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# List of Acronyms

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| APA | Academy of Public Administration under the President of the Republic of Azerbaijan |
| ADA MUN | Azerbaijan Diplomatic Academy MUN Club |
| BSU MUN | Baku State University MUN Club |
| CPD | Country Programme Document |
| CSO | Civil Society Organisation |
| FGD | Focus Group Discussion |
| GSMUN | Galatasaray MUN |
| GSWMUN | Great Silk Way MUN |
| M&E | Monitoring and Evaluation |
| MIMUN | Moscow International MUN |
| MilliMUN | National Model UN |
| MoYS | Ministry of Youth and Sport |
| NAYORA | National Assembly of Youth Organizations of the Republic of Azerbaijan |
| NGO | Non-governmental Organisaton |
| OxiMUN | Oxford MUN |
| QafqazMUN | Qafqaz University MUN Club |
| SPAY | State Programme for Azerbaijani Youth |
| TOR | Terms of Reference  |
| UN | United Nations  |
| UNDAF | United Nations Development Assistance Framework |
| UNDP | United Nations Development Programme |
| UNEC MUN | University of Economics MUN Club |
| UNEG | United Nations Evaluation Group  |
| UNESCO | United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization |
| USD | United States Dollar |

# 1. INTRODUCTION

**Aims of the Evaluation**

International consultant was commissioned to undertake the Outcome evaluation of the UNDP Azerbaijan Country Programme Document (CDP) Outcome 3: *By 2015 civil society, media and vulnerable groups enjoy an increased role in policy formulation and implementation processes*. The purpose of this Report is to present the findings, conclusions and recommendations regarding UNDP’s performance within this Outcome. To contribute to this Outcome, UNDP, in partnership with Government, implemented two subsequent projects, focusing on increased youth participation:

* Youth Participation in Decision Making and Policy Implementation
* Creating New Platforms to Support Active Youth Engagement in Global Policy Debates

The donors contributing to implementation of the Outcome 3 for the period of 2010-2015 were UNDP core funds and Government of Azerbaijan. The current UNDAF and the associated UNDP Country Programme expired in 2015, therefore the purpose of this evaluation was to take stock and evaluate UNDP contribution towards greater civil society participation in policy formulation and implementation, as envisaged under Outcome 3 of the Country Programme. The evaluation findings will mainly be used to inform the planning, design and formulation of the projects under new CPD for UNDP Azerbaijan. As per requirements stated in the Terms of Reference (ToR), Outcome evaluation assessed the following:

1. the extent to which the planned outcomes and related outputs had been, were being achieved, and were likely to be achieved by the end of 2015;
2. the casual linkage by which outputs contribute to the achievement of the specified outcomes;
3. if and which programme processes, e.g. strategic partnership and linkages are critical in producing the intended outcomes;
4. factors that facilitated and/or hinder the progress in achieving the outcomes, both in terms of the external environment and those internal to the portfolio interventions including weaknesses in design, management, resources etc.;
5. added-value and comparative advantage of UNDP in contributing to the outcomes vis-à-vis other partners implementing similar programmes;
6. lessons learnt from implementation of the interventions.

The evaluation requirement was to put the major focus on assessing the collective results of UNDP interventions towards greater involvement of youth in policy formulation and implementation as implemented through various projects and initiatives and assess its contribution to the Outcome 4 of the CPD.

 To respond to the requirements of the Evaluation, a careful methodology for the Evaluation was devised in order to provide an opportunity to both look at what progress had thus far been achieved and also to understand how to improve and build on elements for further programming.

# 2. Context of interventions implemented within the framework of the Outcome 3

Youth in Azerbaijan, defined as persons aged 14-29, constitutes about 30% of the population. Young people have the highest unemployment rate of 10% against 5% for the general population. Although these figures are not high by the international comparison, it is the quality and volatility of the jobs that cause concern. Young people participate in consultations on state policies and programmes, especially those focused on youth issues, and participate in the civil society movement. The National Assembly of Youth Organizations of the Republic of Azerbaijan (NAYORA) is an umbrella organization of youth associations in Azerbaijan uniting 112 youth organizations. Its aims include coordinating the activities of youth member organisations, increasing the participation of youth in decision-making, representing the interests of youth organisations at the regional and international level, and facilitating the exchange of knowledge, ideas and experience.

Despite being a country with relatively short history of independence, Azerbaijan is one of the most advanced when it comes to the investments into the youth sector. Currently approximately 30% of the total population (~3 million people) falls into the category of youth (aged between 14-29), making the youth one of the top priorities in the political agenda. The country has established a legislative basis for further work with young people by adopting the Law on Youth Policy (2002), which was supplemented with two consecutive State Programmes on Youth. These Programmes contain measures to enhance youth engagement in socio-economic, political and cultural life of the country.

# 3. Outcome 3 overview and progress

Since the initiation of implementation of interventions stated under the Country Programme Document, UNDP has focused on supporting the government in the area of youth policy implementation and mainstreaming across government, empowerment of youth leaders as well as supporting government’s initiative to spearhead global forum on youth policies. However, no projects implemented within the scope of this Outcome do not fall within the Output envisaged for this Outcome. That is why, there was an agreement between the UNDP and the Consultant not to take it as the basis for assessment of the outcome, as it would be misleading.

