. See http://na.gov.pk/uploads/documents/1300757961_694.pdf

USAID has provided crucial support to the Pakistani parliament for the first time by funding the establishment of PIPS, but it still faces a great number of challenges. PILDAT has identified various gaps exhibited by the existing parliament when it comes to the due discharge of their constitutional roles and functions. It has also called for the enactment of an Anti-Terrorism Law on an urgent basis since there is no legal basis or penal provision to charge captured terrorists or to sentence them according to the crimes they have carried out³⁸. PILDAT has also generated an online directory of parliamentary Committees, civil society organizations, professional bodies, research institutes and advocacy organizations of Pakistan because “*the Parliament and Parliamentary Committees have limited in-house research capacity*”³⁹. There is an aura of animosity between existing parliamentary structures and new sources of support and assistance to the parliament when, instead, there should be collaboration and cooperation between these diverse entities that exist to support the parliament in carrying out its functions and making democratic governance more effective in Pakistan. The state of research facilities in national and provincial assemblies is limited if not non-existent, and existing rules of procedure regarding hiring of research and support staff are archaic and require revisions. While recruitment procedures and laws need to be amended, gaps in legislative requirements and legislative performance can only be filled once the parliament (federal as well as provincial legislatures) is supported by qualified research staff that can aid and assist parliamentary organs in obtaining necessary information and acting upon it by proposing or enacting legislation on key issues of national governance⁴⁰.

Media

There also is a need to bridge the gaps between the media and legislators in Pakistan: during the past few years, the media has been overly critical of parliamentarians under the auspices of providing a public-led ‘check and balance’ on the performance and orientation of legislators. While the media highlights key issues that require urgent attention of the government and parliament, it also denigrates the existing role and function of legislators and their interest in addressing key problems facing the Pakistani polity through the tools and mechanisms of democratic governance. The media – now referred to as the ‘fourth pillar of the state’ in addition to the executive, legislative, and judicial branches – must support the existing structures of governance in addressing the needs of the people and dealing with the problems faced by the Pakistani public at various levels of jurisdiction and governance. Instead, there exists an uneven relationship between media organs and the structures of democratic governance in Pakistan, and the most evident manifestation of this complex relationship is the failure of developing comprehensive code of conduct for the media by Pakistan Electronic Media Regulatory Authority (PEMRA). The media and PEMRA are not on the same page and therefore in Pakistan electronic media is, in the main, unregulated.

There are a variety of means to bridge this trust deficit, such as joint capacity building and orientation programs for parliamentarians and media persons, publication of research documents and awareness briefs that acquaint the media with the procedures of democratic governance in Pakistan, and much more. With the current trajectory of media coverage,

³⁸ “PILDAT calls for early introduction of Anti-terrorism Bill in Parliament”. *PILDAT News*, September 14, 2012. Web. <http://pildat.org/eventsdel.asp?detid=567>

³⁹ “PILDAT launches an online Directory and Database of the Parliamentary Committees and Civil Society/Research Organizations of Pakistan”. *PILDAT News*, November 11, 2011. Web. <http://www.pildat.org/eventsdel.asp?detid=505>

⁴⁰ Committee System of the Provincial Assemblies of Pakistan. *PILDAT Briefing Paper*, July 2004. Web. <http://www.pildat.org/Publications/publication/PCS/CommitteeSystemoftheProvincialAssembliesofPakistan.pdf>

specifically in terms of legislators and the progress of democratic government in Pakistan, a variety of measures, mechanisms and metrics are required to instill more confidence in the way parliamentarians conduct day-to-day business, contribute to policy, and set national directions. These metrics must serve the purpose of accountability as well as measurement of legislative progress in a transparent fashion; they must allow the people of Pakistan to evaluate the performance of their elected representatives, and must enable the legislators and parliamentarians to recalibrate their own performance and orientation towards issues of national importance and the way they deal with them in the legislatures and parliamentary Committees. The Pakistani “*media has had an overall positive impact on the political process in Pakistan and has become the greatest tool for accountability*”⁴¹. At the same time, prominent media personalities acknowledge that the media – especially Pakistan’s electronic media – must exhibit impartiality in their coverage of political developments as well as the upcoming election process; “*the media’s role is to inform and discuss and not to reform the society*”⁴². The media must play a facilitating role in addition to performing accountability functions that are more people-centric, rather than undertaking uninformed critique of the performance of parliamentarians, legislatures, and the government.

Judiciary

The independent and activist judiciary has emerged as a check and balance on the effectiveness of the parliamentarians as well – the Supreme Court has taken parliamentarians and government officials to task in terms of their performance. The judiciary has also found a number of parliamentarians in contempt of their oaths as legislators, as well as in contempt of court, and has revoked the parliamentary membership of a number of legislators, the most salient being the former Prime Minister of Pakistan. The legislative progress and electoral laws must be carefully studied, and mechanisms need to be developed that allow parliamentary organs to undertake their functions and duly discharge the roles ascribed to them in conformity with the constitution of Pakistan.

Conclusion

The future of democracy in Pakistan is contingent on reclaiming legitimacy and public trust by the parliamentarians for which there needs to be set into motion a long-term agenda for electoral reforms, political party performance, and the accountability of legislators. Hence the rationale for continued operations of SDPD.

Specific measures would include: 1) Support to parliamentary groups of political parties, especially in terms of research services and timely provision of accurate information; 2) Capacity development of parliamentary staff to enhance their skills to serve legislators, and improvement in human resource policies and practices in the parliamentary secretariats; 3) Support to newly-empowered provincial assemblies; 4) Provide capacity to provincial legislatures in ensuring parliamentary transparency and effectiveness; and 5) Continued assistance to National Assembly and Senate to build on the successes of the earlier phases of SDPD in a selected number of areas.

⁴¹ “Policy Roundtables: Political Parties Policy Formulation; and Media in Pakistan”. *Jinnah Institute*. Web. <http://jinnah-institute.org/events/465-policy-dialogue-on-political-parties-policy-formulation-and-media-in-pakistan>

⁴² “Roundtable on upcoming democratic transition”. *Jinnah Institute*. Web. <http://jinnah-institute.org/programs/open-democracy-initiative/502-roundtable-held-on-upcoming-democratic-transition>

IX. Recommendations

Based upon the analysis of the design, implementation and management of SDPD-II, the 2012 IPU-UNDP review mission developed a comprehensive set of recommendations. These have been divided into two sections: recommendations for the remainder of the SDPD-II and recommendations for the possible development of a future, third phase of the project. The justification and context for the recommendations can be found in the preceding chapters.