*Table 1. Outcome output and indicator*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Output** | **Indicator/Baseline/Target:** | **Programme/Project**: |
| **Output 1.** CSOs and in particular rural NGOs have improved project management skills | **Indicator: 3.1.1** Annual qualitative assessment of advocacy skills of NGOs and media outlets**Baseline:** 4 (“NGO Sustainability Index” by USAID, “Freedom in the World” and “Freedom of the Press” reports by Freedom House, “Global Corruption Report” by Transparency International) **Target:** 5 | **Youth Participation in Decision Making and Policy Implementation** **Creating New Platforms to Support Active Youth Engagement in Global Policy Debates** |

*Table 2.* *Projects contributing to Outcome 3*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Programmatic scope** | **Key stakeholders** | **Geographic coverage** | **Timeframe** |
| **Youth Participation in Decision Making and Policy Implementation** | Ministry of Youth and Sport, youth organizations  | Nationwide | 2012-2013 |
| **Creating New Platforms to Support Active Youth Engagement in Global Policy Debates** | Ministry of Youth and Sport, Office of the UN SG Envoy on Youth, youth organizations | Nationwide  | 2014 - 2016 |

***Project: “Youth Participation in Decision Making and Policy Implementation”***

The Project aimed to empower the young people of Azerbaijan to participate in decision-making more actively by contributing to policy planning and policy outcomes, and to develop their capacity as future leaders and public servants. Specific objectives of the project were to: 1) Provide young people with knowledge and skills to identify and advocate for youth-specific outcomes in the state programmes and strategies; 2) Attract more youth to the civil service; 3) Strengthen young people’s capacities to participate at the international fora.

The Project was envisaged as collaboration between the Ministry of Youth and Sport of the Republic of Azerbaijan and UNDP, to address the key priorities of national youth policy set forth in the *State Programme for Azerbaijani Youth in 2011-2015* (SPAY), particularly echoing the SPAY goal of “increasing the role of youth in governance and development of civil society” and “the need of promoting youth participation in governance and development of civil society”. It is among the first international projects to support the implementation of the SPAY through establishment of a well-defined monitoring system. The Project envisaged the following outputs:

1. The capacity of the Ministry of Youth and Sport and youth-led NGOs strengthened to develop indicators of success for the implementation of national youth policy (i.e. SPAY 2011-15);
2. Methodology developed to enable the analysis of the existing and future state programmes to see how these programs contribute to inclusion of youth in the society;
3. The youth attracted to enter public administration through promoting civil service internships;
4. Civil service interns, young public servants and young leaders trained in policy analysis skills and their capacity is strengthened to represent Azerbaijan at various international and regional forums.

***Project: “Creating New Platforms to Support Active Youth Engagement in Global Policy Debates”***

The project has had two main objectives. The primary objective of the project has been to support the Office of the Secretary General’s Envoy on Youth in preparing for and conducting First Global Forum on Youth Policies in the 4th quarter of 2014.The forum was envisaged as the first global gathering of experts, researchers, officials, and youth involved on youth polices development. The aim of the forum was to build a community of experts to help future national youth policy developments. The expected outputs of the Forum were: (1) database displaying up to date landscape of national youth policies implemented across the globe (2) enhanced understanding of quality standards for youth policies and a common understanding of youth policy formulation, including best practices and how to address challenges, also labelled as Guiding Principles for formulating and implementing youth policies; and (3) community of experts at the global level to support the formulation of evidence based youth policies. The Project envisaged partnerships between UNDP, UNESCO, Council of Europe and the Office of the Secretary General Envoy on Youth and the Government of Azerbaijan. Partnering with regional youth networks/NGOs and youth policy oriented think tanks was also envisaged.

The secondary objective of the project has been to support the institutionalization of the Model UN (MUN) in Azerbaijan, as a tool for publicizing UN values among young people, raising awareness among youth on UN work, as well as building capacities of young people (research, negotiations, speech, writing, and diplomacy). The work on this objective was the follow up of the first International Model UN Security Council on cyber-security in Baku that was organized in partnership between Ministry of Youth and Sport and UNDP in October 2013. The success of event sparked a lot of interest in the youth community and the government. The major outputs of this component have been to: (1) create national Model UN mechanism or network associated with UNDPI; (2) deliver financial means to support the participation of national youth in international MUN initiatives; (3) organise national MUN and one international MUN by the end of Year 2 of the project implementation. The project envisaged partnerships with the Ministry of Youth and Sport, Ministry of Education, universities, UNDP and local youth NGOs.

# 4. Evaluation Methodology

The devised Evaluation methodology for this Evaluation was in line with requirements as set out in the ToR. The evaluation analysed the progress to outcome realization, factors affecting outcome, UN’s contribution to outcome, while it also studied the extent of partnership and cooperation, as well as Cross-cutting issues and Sustainability.

Upon analysis of the CPD document and the results framework for the Outcome 3, the needs and expectations from the Evaluation by UNDP, the evaluator applied “mixed methods” to optimise the potential of the analysis and to reach sound evaluation. In line with that, the methodology applied for this Evaluation included qualitative and quantitative methods and instruments, such as focus groups and an online survey with youth leaders engaged in different interventions of the projects, as well as document review, and interviews with UNDP staff, and government partners.

## 4.1 Evaluation Design

The evaluation was carried out in three phases:

* The inception phase and the document review;
* The fieldwork phase comprising the interviews, focus groups and online survey.
* Analysis and report writing phase. This phase was marked by two main points of consultation, the field work de-briefing meeting with the UNDP team, and the final presentation of the report.

Qualitative data were collected by using a number of methods including:

* **A desk review of materials related to the Outcome**, as well as any material that was provided by UNDP such as projects’ reports and annual work plans, etc. This review also extended to documents external to the UNDP that were identified through own research or through informants, which have a bearing on the evaluation questions. The Evaluator conducted a comprehensive review of historical information and reports pertaining to the Outcome 3. This information was analysed and the results were tailored to answer the main evaluation questions outlined in the ToR.
* **Interviews with UNDP team and former UNDP staff members**.
* **In-depth, semi-structured interviews** with representatives from the government counterparts. Semi-structured interviews were conducted as a more appropriate and valuable technique, because they allow partners to present and explain points freely. Purpose of in-depth interviews was to familiarise and assess the use of UNDP delivered outputs by beneficiaries and government partners.
* **Focus Group Discussions (FGDs)** with two groups of young leaders that had the opportunity to participate in UNDP activities, primarily MUN and related activities. FGDs provided qualitative information on the activities, benefits and quality these brought to the beneficiaries and context of achievements made by the related Projects. Selection of participants of focus group discussions was conducted by UNDP.