9.1. Recommendations for SDPD-II

Project Management

1. Enlarge the Project Review Board (PRB) with three MPs from the National Assembly and two more MPs from the Senate, to be selected upon the recommendations from the Speaker of the NA and chairperson of the Senate. Each group of three MPs (from NA and Senate) should include at least one person from an opposition party, and the MPs should preferably be selected from among the group of committee chairpersons receiving support from the project and including a representative of the Women's Caucus.
2. Ensure that the PRB meets at least twice a year.
3. Include a summary list of all decisions taken in the minutes of PRB meetings, including the timeframe for implementation of the decision and the person responsible for overseeing the implementation. Verification of implementation of previous decisions needs to be on the agenda of each PRB meeting.
4. Recruit an international CTA to provide strategic support and advice to parliament: expertise for Committees, implementation and refinement of the Strategic Plan, preparation of a research strategy, holding and institutionalizing public hearings and consultations, etc.
5. Conduct a regular (e.g. every second week) meeting between the NPD, NPM, CTA and the Assistant Country Director Governance to discuss the strategic direction of the project.
6. Foresee in capacity building for existing SDPD staff, as made possible by the UNDP corporate policies on professional staff development and building skills and knowledge.
7. Provide the research assistants with access to Committee documents and minutes so that they can work with Committee staff to create a document database for the Committee.
8. Provide the research assistants with access to the parliament libraries, and with access to on-line legislative data bases and international parliamentary library networks.
9. Provide quality assurance on the work of the research assistants and plan opportunities for trainings and professional development on research skills and the technical area of work.
10. Relocate the research assistants to either PIPS premises or the parliament building.
11. Develop a functional partnership between PIPS and SDPD, through a joint Work Plan for the remaining period of SDPD-II and plan a regular, monthly meeting between the NPD, NPM, CTA and PIPS.
12. Plan for regular consultations between the NPM and the IPU focal point for SDPD.
13. Inquire with IPU for a clear introduction to its resource persons and their specialization.

14. Continue to provide IPU expertise to the Pakistan parliament through SDPD, and plan for it in the joint work plan of PIPS and SDPD.
15. Enable UNDP Country Office's quality training for project staff to upgrade reporting and analytical skills.
16. Provide comprehensive written project information to all MPs in the NA and Senate on a regular basis.
17. Foster a greater role for the UNDP Country Office in quality assurance related to timely PRB meetings, timely recruitment of staff, and review of work plans, reports and publications.
18. Develop a "UN Pakistan Knowledge Matrix" to plan the delivery of UN Agencies' in-house expertise to parliamentary Committees.
19. Foresee in an end-of-project evaluation at the end of 2013, to capture the SDPD-II's additional achievements by that time, based upon the recommendations of this evaluation.

Output 1

20. Provide the Committees with experienced technical advisors, as envisaged in the Project Document.
21. Develop and strengthen the relationships with Universities and Research Institutes to identify a pool of experts who can provide high level technical expertise, especially in the area of legislative drafting.
22. Enhance the quality review process for the content of the SDPD publications by requesting feed-back on draft texts from thematic experts at the UNDP CO or at other UN agencies; and collect feed-back on the effective use of different knowledge products.
23. Recruit an international parliamentary development expert to conduct a comparative study on public hearings in other parliaments; prepare a "Public Hearings Manual" for MPs and staff and consider amendments to the parliament's Standing Orders, outlining the procedural framework for public hearings and consultations as mechanisms for public input into the Committees' work.
24. Re-launch the comprehensive functional review of the Committee system, which looks into the streamlining of mandates, reviewing the number of Committees, providing public access to hearings, preparing draft amendments to the Standing Orders. Ensure that this review is finalized prior to the 2013 elections and the subsequent creation of new Committees in the newly elected NA.

Outcome 2

25. Expand the length of staff training programs, based on a well-identified training plan and followed-up with advanced training.
26. End the SDPD role in the organization of basic induction trainings for staff, such as computer literacy, and advice PIPS or the parliament Secretariats in organizing them.
27. Explore possibilities for alternative training modalities for staff, including on-line trainings and leveraging existing e-learning tools.
28. Provide training quality advice through the CTA by reviewing the training proposals and training requests submitted at PIPS from the international quality perspective, giving input

for a comprehensive staff training calendar and advising the Secretariats on their Human Resources Development Policy.

29. Develop, through the CTA, a conceptual framework and quality guidelines for different modalities of international exposure for MPs and staff.

Outcome 3

30. Engage with the Parliamentary Reporters Association for an advanced capacity building program.
31. Support the establishment of a platform for regularly scheduled consultations between CSOs and Standing Committees.
32. Support long term advocacy programs of CSOs.
33. Facilitate policy dialogues between the Women Caucus, NGOs working on gender questions and UN Women.

Outcome 4

34. Support through a CTA, the review of the Strategic Plan of the National Assembly based upon discussions with the Deputy Speaker and the parliamentary groups.
35. Advise that the multi-party group of MPs discussing the Strategic Plan continues to provide guidance to the implementation and enforcement of the Strategic Plan for at least 2 years after its adoption.
36. Establish the Aid Coordination Committee, upon the initiative of the NPD.
37. Establish a Technical Working Group, upon the initiative of the UNDP Assistant Country Director for Governance, and later on the CTA.
38. Organize regular meetings of all UN agencies interacting with parliament, upon the initiative of the UNDP Country Director or Deputy Country Director Programs.
39. Plan for regular bilateral and informal meetings with the NPM and the Team leader of the EC-program in Parliament.
40. Prepare for next year's induction program for newly elected members of the National Assembly and the provincial assemblies, and bring the best human resources of PIPS, UNDP-SDPD, EC-British Council, the European Parliament-OPPD and national actors into the induction program, achieving in this way an example of high quality donor coordination.
41. Ensure regular communication and interaction between SDPD-PMU and the UNDP DGG Community of Practice on parliamentary development.