**Quantitative** data collection methods consisted of:

* **Online Survey for youth leaders.** The Online survey was envisaged as a tool to complement collected qualitative data. The aim was to provide an opportunity to the “universe” of youth leaders involved in different activities within the scope of the two projects in order to obtain further data and reflection on the performance and outcomes of targeted activities on young people. The online survey was conducted with use of online survey tool SurveyMonkeyTM based on developed Survey Questionnaire that was approved by UNDP.
* Review of data sourced from the interventions on indicator related to the Outcome 3
* Collection and review of secondary data from the analysis of the strategic framework, including but not limited to the SPAY, the Law on Youth Policies, etc.
* Review of data from other secondary sources.

**Data Analysis**

Data analysis was guided by the quality standards in evaluation as reflected in the UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results. In order to ensure that findings and related conclusions are objective and evidence based, triangulation was used to identify inconsistencies and ensure reliability.

**Survey results**

Total of 62 young leaders engaged in different activities took part in the survey (62.9% female and 37.1% male). Over half respondents are of age between 18-20, while 41% are of age between 21-29, with 74% of them are based in Baku, while the rest is either from regional centres (11.3%) or smaller towns (9.7%). One respondent is an international student. Most respondents are either studying for their BA or hold BA degree (45.2%), while there are 18% of respondents who are studying for MA or holding MA degree. Slightly over 30% of respondents are engaged in some sort of employment (either part or full time), while over 62% are studying or looking for work. Interestingly, 45% of respondents participated in three or more than three types of events organised by UNDP, while 34% participated in one, and 21% participated in two events.

# 5. Key Findings

The Outcome 3 of UNDP Azerbaijan Country Programme Document (hereinafter CPD) is defined as follows: *By 2015 civil society, media and vulnerable groups enjoy an increased role in policy formulation and implementation processes.* The Outcome was directly transposed from the United Nations Development Assistance Framework for Republic of Azerbaijan (2010 – 2015), without further adaptations to the programmatic focus and areas of interventions of UNDP Country Office. According to recent UNDP guidelines for CPD development ‘The number of CPD outcomes should not exceed four. These outcomes should be copied verbatim from the UNDAF (i.e. CPD outcomes are UNDAF outcomes’, which explains the comprehensiveness of the Outcome. Due to this, the Outcome 3 is a comprehensive and ambitious outcome, not necessarily reflecting the UNDP portfolio of projects, particularly in terms of working on increased role in policy formulation and implementation processes by civil society, media and vulnerable groups. During the CPD implementation, UNDP has had projects for empowerment of vulnerable groups, but primarily aiming at strengthening of their socio-economic status (e.g. Promoting Rural Women Participation in Social and Economic Life or Towards Decent Employment Through Structural Reform) but these projects in no way worked on governance and *increased role in policy formulation and implementation processes of such groups.* Further review of available documentation showed that none UN Agency worked actively with media in terms of their role in policy formulation and implementation, so it seems that this segment of the work within the Outcome was not tackled. UNDP worked with civil society extensively in different areas, but only the work with youth leaders and government on mainstreaming and strengthening youth policies (within frameworks of projects assessed through this evaluation) directly contributed to some segments of this Outcome 3.

In order to ensure that the evaluation presents the realistic evaluation of the interventions implemented within the framework of the Outcome 3, this evaluation assesses, the extent of UNDP contribution to the stated Outcome through the lens of UNDP’s direct contribution as per its mission. This means that contributions to areas of ‘*media and vulnerable groups enjoy an increased role in policy formulation and implementation processes*’ are not closely examined as neither of these areas were tackled with related projects. The evaluation focuses on areas of direct contribution by UNDP work in Azerbaijan, i.e. the extent to which UNDP contributed to *civil society groups enjoying an increased role in policy formulation and implementation processes*. In this sense, broader definition of civil society is applied: civil society encompasses a wide range of organisations - all non-market and non-state organisations and groups in which people organise to pursue shared objectives and ideals. Civil society also includes professional associations, community-based organisations, environmental groups, independent research institutes, universities, faith-based organisations, labour unions, and the not-for-profit media, as well as other groups that do not engage in development work[[1]](#footnote-1).

## 5.1 Relevance of the Intended Outcome and related outputs

The relevance of the UNDP CPD Outcome 3 interventions has been assessed using available data, facts and statistics for the period of 2010-2015 as well as relevant legal and strategic documents of the Azerbaijani Government and its commitments to address the issues of youth empowerment, as well as UNDP strategies in the country. Interviews and focus groups with key stakeholders and beneficiaries were also used to triangulate findings.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **EQ 1.** | **To what extent do the intended outcome and the relevant outputs address national priorities?**  |

Desk review of relevant government policies and legislation focusing on youth and respective projects’ documentation as well as interviews and focus groups point to high relevance of the projects to the national priorities for youth in Azerbaijan. Both projects are designed along the key priorities of national youth policy set forth in the State Programme for Azerbaijani Youth in 2011-2015 (SPAY), particularly echoing the SPAY goal of “increasing the role of youth in governance and development of civil society” and “the need of promoting youth participation in governance and development of civil society”. These goals were tackled through a number of interventions implemented by UNDP, as described below.

The SPAY did not contain comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) framework which would ensure that measures are being adequately monitored and accented. UNDP Projects tackled this challenge through supporting the establishment of the M&E system for the SPAY, making it the first international project to support the implementation of the SPAY through establishment of such a system.

Another challenge that the Ministry of Youth and Sport faced was related to the extent to which youth is mainstreamed through different policies and strategies adopted by other government institutions. Namely, in Azerbaijan, all policies and strategies that are under preparation undergo a series of consultations with peer institutions (e.g. Policy on economic development is shared with all ministries which provide their inputs to this policy from the perspective of portfolio (or target groups) of these respective institutions). Before UNDP interventions in the youth field, youth mainstreaming methodology was never attempted in Azerbaijan, so UNDP assisted the government through Ministry of Youth and Sport (MoYS) to develop an original and practical instrument for further supporting the integration of young people’s needs and contributions in all stages of planning, implementation and evaluation of state policies.