9.2. Recommendations for the third phase of SDPD, 2014 onwards

42. Plan for an extensive scoping and programming mission for the next phase of the SDPD, identifying the future support to the federal parliament and the provincial assemblies; and ensure early coordination with the EC scoping process for a future program with the

- provincial assemblies. The mission team needs to include (at least) one international parliamentary development expert, one national governance expert and the CTA.
43. Redesign the project management arrangements so that the PRB will be co-chaired by the UNDP Country Office and the National Assembly / Senate. To improve working practices, the NPD and the co-chair of the PRB should be from the same house, alternating between the National Assembly and the Senate for half of the project period each.
 44. Develop the new Project Document with clearly distinct program components for the National Assembly and Senate, in addition to some common program components, while maintaining a joint management framework under the PRB.
 45. Continue to provide IPU expertise to the Pakistani parliament through SDPD and make it one of the bases for cooperation between PIPS and SDPD.
 46. Ensure that the participation of Pakistani MPs to IPU meetings provides input into identifying priorities for UNDP project support to the Committees and the parliament at large.
 47. Inquire with the Secretariats of the National Assembly and the Senate on their openness to institutional reform in line with a parliamentary Strategic Plan and make this the basis for future technical international expertise from IPU and UNDP.
 48. Ensure UNDP Country Office's continued role in quality assurance related to timely PRB meetings, timely recruitment of staff, and review of work plans, reports and publications.
 49. Implement and regularly review the "UN Pakistan Knowledge Matrix" for the delivery of UN Agencies' in-house expertise to parliament Committees.
 50. Strengthen parliament's cooperation with academic institutions to ensure more sustainability to the research input for Committees.
 51. Explore the feasibility of a parliamentary Budget Office, possibly to be established at PIPS.
 52. Support the Parliament in developing a public outreach plan, as part of/linked to the revised Strategic Development Plan of Parliament.

X. Annexes

Annex 1: Overview or interlocutors and persons interviewed

Members of the National Assembly and Senate

1. Sabir Ali Baloch, Deputy Chairman Senate, Chair PRB
2. Riaz Fatyana, chairperson Committee on Human Rights, National Assembly
3. Syed Haider Abbas Rizvi, Deputy Parliamentary Leader, NA
4. Bushra Gohar, MQM, Chair former Committee on Women's Development NA
5. Haider Abbas Rizvi, Deputy Parliamentary Leader MQM; member PAC NA.
6. Dr Attiya Inayatullah, PML-Q, NA

Staff of the National Assembly and Senate

7. Shamoan Hashmi, National Project Director, SDDP Joint Secretary, National Assembly
8. Karamat Hussain Niazi, Secretary National Assembly
9. Syed Munawwar Abbas, Additional Secretary National Assembly
10. Anjum Mughal, Chief, Protocol & Public Relations National Assembly
11. Sharifullah Khan Wazir, Joint Secretary Senate (Focal Person, SDDP)
12. Iftikhar Ullah Babar, Secretary Senate
13. Tahir Hanfi, Director General, National Assembly
14. Khan Ahmad Goraya, Executive Director, PIPS
15. Muhammad Rashid Mafzool Zaka, Director (Research and IT), PIPS
16. Sharafat Hussain Niazi, Additional Director (Human Resources), PIPS

Members and staff of provincial assemblies

17. Rana Mashood Ahmad Khan, Deputy Speaker, Provincial Assembly of the Punjab
18. Dr Maqbool Aftab Joiya, Secretary of the Provincial Assembly of the Punjab
19. Inayatullah Lak, DG, Library and Automation Cell
20. Sardar Jam Tamachi, member Provincial Assembly Sindh
21. Pitanbar Sewani, member Provincial Assembly Sindh
22. Gulam Mohammad Umer Farooq, Secretary, Provincial Assembly Sindh
23. Mian Mohammad Hussain Shah, Assistant Secretary, Provincial Assembly Sindh
24. M Sajid, Director Automation, Provincial Assembly Sindh

SDPD staff

25. Marvi Sirmed, National Project Manager, SDDP
26. Jamil A. Qureshi, National Technical Adviser, SDDP
27. M Aslam Brohi, Deputy Project Manager, SDDP
28. Syed Ali Mujtaba Zaidi, monitoring and evaluation officer, SDDP
29. Karim Gabol, Communications and Advocacy Officer
30. Zobia Haider, research assistant, SDDP
31. Javeria Farheen, research assistant, SDDP
32. Tahira Ambreen, research assistant, SDDP
33. Bilal Khan Khattak, research assistant, SDDP
34. Baqir Sajjad, research assistant, SDDP

Civil Society, Islamabad

35. Ahmed Bilal Mehboob, President, PILDAT
36. Harris Khalique, Team Leader, Awaz Programme, Islamabad
37. Dr Rakhshinda Perveen, Founder, SACHET, Islamabad
38. Wasim Wagha, Advocacy and Resource Service Specialist, Aurat Foundation, Islamabad
39. Mohammad Gul, ASHAA network, Islamabad
40. Zahid Abdullah, Program Officer, Center for Peace and Development (CPDI), Islamabad

41. Daud Malik, Manager Advocacy, Education and Communication, FAFEN, Islamabad
42. Adnan Anjum Saeed Akhtar, Program Officer, FAFEN, Islamabad
43. Rafique Jadoon, Programme Manager STAEP
44. Kashif-Ur-Rehman Qureshi, Director Technical, 360 Technologies

Civil Society in provinces

45. Rafiq Khan, Manager Democracy and Governance, Bedari
46. Ume Laila Azhar, Executive Director, HomeNet, Lahore
47. Mahmood Ahmad, Vice President, Rising Sun Education and Welfare Society, Lahore
48. Bushra Khaliq, Executive Director, Women in Struggle for Empowerment (WISE), Lahore
49. Shahid Iqbal, Senior Program Officer, WISE, Lahore
50. Sher Zaman, Monitoring Officer, Democratic Commission for Human Development, Lahore
51. Salman Abid, Regional Director, Strengthening Participatory Organisation, Lahore
52. Najmuddin, Programme Officer, Human Rights of Commission Pakistan, Lahore
53. Anis Danish, Senior Officer Outreach, Civil Society Resource Center, Karachi
54. Zahid Farooq, Joint Director, Urban Resource Centre, Karachi
55. Muhammad Tahir Iqbal Malik, C.E.O., Legal Rights Forum, Karachi
56. Bilquis Rehman, General Manager Advocacy, HANDS, Karachi
57. Lutf Ali, HANDS, Karachi
58. Malka Khan, Regional Coordinator, Aurat Foundation, Karachi
59. Advocate Robina Brohi, Regional Coordinator, Aurat Foundation, Karachi
60. Ayesha Rahim, Takhleeq Foundation, Karachi
61. Muhammad Yaqub, Executive Director, Takhleeq Foundation, Karachi

Authors of research papers

62. Asad Mahmood Awan, Author of "Office Management Skills", Consult Us
63. Ch Muhammad Ashraf, author of "How to Understand Legislative bill"
64. Kashif ur Rehman & Haroon, author of "Ms Office, Social Networking, Basic Internet Skills"
65. Muhammad Anwer, Joint Secretary Senate, Author of "Parliamentary Oversight"

Reporters on parliamentary affairs

66. Khawaja Babar Farooq, Reporter Associated Press of Pakistan
67. Raza Aabid Mustafa, Reporter Apna TV
68. Bahzad Saleemi, Senior Correspondent of News One
69. Syed Nasir Abbas Naqvi, Reporter Daily Ausaf

International community representatives

70. Jan Luc Stalon, Deputy Country Director Program, UNDP Pakistan
71. Azhar Saeed Malik, Assistant Country Director, Chief Governance, UNDP Pakistan
72. Muhammad Asif Bhattee, Program Officer, Democratic Governance Unit, UNDP Pakistan
73. Norah Babic, Institutional Capacity Building Program, IPU, Geneva
74. Ole Holtved, Country Director IFES Pakistan
75. Eva Atanassova, Development Advisor Governance, European Union Delegation to Pakistan
76. Anitra Jankevica, Team Leader EU project, British Council
77. Reena Johl, Project Director, Parliamentary Project Pakistan, British Council, London
78. John Patterson, EU consultant for Pakistan project, London
79. Theo Oltheten, Deputy Head Development Cooperation, Netherlands Embassy, Pakistan
80. Seyd Saadat Ali, Senior Program Officer, Netherlands Embassy, Pakistan
81. Sandra Houston, Resident Country Director, NDI Pakistan
82. Nazeer Ahmad Mahar, Governance Advisor, USAID Pakistan
83. David A. Thirlby, Program Manager, Westminster Foundation for Democracy, London
84. Marina Narnor, Program Manager, Westminster Foundation for Democracy, London
85. Marc Bentinck, Office for Promotion of Parliamentary Democracy, European Parliament, Brussels

Annex 2: Bibliography of documents consulted

Project Documents

- Project Document SDPD Phase 1
- Project Document SDPD Phase 2

Annual review Reports

- Project Annual Report , January 15, 2007
- Project Annual Report, January 12, 2009

Bi-annual Progress Report

- Progress Report Strengthening Democracy through Parliamentary Development (Phase-II) Project, December 2009 – June 2010
- Progress Report Strengthening Democracy through Parliamentary Development (SDPD II) Project, Jan – June 2011
- Revised Bi-Annual Progress Report Strengthening Democracy through Parliamentary Development (SDPD II) Project, July – December 2011
- Bi-Annual Progress Report Strengthening Democracy through Parliamentary Development (SDPD II) Project, January – June 2012

Quarterly reports

- Quarterly report October-December 2009
- Quarterly report April – June 2010
- Quarterly report July –September 2010
- Quarterly report October –December 2010
- Quarterly report January–March 2011
- Quarterly report April–June 2011
- Quarterly report July –September 2011
- Quarterly report January –March 2011
- Quarterly report April –June 2011

Evaluation Reports

- Strengthening Democracy through Parliamentary Development: review and Project Formulation mission 2009

UNDP Pakistan

- UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD)
- Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP)
- UNDAF 2004- 2008
- 2010 Resident Coordinator Annual Report

SDPD Publications NA

- Four year performance of National Assembly
- Hand Book for Members
- Procedural Manual

SDPD Publications Senate

- Book for Members
- Rules Of Procedure and Conduct of Business
- Salaries And Allowances Act 1975
- The Mediation Committee
- The Parliament (Joint Sittings)
- The Constitution of Islamic Republic of Pakistan
- Role, Functions & Procedures
- The Chairman and Speaker (salaries, allowances, privileges)
- The deputy chairman and deputy speaker (salaries, allowances, privileges)
- The parliament joint sitting rules 1973
- Rules of Procedure and Conduct

SDPD Brochures

- Youth Inclusion & Democracy a panel discussion, SDPD II, 2011
- Parliaments & Political Parties
- How to understand a bill
- Parliaments and conflict resolution
- Provincial Autonomy
- Legislative Function of Parliament
- Human Resource development in Parliament
- Oversight Function of parliament
- Parliament and human rights

SDPD Publications on Parliament

- Role of parliament in International Agreements
- A handbook on Budget Processes

SDPD Reports

- People and Parliament(Project Completion Report)
- Two Years Progress Report of the Standing Committee on Human Rights, June 2009 to June 2011
- Report of the Senate Standing Committee on religious Affairs (August 2009- November 2011)
- Need assessment of civil society organizations, What is to be done for enabling civil society engage with the Parliament, 2012
- Rules of procedures and privileges 2009-2011
- Post Budget Orientation Series for Parliament
- Report of the Senate Standing Committee on health
- Report of the Functional Committee on Government Assurances
- Problems of less developed Areas
- A study on impact
- Rules of procedures and privileges 2009-2011
- Senate of Pakistan

Research papers

- Public and Media Access To Parliament
- Protection And Promotion Of Human Rights

Policies

- Agricultural policy
- Industry Policy
- Energy crises
- Housing Policy
- Labor Policy

SDPD Briefing series

- Parliament and the State in Pakistan: Case for Constitutional Reforms Public Accounts Committees
- Economic Crisis
- Food Security
- Poverty Reduction
- Analysis of Federal Budget
- Federal Budget: Revenue & Taxation (VAT)
- National Budget: NFC & 18th Amendment

TOR

- Terms of Reference for Senior Technical Advisor , Project Title: Strengthening Democracy through Parliamentary Development (SDPD) phase-II
- Terms of Reference for Project Formulation and Review Mission Strengthening Democracy through Parliamentary Development in Pakistan Project (SDPD), February 2009
- Terms of Reference for Project Formulation and Review Mission Strengthening Democracy through Parliamentary Development in Pakistan Project (SDPD II), August 2011

Websites

- <http://www.sdpd.org.pk>
- <http://undp.org.pk/>
- <http://www.senate.gov.pk/>
- <http://www.na.gov.pk/>
- <http://www.pildat.org/>
- <http://www.ipu.org/>
- <http://www.pips.org.pk/>
- <http://www.democracy-reporting.org/publications/country-reports/pakistan.html>
- www.iknowpolitics.org
- <http://www.agora-parl.org/>
- <http://www.euoparl.europa.eu/oppd>

Annex 3: Biography of members of the IPU-UNDP evaluation team

The evaluation team included an international parliamentary expert proposed by IPU (the Mission Leader, Franklin De Vrieze), a parliamentary development specialist from UNDP DGG (Ruth Beeckmans), and a national consultant with expertise in governance in Pakistan (Raza Ahmad).