Another important aspect of youth empowerment is seen through enabling young people to understand first-hand how government institutions operate and also to gain practical skills. To respond to this need, UNDP organized a component on civil service internships, which would supply the Government with resources for institutionalizing internship in civil service and putting in place a training system targeting group of young professionals aspiring to become public servants.

Also importantly, Projects implemented within the scope of Outcome 3 contribute to the expected achievement of the objectives set out in the Democratic Governance Key Corporate Outcomes of UNDP Strategic Plan 2008-2011 by aiming at a “double-hit” capacity building: on one hand, contributing to the institutional capacity of the government institutions, through Ministry of Youth and Sports to bring results-oriented approach to implementation of national youth strategy, and on the other hand, empowering the youth to work with the Government on mainstreaming youth into other state policies and to be proactive in matters relevant to public administration.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **EQ 2.** | **Have UNDP interventions been relevant to women and other vulnerable groups?** |

Document review, interviews and focus groups with young leaders involved in UNDP projects conducted within the scope of this Evaluation show that UNDP interventions were relevant to young women leaders in Azerbaijan. This is further confirmed by the M&E data o the projects, presented in the Table x below. As can be seen from the data on participation in various events, Model UN activities have gathered equally men and women leaders, with some events attracting more women than men.

*Table 3. M&E data on participation of young leaders in projects’ activities*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Type of event** | **Total participants**  | **Male**  | **Female**  |
| *“****Creating new platforms to support active youth engagement in global policy debates” project*** |
| MilliMUN | 338 | 173 | 165 |
| Baku State University Model UN Conference | 74 | 39 | 35 |
| YouthMUN 2016 | 140 | 55 | 85 |
| YouthMUN 2015 | 77 | 34 | 43 |
| ADAMUN 2015 | 52 | 22 | 30 |
| ADAMUN 2014 | 42 | 27 | 15 |
| QafqazMUN G20 simulation | 47 | 26 | 21 |
| Qafqaz MUN 2015 | 58 | 27 | 31 |
| UNECMUN 2016 | 110 | 52 | 58 |
| UNECMUN 2015 | 38 | 18 | 20 |
| Model UN Summer School in Dashkesen | 86 | 48 | 38 |
| Naxchivan Model UN Conference | 87 | 38 | 49 |
| Participation of Azerbaijani MUNers in international Model UN conferences  | 43 | 26 | 17 |
| First Global Forum on Youth Policies | 705 registered participants | 368 | 337 |
| ***“Youth participation in decision making and policy implementation” project*** |
| Youth Participation Project Focus group | 50 selected youth | 21 | 29 |
| Internships | 42 (some went to study abroad or to military service) | 18 | 24 |
| Baku International Model UN Conference | 45 (3 delegate per each UNSC member – 2 foreign participants+1 Azeri, except Azerbaijan delegation) | 24 | 21 |

Relevance of interventions implemented within the two projects of the Outcome 3 to the vulnerable groups cannot be verified by this Evaluation. This is due to the fact that none of the two projects focused on vulnerable groups, having youth leaders and government counterparts as main target groups and beneficiaries of the projects.

## 5.2 Effectiveness

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **EQ 3.** | **How have the corresponding results at the output level delivered by UNDP affected the outcome, and in what ways have they not been effective?** |

As mentioned in the relevance section, the Outcome itself is transposed from the UNDAF for Azerbaijan to the UNDP CPD, making it broad and not reflecting the scope of UNDP contributions to the empowerment of youth leaders in the country. Presentation of findings for Effectiveness of UNDP interventions is organised as per evaluation questions for this criterion. For the purpose of more suitable presentation of the evaluation findings, the numbering/position of Evaluation questions relating to this evaluation criterion have been slightly changed.

The UNDP CPD Outcome 3 is more specified through one output and its related indicators, which provide more elaborate understanding of what UNDP provides through its interventions within this Outcome. However, as discussed in previous sections, output defined for this outcome (Output 1. CSOs and in particular rural NGOs have improved project management skills) is not reflecting the actual interventions of UNDP, so it is not taken as basis for assessment, which would be misleading. Therefore, this section provides an assessment of the extent to which the implemented interventions were effective in achievement of the set output contributing to overall outcome whereby b*y 2015 civil society, media and vulnerable groups enjoy an increased role in policy formulation and implementation processes*.

Results materialising from strategic partnership with the government, particularly in putting Azerbaijan on the top of international undertakings in the youth policies sphere has brought significant results both in raising profile of the country as leader in this sphere but also in bringing direct benefits to youth leaders from the country. This level of support also resulted in renewed commitment of the government to youth policies and adoption of the Second SPAY. UNDP support to building capacities and mechanisms for monitoring and evaluation and internship placements resulted in a set of recommendations and tools for government to use. However, these deliverables did not transform in any durable changes in the way government bodies operate in these areas.

Results, notably relating to increasing capacities of youth leaders and investment in building knowledge, skills and empowering them to take more active role have contributed to increase of the social capital thus **improving the chances of positively influencing the outcome**. Review of project documents as well as interviews with government and youth leaders indicate that the interventions towards empowerment of young people constitute noteworthy contribution to the achievement of the desired outcome, defined in its narrower scope where UNDP has had direct input (*civil society role in policy making and implementation*). This investment materialised in new values and potential for development of vibrant civil society organisation, MUN clubs, which have a potential to grow and attract new and extended number of new youth leaders. The survey shows that events in which youth leaders participated were of good quality and useful (See Graph 1 below).

Young people, respondents to the survey, found it relatively easy to find information and to enrol in activities organised within the UNDP projects. Respondents confirm that the knowledge they acquired through UNDP events was extremely useful (40%) or useful (42%). Three respondents (4.8%) fond it not so or not at all useful. The respondents found that the events contributed to increasing skills and knowledge but also networks among young people, as can be seen in Graph 2 below.



Over half of respondents (60%) confirm that UNDP supported activities helped them find further educational activities, almost equally in the country and abroad; but not so much to find further employment opportunities (38.6%). For those who found it helpful to find employment, 38% were able to find employment with public sector, while others found employment in other sectors (See Graph 3).