Franklin De Vrieze is an international parliamentary development and governance expert with over 15 years experience. He is a former Program Manager of UNDP's Global Program for Parliamentary Strengthening (GPPS), and in that capacity provided technical advice on issues such as the Benchmarks for Democratic Parliaments and the Global Parliamentary Report. In 2011, he continued to work on parliamentary strengthening and governance as a freelance consultant. He conducted parliamentary evaluation and programming missions in Libya, Montenegro, Myanmar, the Solomon Islands, Suriname, Trinidad & Tobago, Vietnam and Zimbabwe. From 2001 to 2008, he worked for the OSCE Mission in Kosovo as Head of the Central Assembly and Political Parties Section. He coordinated the parliamentary capacity building programs and technical assistance projects with the Assembly of Kosovo. He is an author on parliamentary development and public affairs; and studied political science and international relations at the University of Antwerp in Belgium.

Ruth Beeckmans has worked for the past two and a half years as Parliamentary Development Analyst for the UNDP Democratic Governance Group in New York. She was UNDP's focal point for the project "IKNOW Politics" (International Knowledge Network of Women in Politics) and is now supporting several UNDP Country Offices in parliamentary development programs. She was one of the main authors of the handbook "The UN Declaration on the rights of indigenous peoples: Understanding and implementing it in the work of Parliaments". Prior to her work on parliamentary development, she worked in the field of electoral assistance. Ruth Beeckmans holds a Masters in "Comparative Culture Sciences" and "International and European Law".

Raza Ahmad is an international development expert based in Pakistan. He has worked for the Government of Pakistan, Pakistani NGO networks, the United Nations and Asian Development Bank HQ in the Philippines. Raza is an academic adviser to the Network of Asia Pacific Schools and Institutes of Public Administration and Governance, Public Policy Adviser to Leadership for Environment and Development, Pakistan and a member of the Advisory Board of ASR Resource Centre, Pakistan. Currently he is affiliated with the Jinnah Institute (a public policy think tank) in Islamabad. Raza's research interests and advisory skills include: security, justice and counter-terrorism, Public Policy, Governance & Anticorruption; Decentralization; Capacity Development; and change management. He has authored several research papers and publications on governance, institutional development and South Asian arts and culture. Raza also writes for the media under the nom de plume Raza Rumi. He edits the weekly *The Friday Times* and writes a regular column for the daily Express-Tribune and The News.

Annex 4: Parliamentary Staff Questionnaire and consolidated responses

Questionnaire for Parliamentary Staff Pakistan

National Assembly Senate (check the appropriate box)

- 1. Are you a newly recruited staff of the Secretariat (less than 2 years)?**
 Yes
 No

- 2. Are you a man or a woman?**
 Man
 Woman

- 3. Have you participated in an activity organized by SPDP?**
 Yes
 No

- 4. If Yes, how many?**
 0
 1
 2-3
 More than 4

- 5. Were the workshops relevant and provided useful information?**
 Yes
 No

- 6. What was the most relevant activity you attended?**
 Intercession activity
 Capacity development workshop
 Study tour
 Other – please describe: _____

- 7. How have you used the information provided during the workshop in your daily work?**

- 8. What is your overall level of satisfaction with the SPDP activities?**
 Very satisfied
 Satisfied
 Some level of satisfaction
 Not satisfied

Please provide a short comment explaining your answer:

9. **Were the workshops conducted in a manner compatible with the NA agenda?**
 Yes
 No
10. **Were the workshops themes aligned with the NA legislative priorities?**
 Yes
 No
11. **Is your daily work aligned with your job description?**
 Yes
 No
12. **Is there a performance-based Human Resource Management System in place?**
 Yes
 No
13. **Do you have access to a computer at work?**
 Yes
 No
14. **What do you use it for?**
-

15. **Is internet a tool you have used for research?**
 Yes
 Sometimes
 Never

16. **Chose min. 3 to max. 7 priorities for training and capacity building for parliamentary staff which will positively affect their work in 2013:**

- Parliamentary Rules of Procedures, Constitutions and political systems
- Technical expertise and background information on draft laws under discussion
- Legal drafting and drafting amendments to laws
- Report writing and analytical writing
- Budget analysis
- Oversight techniques
- International Law
- Knowledge of international relations, organizations, treaties and conventions
- Information and Communication Technology – basic skills
- Information and Communication Technology – advanced skills
- Time management
- Language skills: speaking, reading and writing in different languages
- Human Resources management, self-evaluation and improving personal performance
- Change management in organizations
- Information and research management
- Public Outreach and Communication Strategy

Feedback Provided by the Secretariat Staff

Total participants from Senate: 6

Total participants from NA: 10

Sr#	Area	Dimensions	Senate	National Assembly
1	Working Experience	Less than 02	1	1
		More than 02	5	9
2	Gender	Male	3	6
		Female	3	4
3	Participation in SDPD's activity	1	1	6
		2 to 3	4	4
		More than 04	0	0
		unanswered	1	0
5	Relevance of activities	Yes	6	10
		No	0	0
6	Most relevant activity attended	Intersession activity	0	1
		capacity development	4	9
		study tour	0	0
		other	1	0
		unanswered	0	0
8	Level of satisfaction with the SDPD's activity/activities.	Very satisfied	1	2
		Satisfied	2	6
		Some level of satisfaction	3	2
		Not satisfied	0	0
9	Compatibility of activities with the NA agenda	Yes	3	7
		No	0	3
		unanswered	3	0
10	Alignment of activity with the NA legislative priorities	Yes	2	7
		No	1	3
		unanswered	3	0

11	Alignment of work with job description	Yes	5	10
		No	0	0
		Unanswered	1	0
12	Performance based HRM system.	Yes	6	7
		No	0	3
		unanswered	0	0
13	Access to computer	Yes	6	10
		No	0	0
15	Usage of Internet as tool for research	Yes	4	7
		Sometimes	2	3
		Never	0	0
16	Parliamentary Rules of Procedures, Constitutions and political systems.		4	10
	Technical expertise and background information on draft laws under discussion.		1	2
	Legal drafting and drafting amendments to Laws.		4	5
	Report writing and analytical writing.		5	4
	Budget Analyses.		3	3
	Oversight techniques		1	2
	International Law.		0	1
	knowledge of international relations, organizations, treaties and conventions.		8	4
	Information and Communication Technology-Basic Skills.			5
	Information and Communication Technology-Advance Skills.		3	5
	Time Management.		2	5
	Language Skills; speaking, reading & writing in different languages.		2	7
	Human Resource Management, self evaluation and improving personal performances.		3	4
	Change management in organization.			1
Information and research management.		2	3	
Public outreach and communication strategy.		2	2	

Terms of Reference
Mid-Term Review Mission
(September 10 to October 31, 2012)
**Strengthening Democracy through Parliamentary Development in Pakistan –
SDPD-II**

1. Background

In 2002, the authorities of the Parliament of Pakistan sought the support of the Inter Parliamentary Union (IPU) and United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) in strengthening its operations. In the light of the report of an UNDP/IPU mission in 2003, a project, Strengthening Democracy through Parliamentary Development (SDPD), was initiated.

Led by Parliament, with support from the UNDP and IPU, the SDPD Project provided Parliamentarians with access to a range of orientation and capacity building opportunities offered through national and international sponsored programmes. These afforded participants an opportunity to gain information and to strengthen links with civil society and the media. Technical capacity building and institutional strengthening of the Parliament's Secretariats was undertaken in the hope that progressively enhanced support could be delivered to Parliament and Parliamentarians. The overall outcome envisaged for the Parliament in the SDPD Project Document was long term. A Review Team, comprising a representative of the UNDP, the IPU, and a national consultant, was tasked to develop a framework for a future UNDP Parliamentary assistance project based on a progress review of the SDPD Project. The Review Team conducted its work from 15 to 27 February, 2009, using a methodology of extensive interviews and a thorough review of relevant documents. The review mission found that achievement of the overall outcome would not have been realistic within the lifetime of the Project, given the nature of Parliament in 2003, the programme design and availability of resources of the SDPD Project. The mission concluded that the project had made a significant contribution to enhancing the role of Parliament but that much remains to be done. The mission identified the following considerations for future support to strategically complement and build on the outputs achieved under SDPD:

1. The Parliament requires support in all key functions. The MNAs and Senators do not have the resources (human, financial or infrastructure) to address the concerns of citizens (i.e. – constituency relations). This lack of support is also obvious in the work of Parliamentary Committees.
2. The Secretariats in both Houses of the Parliament lack the skills and capacity to support the Parliamentarians with regard to crucial work: drafting of laws and amendments to laws, Committee work, and research.
3. With regard to third party relations, Parliament and Parliamentarians have not established strong relationships with CSOs, media and citizens. There is a lack of understanding of the key role all play in a democratic society. This is a key underlying factor in the many of challenges facing Pakistani democracy.

The four strategic interventions identified for the project are:

- Support to a selected (up to four a year) number of Parliamentary Committees
- Enhancing the skills of Secretariat staff that work with Committees
- Working with CSOs to create effective advocacy on behalf of citizens
- Better coordination of Aid and support to the Federal Parliament (for details, annex 4)

Based on the above, second phase of SDPD was designed for next four years, which came into effect on October 1, 2009 and will finish its term on September 30, 2013. Under the agreed framework of support during Phase II, the current support for the Pakistani National Assembly and the Senate aims to focus assist specific Committees to improve their legislative and oversight work, for an effective Parliament with limited resources.

It was, thus, agreed under an operative MoU with the Parliament Secretariats and the Govt of Pakistan, that second phase of the UNDP's Parliamentary support would focus a select number of Committees, as a pivot. It was intended that the assistance through training to Parliamentary staff and civil society organizations and through the use of long-term technical advice and support to MNAs and Senators (Members of Committees), would have a direct impact on the capacity of the Parliament to pass quality legislation, scrutinize the executive branch and reflect the needs of Pakistani citizens. Within this work support to the women's caucus and any other

caucuses would continue and would build on the success of the women's caucus supported by SDPD in first phase. The major activities of SDPD-II revolve around three components:

1. Capacity Development (Parliamentarians, parliamentary staff and Civil society)

Under the agreed MoU, a national technical adviser had to be engaged for each Committee identified and one international senior technical adviser who would be a backstop for the national advisers in their work with the Committees. The technical advisers would thus be the entry points for both procedural challenges and the provision of information with regard to specific, substantive topics. The Committees would be supported in conducting public consultations and public hearings. At the same time, CSOs will be supported in enhancing their ability to make presentations before the Committees.

Secretariats of both the Houses are considered to be the institutional, long-term wings of the Parliament. MNAs and Senators come and go, but staff remains the key focal point for Parliamentary parties. With this in view, project involved three areas of support for training of the staff: Committee work, research and legislative drafting.

2. Citizen Advocacy

Considering the importance of responsiveness in a strong democracy and of civil society's role therein, ensuring an effective dialogue between the citizens of Pakistan and their Parliament is crucial to the long-term viability of democratic institutions. In order to have a dialogue, there are at least two parties that must have the knowledge and capacity to engage in discussions. To that end, project envisaged support and information to be provided to civil society and the citizens of Pakistan. Also, considering the importance of media's engagement with Parliamentarians, the project entailed specific support to media to strengthen its constructive and enabling role for democracy.

3. Aid Coordination

In order to ensure there is clear direction from the political leadership of the Parliament that reflects the interests of both the treasury and opposition benches, the project entailed the establishment of an Aid Coordination Committee.

2. Mid Term Review

As per the project document, a mid term review was foreseen at the end of the second year. As the project could operationalize almost six months late (due to delays in identification of National Project Director and of Committees to be supported), the Mid Term Review (MTR) also got delayed accordingly. However as the project time frame concludes in September 2013, the review would still be useful to appraise project's progress, stakeholders' feedback and reorientation if needed.

It is for this purpose, that a MTR Mission comprising an international expert on parliamentary development, who will come from IPU as per agreed framework, (the Mission Leader) and a national consultant with demonstrated expertise in governance, strategic management and democratic development, a representative from UNDP Headquarters (International Democracy and Governance) is proposed to be instituted.