The survey findings confirm the focus group findings that UNDP interventions were very useful for young leaders, helping them to open up for new opportunities for education or employment.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **EQ 4.** | **To what extent the planned outcome has been or is being achieved?** |

As discussed in the section on Relevance, the Outcome was transposed directly from the UNDAF document, creating such a definition that goes beyond UNDP’s interventions to capture also actions of other UN agencies. Therefore, it is clear that there has been no contribution of UNDP towards increased role of media and vulnerable groups in policy formulation and implementation processes. While, vulnerable groups and their empowerment fall within the mandate of UNDP and of other UN agencies; experience with media, while some interventions may be organised within the democratic governance, is scarce among UN agencies in Azerbaijan. UN Agencies, including UNDP have been providing significant support to vulnerable groups, particularly women and rural population in socio-economic development, but UNDP’s support within this Outcome did not go beyond to support their direct involvement in policy formulation and implementation. None of UNDP or other UN Agencies’ projects deal with media and their inclusion in policy formulation and implementation. At the same time, there is evidence that UNDP has worked with civil society, in its wider definition, and this section will offer an assessment of this type of support and its outcomes.

UN Agencies, including UNDP have been offering support to civil society, mainly in terms of supporting service provision, and socio-economic development. The projects that are the focus of this evaluation have been working on youth empowerment, thus supporting empowerment of civil society. This report will assess the extent to which youth leadership support and empowerment has been conducive for increasing the role of civil society, particularly those youth leadership forums and groups in policy formulation and implementation.

Progress has been made towards achieving the intended outcome to increase the role of civil society in policy formulation and implementation. UNDP’s contribution to this Outcome has yielded results particularly for youth leaders and their interest groups through investments in strengthening (youth) policy and its monitoring and evaluation framework; building skills and empowering a critical mass of youth leaders; and partnership building strategies through national and international fora for youth policies. Results have also been yielded in multiplication of knowledge and extending the critical mass of youth leaders through creation of MUN clubs at Universities and peer learning and exchange through a number of events organised by UNDP but also self-organised by the leaders who benefited from UNDP support. However, the extent to which direct contribution to the overall level of civil society’s inclusion in policy formulation and implementation cannot be evidenced by this Evaluation.

The CPD outcome has one indicator, as presented in Table 4 below. The review of the outcome indicator shows that the indicated target (5) has been achieved. However, it is worth noting that the baseline was not set properly, as the NGO sustainability index for Azerbaijan in 2010 (baseline) was 4.7 which is actually better as the lower the mark in the NGO sustainability index marks better performance. This means that the indicator’s baseline-target figures cannot be used for practical reasons to show contribution. Also, the NGO sustainability index is a combination of assessment indices that also assess the level of government support, financial sustainability, etc. all of which saw sharp decline in the last period in Azerbaijan.

*Table 4. Outcome indicator as per the Country Programme document*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcome Indicator**: | **Baseline:** | **Target** | **Status: 2014 (data for 2015 still not available)** |
| **Indicator:** 3.1.1Annual qualitative assessment of advocacy skills of NGOs and media outlets | 4 (“NGO Sustainability Index” by USAID, “Freedom in the World” and “Freedom of the Press” reports by Freedom House, “Global Corruption Report” by Transparency International) | 5 | **5.1 (NGO Sustainability Index)[[2]](#footnote-2)** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **EQ 5.** | **Is the current set of indicators effective in informing the progress made towards the outcome? If not, what indicators should be used?** |

The Outcome 3 has only one indicator relating to *Annual qualitative assessment of advocacy skills of NGOs and media outlets* as can be seen in Table 4 above. Having in mind that the Outcome 3 focuses on a number of areas (civil society, media, vulnerable groups), the indicator is not effective in informing the progress made towards the outcome. Taking into account the actual project interventions of UNDP within the scope of this Outcome, it makes it clear that the indicator is not at all relevant to measuring UNDP’s actual contributions to the Outcome 3. While there was necessity to transpose the actual Outcome from UNDAF making it understandable why the scope is so wide, UNDP did not take measures to define more adequate indicators that would allow measuring the contributions. The indicators relating to youth empowerment, level of improvement of youth policies and extent to which young leaders are involved in policy formulation would have been beneficial.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **EQ 6.** | **What are the challenges to achieving the outcome?** |

The government of Azerbaijan has been very supportive towards development of youth policies and legislative solutions to youth issues in the country. The second consecutive State Programme on Youth has been adopted with measures to tackle youth problems in many areas, including employment, education, health, participation, etc. However, despite efforts to establish a sound Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) framework for the State Programme, such **M&E framework was never embraced by the Governme**nt due to lack of readiness on the government side to establish and apply measurable indicators to monitor success in implementation of measures and achievement of results.

There are **big differences between opportunities young people in the capital, Baku, have versus those in the regions and small communities**. While youth in Baku are able to participate and benefit from a number of events, opportunities to learn and practice foreign languages (Russian and English) and gain new skills and knowledge, young people in small communities and regions are not exposed to a great number of events and processes. This diminishes their opportunity to acquire skills necessary to participate positively in community processes at local or higher levels. Events organised with UNDP support (international conferences, MUN sessions and other events) were highly demanding (for example, MUN is organised and held only in English language, with research mainly conducted by use of internet sources) which was restrictive for a great number of youth leaders from smaller communities who do not speak the language or do not have extensive computer skills. These posed challenges to including more diverse groups of young leaders in the policy and educational opportunities.

Civil society in Azerbaijan operates in a **complex political and institutional context**. Due to government interference and due to lack of public awareness of civil society’s work and relevance their work and contribution is most often minimal. Recent years have been marked by a worsening environment for civil society, including new legislative restrictions (laws governing registration, taxation, activities, and funding sources) which make it difficult for civil society organisations to operate. At the same time, these conditions pose important obstacles for CSOs to participate in reform agendas and promote a sustainable democratic culture. The decision-making in the country is centralized, which makes further obstacles to CSOs, particularly those active in the regions and at local level to participate in decision-making processes. Local CSOs and ordinary citizens have few opportunities to put forward visions and ideas, to initiate and propose initiatives and new approaches, and participate in a meaningful way in the policy-making processes.

Civil society organisations in Azerbaijan **have limited capacities and constituency base** to be able to strongly advocate for rights and to participate in policy processes. Due to lack of consistent support and opportunity for CSOs to take active part in decision-making processes, CSO capacities and organisational structures are not developed sufficiently to provide for strong base for their operations.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **EQ 7.** | **Has UNDP best utilized its comparative advantage in defining and delivering planned outputs?** |

The evaluation finds that UNDP has utilized its comparative advantage in defining and delivering upon set results. UNDP has used its unique UN mandate and expertise drawn from years of implementing youth leadership programmes to organize and implement interventions for youth empowerment. Different interventions towards supporting the government’s strategic planning efforts and improvement of Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) of youth policies have been based on UNDP regional expertise drawn from Regional Office in Bratislava.

Model UN (MUN) activities and outreach to youth leaders have been based on UNDP’s direct expertise and experience with such interventions at country, regional and global levels.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **EQ 8.** | **Has UNDP’s partnership strategy been appropriate and effective in contributing to the outcome?** |

**UNDP maintains strategic partnership with the Government*.*** UNDP has traditionally strong support of the Government, be it financial or institutional. UNDP efforts within the scope of this Outcome, particularly organisation of the First Global Forum on Youth Policies were lead and supported by the Government of Azerbaijan. At the same time, UNDP maintained close cooperation with the Ministry of Youth and other relevant ministries involved in various activities o of the project interventions. Interviews with government stakeholders confirm that government is included in planning and implementation of interventions, responding to their needs for different kinds of support (support to strategic planning, organisation of joint events, participation in international conferences, etc.).

**UNDP is in dialogue with Universities for institutionalisation of MUN Clubs.** While MUN Clubs are still grass roots initiatives of youth leaders who participated in MUN events, UNDP and MUN participants perform ongoing advocacy with Universities to introduce MUN Clubs within their institutional structures.

**Partnership with Civil Society organisations within the scope of this Outcome is missing*.*** UNDP has implemented interventions within the Outcome 3 in close cooperation with the government and direct outreach to youth leaders and individuals who fulfilled criteria for participation in project activities (e.g. MUN activities, conferences, etc.). However, there is no strong evidence of partnerships with civil society organisations within the scope of this Outcome.

**Partnerships between UNDP and other UN Agencies, were effective in achieving the objectives of UNDP Interventions.** The Global Forum on Youth Policies was organised in cooperation between the Government of Azerbaijan, UNDP, the Office of the Secretary General’s Envoy on Youth, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and the Council of Europe (COE). Evidence gathered within the scope of this evaluation shows that the event was the result of successful partnership, relying on knowledge and expertise of different agencies.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **EQ 9.** | **To what extent did the results, both at the outcome and output levels, benefit men and women equally?** |

**Considerable results** have been achieved towards **young** **women leaders’ empowerment** with assistance of UNDP interventions. For instance, approximately 50% of direct beneficiaries in UNDP MUN interventions are women. This is encouraging because young women in Azerbaijan find it harder to equally participate in decision making processes or face difficulties in finding a relevant job, often this is main reason for women social exclusion. Internship placements were also targeting women, with 24 (or 57%) participating in this measure. It is expected that the UNDP support to strategic planning resulting in new State Programme for Youth will materialise in equal support of the government to young men and women in the country.

## 5.3 Efficiency

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **EQ 7.** | **Has there been any duplication of efforts among UNDP’s interventions and interventions delivered by other organizations contributing to the outcome?** |

**UNDP and its government partners ensured there was no overlap with other initiatives in the area of youth development and policies**. interventions implemented within the framework of this Outcome have been planned in close cooperation with the government counterparts and in cases where needed also with other relevant UN agencies. There are not many actors working specifically with young people in Azerbaijan. Work with this age group is mainly covered by support to other groups (e.g. civil society, vulnerable groups, support to universities or vocational education, etc.). However, empowering youth and building their leadership and diplomacy skills is not on the forefront of interventions of any other donor.

Nevertheless, there are other donors which support civil society in a wider term, meaning that they would contribute to the Outcome set forth in the UNDAF and respective CPD.

## 5.4 Sustainability

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **EQ 11.** | **How strong is the level of ownership of the results by the relevant government entities and other stakeholders?** |

**The level of ownership of different deliverables produced by projects implemented within the framework of this Outcome varies.** Young people engaged in different project activities have very high level of ownership and commitment to the new tools they have for building their skills and empowerment. Focus groups with young leaders show thorough knowledge and understanding of what MUN stands for, how it works and can be ‘localised’ (at Universities). They have already started initiatives to establish MUN clubs in their respective universities and to attract young people, fellow students to take part in the activities.

Level of ownership of the government counterparts over the Global Forum has been very strong, and interview with government counterpart shows that this event was a flagship of the government, leading to other results, such as adoption of the second SPAY. Also, Government of Azerbaijan got further recognition for its work with youth internationally. However, level of ownership over other important deliverables of the projects, such as the M&E framework for the youth policy, the internship placement work did not result in sufficient level of ownership, resulting in lack of use of these mechanisms by the government.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **EQ 12.** | **What is the level of capacity and commitment of the Government to ensure sustainability of results?** |

Closely related to issues raised above is the finding that the there is low level of capacity and commitment of the government to ensure that M&E framework or the internship placements are institutionalised. this is particularly relevant for the M&E framework. Interviews with stakeholders conducted for this evaluation point towards lack of capacities and thus also willingness of the relevant government institutions to take on, elaborate and introduce the M&E system, which would entail structured work on collecting, putting together, analysing and presenting data from a range of institutions working with young people. Similarly, there was no sufficient commitment of the Government to introduce legislative and structural solutions to the internship placement. The government already has practice of internships within public service, but it happens erratically and with no clear structure. UNDP attempted to introduce structural solution but the government could not ensure capacity and buy in is there for it to be institutionalised.

On the other side, MUN and related investment in youth policies has been integrated in the new SPAY, which is a great foundation for further work on institutionalisation of mechanisms supported by UNDP.