3. Objectives of the Mid-Term Review

The Mid-Term Review (MTR) will assess the progress of the project against stated outputs as of June 2012, as well as identify issues and recommend course corrections. It will also highlight issues and challenges affecting efficient implementation of outputs and their contribution to project outcomes and impact. The Mission would also recommend whether results obtained thus far warrant a reorientation, expansion of the scope or an extension of the project period.

The review is being undertaken at almost the midpoint of project implementation and is expected to pave the way for improved project delivery for the remaining project duration and propose amendments (if any) required in project design, implementation arrangements and/or institutional linkages in order to effectively and sustainably contribute to the strengthening of democratic institutions through improved legislation and oversight.

4. Key Focus Areas

The MTR Mission will assess the SDPD according to standard evaluation criteria, as elaborated below.

Relevance

- i. Assess the contribution of the project towards the achievement of national objectives and CPAP goals.

- ii. Analyze whether current approach of the project addresses the needs and demands of the partners (in a disaggregated manner) along with the response / feedback of the stakeholders.
- iii. Assess the relevance of the tools / instruments / inputs applied by the project for creating support mechanisms for the members of Parliament, Secretariats' staff, civil society, media, citizens –for improving legislation, government's oversight and citizens' representation including the technical input.
- iv. Assess the relevance and effect of technical assistance, training and other support given to the parliament, Secretariats, media and civil society.

Effectiveness

- v. Review whether the project has accomplished its outputs;
- vi. Assess the performance of the project so far with particular reference to qualitative and quantitative achievements of outputs and targets as defined in the project documents and work-plans;
- vii. Assess the effectiveness of the cost sharing arrangement between UNDP and the Embassy of the Kingdom of Netherlands;
- viii. Based on the progress so far and ground situations, suggest / recommend any changes to the above cost-sharing arrangements

Efficiency

- ix. Assess whether the project has utilized project funding as per the agreed work plan to achieve the projected targets.
- x. Assess the timeline and quality of the reporting followed by the project
- xi. Analyze the performance of the Monitoring and Evaluation mechanism of the project and the use of M&E tools
- xii. Assess the efficiency of mechanism for technical input to the Committees and the civil society
- xiii. Assess the qualitative and quantitative aspects of management and other inputs (such as equipment, monitoring and review and other technical assistance and budgetary inputs) provided by the project vis-à-vis achievement of outputs and targets.
- xiv. Identify factors and constraints, which have affected project implementation including technical, managerial, organizational, institutional and socio-political policy issues in addition to other external factors unforeseen during the project implementation.

Sustainability and Impact

- xv. Assess preliminary indications of the degree to which the project results are likely to be sustainable beyond the project's lifetime (both at the parliament and civil society level), and provide recommendations for strengthening the sustainability factor.
- xvi. Assess the sustainability of the project interventions in terms of their effect on future policy environment
- xvii. Analyse the emerging impact on the future legislation, policy making and implementation along with the oversight of this policy implementation with special focus on post-18th Constitutional Amendment governance scenario
- xviii. Based on the findings (relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and impact) as well as taking into account new initiatives emerging under the one UN, recommend whether extension in scope and period of this project is warranted.

Network /linkages

- xix. Evaluate the level, degree and representation by the stakeholders (parliament, PIPS, civil society, media and donor partners etc.) in the implementation of the project
- xx. Examine the synergies and potential overlap between SDPDII and other parliamentary development initiatives emerged during last two years, as well as propose strategy to enhance complementarities.
- xxi. Assess the alignment of the project with the one UN program and CPAP, identifying linkages and opportunities for the achievement of objectives/targets;

- xxii. Assess the project's knowledge management strategy and outreach and communications to all stakeholders.

Lessons learnt/ Conclusions

- xxiii. Analyze areas for improved programme planning, especially with respect to setting targets, relevance and capacity of institutions for project decision-making and delivery. In particular examine the UNDP value added in a democratic governance initiative in the context of the One UN program.
- xxiv. Identify significant lessons or conclusions, which can be drawn from the project in terms of effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and networking. Special attention may be given to the political and security situation alongside the coping strategies developed by the project to maintain work momentum.

5. Outputs

The Mission's findings and recommendations will be thoroughly discussed with the UNDP Country Office, Project Review Board, Parliament Secretariats, civil society / media partners, project management and the Economic Affairs Division (EAD).

The Mission will complete and submit a draft final report in both hard and soft copy at the end of the mission. The Mission Leader will finalize the report in the light of comments/suggestions of stakeholders. The key outputs of the MTR are:

- (a) Draft Report Template: Submission of a draft report format containing Table of Contents for the final report for approval by UNDP CO / SDPD PMU.
- (b) An Aide Memoire (including key findings and recommendations) and its presentation: The Mission will present the aide memoire to the project stakeholders (UNDP, EAD, and SDPD) in a consultative workshop.
- (c) The MTR Final Report: The report should be logically structured, contain evidence-based findings, conclusions, lessons and recommendations, and should be free of information that is not relevant to the overall analysis. The report should respond in detail to the key focus areas described above. It should include a set of specific recommendations formulated for the project, and identify the necessary actions required to be undertaken, who should undertake those and possible time-lines (if any). Project stakeholders will provide comments on the Draft Report, and the Mission will finalize the report in view of these comments.
- (d) A brief paper documenting changes (if any) to be made to the Project Document. This may be annexed to the MTR Report
- (e) Proposal / project document that covers the changes / additional scope that the MTR proposes, for the provincial interventions
- 5) Presentation: For presenting and discussing the draft final report interactively, the consultants will facilitate a one-day concluding workshop for the project stakeholders.

6. Background Documents

- Project Document
- Project Annual Progress Reports 2010 and 2011
- Quarterly progress reports
- Minutes of the Project Review Board (PRM) Meetings
- Any other reports produced by SDPD
- One UN Program
- UNDP Country Programme Action Plan

7. Methodology

The mission will adopt a consultative and participative approach. This may include visits to / meetings with the Committee Chairs / members; visits to the provincial assemblies; civil society partners, media and political experts, senior Secretariat staff etc. The mission will also meet with the Project team, relevant government agencies / partners at federal, provincial and district level, if need be, the mission may also meet other agencies / projects engaged in similar interventions. The MTR will start with a meeting at UNDP Country Office and conclude with a debriefing meeting with UNDP and other project partners.