# 6. Conclusions

Interventions within the Outcome 3 of UNDP’s Country Programme are focusing on youth empowerment and capcity building, and do not include wider scope of civil society work as envisaged by the Outcome definition. One of the two projects contributing to the Outcome 3 is finished, while the second one is in its final phase of implementation at the moment of finalisation of this Evaluation.

While UNDP does not contribute to the defined areas of change (civil society, media, vulnerable groups) of the Outcome 3, **UNDP interventions are relevant** **and important investments in supporting youth leadership and empowerment**, as well as relevant investments in institution building and strengthening government’s capacities. UNDP brings its extensive experience with youth work, as well as UN perspective in the work of government and with young people, which is important investment into building Azerbaijan’s human capital and also diplomatic capacity. The work on First Global Forum on Youth Policies and the MUN came in time when Azerbaijan became non-permanent member of UN Security Council, so the MUN activities particularly were timely to practice diplomatic work and ways in which international issues may be resolved.

**Projects were not linked to the Output defined within this Outcome, so their contribution to it and subsequently to the Outcome overall is not applicable. However, on project level, results are almost exclusively positive**. Analysis of projects implemented within the framework of Outcome 3 (through document review, stakeholder consultations and focus groups with young leaders) show that they achieved almost all of their planned objectives, and there is evidence of contributions to progress towards the envisaged overall objectives of respective projects. Particularly strong contributions were made in view of strengthening human capital – empowering and capacitating young people to become leaders in their universities and in their areas of work. The MUN and other events organised by UNDP created a critical mass of youth leaders who are able and committed to bring the MUN and related activities to the next level: ‘localising’ it in their universities, so they can reach to larger group of young people.

**Work with government resulted in new partnerships and new mechanisms.** Mechanisms for mainstreaming of youth issues have been taken on by the government. Also, joint work on organising the Global Forum on youth policies brought significant positive results to all parties involved and particularly brought Azerbaijan to the forefront of youth policy work internationally. On the other side, investment in providing inputs to institutionalisation of M&E framework for youth policy and internship placements have not been very successful, as most of the supported policy process were not embraced by the government.

**UNDP interventions have brought contributions to increased role of youth leaders in policy formulation and implementation processes.**If we understand that informal MUN group of leaders as well as formal MUN clubs, by definition, constitute civil society, we can conclude that UNDP’s contribution in this area have some contribution to civil society, albeit limited to a very small segment of it.Investments in youth empowerment and capacity building already show positive changes in ways young leaders get involved in different issues of interest and also commitment to be more active in different spheres of life.

***UNDP has had no direct contributions to* media and vulnerable groups’ increased role in policy formulation and implementation processes*.*** This Evaluation recorded that direct contributions to these thematic areas have not been provided by UNDP or other UN Agencies active in Azerbaijan.

***UNDP Interventions have been managed and implemented efficiently, ensuring that there were no overlaps with other interventions***. Management of projects and expertise of the teams for respective areas of interventions has been sound and contributed to effectiveness of projects and maintaining good cooperation with the government and development partners.

The ***sustainability prospects of achievements of the projects implemented within the framework of Outcome 3 are mixed***. The current policy framework integrates important results and new initiatives introduced by UNDP (e.g. MUN, mainstreaming of youth issues). MUN clubs are being organised in Universities and engage increasing number of young leaders. However, M&E framework and legislative/formal structures for internship placements have not taken root institutionally. Capacities and models for innovative practices and mechanisms are in place and are relatively sustainable.

# 7. Recommendations

The findings and conclusions of the evaluation point to the following recommendations, as elaborated in this section. Each recommendation has an addressee and a proposed timeframe. For ease of reference, recommendations are divided into two categories, as follows:

| **No** | **Recommendations** | **Addressee** | **Timing** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Strategic and Programming Recommendations (SP)** |
| **SP1** | **Continue investing in youth leadership and empowerment** UNDP globally has strong legacy and experience in youth empowerment and youth policy development, and strong experience, critical mass of young leaders and government partners in Azerbaijan. Implementation of projects within the framework of Outcome 3 brought good momentum that could be built on with further investment in this area. Exploring opportunities for further work with young leaders would be important and would fill in the gap in inclusion of civil society in policy making.  | UNDP and international donors | 2016 onwards |
| **SP2** | **Ensure that Outcomes of UN/DP Partnership Framework with Government are well elaborated and sound.**This evaluation showed weaknesses in approach whereby UNDP is required to transpose UNDF/UNPF outcomes for its country programme document. This is particularly important for countries where UNDP’s interventions are not extensive, as it is the case in Azerbaijan | UN Agencies | permanent |

|  |
| --- |
| **Operational Recommendations (O)** |
| **O1** | **Consider (non)cost extension of the Project “Creating New Platforms to Support Active Youth Engagement in Global Policy Debates” to ensure support to institutionalisation of MUN clubs in targeted universities.**UNDP has invested in creating a critical mass of young leaders who gathered around the MUN in the country and internationally. These youth leaders took initiative to establish MUN clubs in their respective universities, which goes in line also with SPAY which recognises MUN structures. UNDP should consider extending the project duration for minimum six months, during which time UNDP and young leaders would work with government and universities to ensure MUN clubs are institutionalised. This measure would strengthen sustainability prospect of these UNDP interventions.  | UNDP and government | 2016 |
| **O2** | **Further promotion of best practices and achievements**UNDP and its partners have achieved positive results, particularly in working with young leaders. It is recommended that UNDP invest in promotion of these practices and achievements through country and international dissemination of results to wider public. | UNDP  | permanently |

# Annex 1. Terms of Reference

**UNDP AZERBAIJAN**

**TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR OUTCOME EVALUATION**

**Country Programme Outcome 4: By 2015 civil society, media and vulnerable groups enjoy an increased role in policy formulation and implementation processes**

Title: Evaluation Consultant (international position)