8. The team for MTR

The Mission will consist of a three-member team of consultants, each with at least 10 - 12 years of experience related to democratic governance. As explained in Section 2, the three-member team will consist of an international expert on parliamentary development, a representative from the UNDP Head Quarters with relevant experience and expertise, and a local consultant with demonstrated experience in and knowledge of Pakistan's political structure, democratic institutions and legislative process.

a) *International Consultant (Team Leader)*

The International Consultant (IC) will be engaged by IPU under the agreed framework of its partnership with UNDP and the Parliament of Pakistan for SDPD. IC will be leading the team of consultants and will be responsible for:

- Presenting an inception report before the fielding of mission. The inception report should include an outline of the mid-term review report, the methodology to be applied and a draft timetable for the mission;
- Being a leading part of meetings / focus group discussions and key interviews and field trips to be held during the mission, with a range of stakeholders;
- Keeping close contact with PMU for discussion and perspective on various issues that might emerge during interactions with stakeholders;
- Preparing a concise Debriefing Note towards the end of the Mission, that would include key findings and recommendations, to be discussed with the implementing partners and UNDP Country Office;
- Preparing a Mid-Term Review Report, which should be submitted to SDPD / UNDP CO for feedback, within two weeks after departure from Pakistan. The final report shall be submitted within one week of receiving the feedback.

b) *Local Consultant*

- Provide insight on the political culture and determinants of democratic progress, alongside identifying a range of stakeholders of parliamentary democracy in Pakistan
- In consultation with the Team Leader, prepare a working schedule of the Mission including focus group discussions (where necessary) and key informant interviews
- Identify federal and provincial officials / politicians / civil society representatives / media persons / parliamentarians / provincial assembly members etc to be interviewed
- Contact relevant persons / institutions to fix meetings
- Prepare daily reports for group discussions and interviews for the team leader
- Prepare the presentation of the draft Aide Memoire, which the team will debrief to the stakeholders.
- Consolidate the information of daily reports, gathered through interviews and meetings, into a structure of MTR Report after due consultations with PMU and CO. The draft will then be sent to the International Consultant for review and further input.

c) *UNDP H/Q Representative*

- Bring the UNDP perspective of parliamentary strengthening based on UN's experience in other countries
- Give input for setting the approach of MTR based on UNDP universally accepted guidelines
- Contribute to the process of MTR, discussions with stakeholders, performance assessment of SDPD II and in the debriefing as well as MTR report.

9. Schedule of MTR

The evaluation will begin on September 10, 2012. The Local Consultant will prepare MTR-Report in consultation with PMU & CO before submitting it to IC for further feedback and insight latest by 20 October 2012. Comments on the draft report will be sent to the IC by 26 October 2012, after which the consultant will submit the final report no later than 31 October, 2012.

By this token, total period for the MTR would span over 6 weeks. With number of days for each consultant as follows:

International Consultant:	20 days
Local Consultant:	35 days
UNDP H/Q rep:	15 days in Pakistan.

Annex 6: ToR of the Chief Technical Advisor to SDPD-II

1. Background

The Strengthening Democracy through Parliamentary Development Phase-II project is designed to assist the parliament to strengthen its legitimate role within national governance, enhance its administration, and provide appropriate support for Parliamentarian in discharging their core tasks of executive oversight and law making.

2. Objective

The assignment should focus on the facilitation of technical cooperation with partners and relevant stakeholders for all strategic decisions and activities of the project.

3. Job Description

Under the overall supervision of the Assistant Country Director, UNDP Governance Unit and with support from National project Manager the incumbent will be tasked with:

- Conduct consultations and establish a functioning system of donor coordination in the area of parliamentary development, which includes the federal parliament and provincial assemblies;
- Prepare and follow-up to the findings of the proposed Identification and Programming mission for the next phase of the SDPD project, in particular with the provincial assemblies; develop the Project Document, liaise with development partners and take the lead in resource mobilization;
- Liaise with Speakers, political parties and parliamentary groups at federal and provincial level in relation to their interest to engage in drafting, revising, implementing and evaluating a Strategic Development Plan for parliament (federal parliament and provincial assemblies);
- Provide substantive inputs to PIPS programming, in particular the induction program for newly elected members of the National Assembly and the provincial assemblies;
- Assist in developing a research strategy and implementation framework for parliamentary research at federal and provincial level.
- Provide a comparative perspective on the parliament's functioning and bring best practices to upgrade the functioning of the Pakistani parliament;
- Provide quality control on the programming and activities of SDPD-II during the coming year.
- Provide technical assistance and on-the-job support to parliamentary staff and members with regard to legislative and oversight functions, for specific outputs indicated in the project document; have regular formal and informal interaction with the Project Review Board Members and other key stakeholders;
- Advise on developments related to modern and effective parliamentary practice in other countries;
- Ensure quality and timely submission of working papers, ownership and broad support of relevant stakeholders; compile and consolidate the working papers into a coherent and comprehensive compendium of policy orientation and training material for parliamentarians, Secretariat staff and the civil society organizations.
- Support the National Assembly on gender- and other equity considerations in development, working closely with the Women's Caucus;
- Provide regular technical assistance to Committee chairs of both the houses.

- Enhance the international cooperation of the Pakistani parliament, in particular in the region of South East Asia; and develop guidelines and a policy framework for a possible future staff placement at another parliament;

Deliverables

- Submission and approval of the Report on the options for cooperation in the region of South East Asia including guidelines and policy framework for a possible future staff placement at another parliament;
- Submission and approval of the Report on consultations and a functioning system of donor coordination in the area of parliamentary development, which includes the federal parliament and provincial assemblies;
- Submission and approval of the Develop proposal for the next phase of the SDPD project, in particular with the provincial assemblies; develop the Project Document, liaise with development partners and take the lead in resource mobilization;
- Submission and approval of the Report on drafting, revising, implementing and evaluating a Strategic Development Plan for parliament (federal parliament and provincial assemblies);
- Submission and approval of the Report on substantive inputs to PIPS programming, in particular the induction program for newly elected members of the National Assembly and the provincial assemblies;
- Submission and approval of the Developing of a research strategy and implementation framework for parliamentary research at federal and provincial level.

REQUIREMENTS FOR EXPERIENCE AND QUALIFICATIONS

Experience

- Over 12 years experience in democratic governance with a strong focus on Parliamentary development;
- Work in an established parliamentary administration (preferably West Minister style Parliament) as a senior career official is desirable; with atleast 4 years working in an international development setting.

Language:

Excellent English oral and written communication skills

Education:

Masters degree in Political Sciences, Public Administration, Law, International Relations or a related discipline