Type of contract: Individual Contract

Timeframe: December 2015 – January 2016

Duty station: Home-based with travel to Azerbaijan

**INTRODUCTION**

UNDP Country Programme document (CPD) for 2011-2015 is directly based on the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) for Azerbaijan (2011-2015). The UNDAF was formulated in consultation with the Government of Azerbaijan and development partners and is aligned with the State Programme for Poverty Reduction and Sustainable Development (SPPRSD) for 2008-2015, which provides for achievement of the Millennium Development Goals. Under the CPD, UNDP Azerbaijan works to contribute towards the achievement of five development outcomes:

Outcome 1: National policies and institutions strengthened to increase private sector competitiveness, remove trade barriers, especially for exports, while reducing vulnerability of the economy and population to external shocks

Outcome 2: National strategies, policies, capacity to address regional and gender disparities in work opportunities strengthened, with focus on increasing the ability of vulnerable groups to manage and mitigate risks

Outcome 3: Relevant national strategies, policies, and capacities strengthened to address environmental degradation, promote a green economy, reduce vulnerability to climate change

Outcome 4: By 2015 civil society, media and vulnerable groups enjoy an increased role in policy formulation and implementation processes

Outcome 5: Efficiency, accountability and transparency in public administration enhanced through capacity development of State entities, including gender sensitive approaches

In line with the Evaluation Plan of UNDP Azerbaijan, an outcome evaluation will be conducted to assess UNDP contributions towards the progress made on outcome achievements. Specifically to this Terms of Reference, UNDP contribution towards the following outcome will be evaluated:

*By 2015 civil society, media and vulnerable groups enjoy an increased role in policy formulation and implementation processes*

This ToR outlines the scope, the requirements and expectations of the evaluation and will serve as a guide and point of reference throughout the evaluation.

1. **BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT**

Over the Country Programme period, UNDP has contributed to this outcome by supporting two projects focusing on increased youth participation:

* Youth Participation in Decision Making and Policy Implementation
* Creating New Platforms to Support Active Youth Engagement in Global Policy Debates

The key legal instruments governing the youth policy in Azerbaijan, aside from the general provisions stipulated by the Constitution, are the Law on State Youth Policy and the current State Program on Azerbaijani Youth 2011-2015. As one of the principal national priorities of the Government, youth policy in Azerbaijan aims at youth development through helping youth to develop their professional skills and capacities; creating enabling legal environment; implementing different youth programmes in social, cultural and economic spheres; supporting national youth associations and NGOs; and so on. Each of these priorities implies a set of policy measures to be implemented on local, regional and national levels. The Ministry of Youth and Sport is responsible for implementation of youth policy.

Other important initiatives in support of the young people are:

* State Programme on Study Abroad for Azerbaijani Youth 2007-2015, which finances studies of successful youth in foreign countries
* State Fund in Support of Youth under the President of the Republic of Azerbaijan

Youth in Azerbaijan, defined as persons aged 14-29, constitutes about 30% of the population. Young people have the highest unemployment rate of 10% against 5% for the general population. Although these figures are not high by the international comparison, it is the quality and volatility of the jobs that cause concern. Young people participate in consultations on state policies and programmes, especially those focused on youth issues, and participate in the civil society movement. The National Assembly of Youth Organizations of the Republic of Azerbaijan (NAYORA) is an umbrella organization of youth associations in Azerbaijan uniting 112 youth organizations. Its aims include coordinating the activities of youth member organisations, increasing the participation of youth in decision-making, representing the interests of youth organisations at the regional and international level, and facilitating the exchange of knowledge, ideas and experience.

1. **EVALUATION PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES**

The current UNDAF and the associated UNDP Country Programme are set to expire in 2015. In 2014, UNDP, along with other members of the UN System in Azerbaijan, have initiated a broad-based participatory process of formulation of a new UNDAF and, later on, the UNDP Azerbaijan Country Programme to cover years 2016-2020. The purpose of this evaluation is to take stock and evaluate UNDP contribution towards greater civil society participation in policy formulation and implementation, as envisaged under Outcome 4 of the Country Programme. The evaluation findings will mainly be used to inform the planning, design and formulation of the projects under new CPD for UNDP Azerbaijan. Therefore, this evaluation will need to be forward-looking; the findings and judgments made must be based on concrete evidence that will support UNDP strategic thinking for its new programme cycle, specifically in determining its strategic priorities in supporting the Government in the area of youth participation and empowerment.

The outcome evaluation will assist UNDP in gaining a better understanding of the following aspects of its interventions:

1. the extent to which the planned outcomes and related outputs have been, are being achieved, and likely to be achieved by the end of 2015;
2. the casual linkage by which outputs contribute to the achievement of the specified outcomes;
3. if and which programme processes, e.g. strategic partnership and linkages are critical in producing the intended outcomes;
4. factors that facilitate and/or hinder the progress in achieving the outcomes, both in terms of the external environment and those internal to the portfolio interventions including weaknesses in design, management, resources etc.;
5. added-value and comparative advantage of UNDP in contributing to the outcomes vis-à-vis other partners implementing similar programmes;
6. lessons learnt from implementation of the interventions.
7. **EVALUATION SCOPE**

This evaluation is to evaluate the collective results of UNDP interventions towards greater involvement of youth in policy formulation and implementation as implemented through various projects and initiatives and assess its contribution to the Outcome 4 of the current CPD.

Programmatic scope, geographical coverage and timeframe are presented in Annex 1 of the ToR.

For more information on the projects, visit [www.az.undp.org](http://www.az.undp.org)

1. **METHODOLOGY**

Overall guidance on the evaluation methodology can be found in the UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results. The Outcome evaluation should include the following categories of analysis:

***Outcome status:*** Determine whether or not the outcome has been achieved and, if not, whether there has been progress made towards its achievement. List innovative approaches tried and capacities developed through UNDP assistance. Assess the relevance of UNDP outputs to the outcome. Ascertain the progress made in relation to the outputs. List the factors (positive and negative) that affect the accomplishment of outputs.

***Underlying factors:*** Analyze the underlying factors beyond UNDP’s control that influenced the outcome. Distinguish the substantive design issues from the key implementation and/or management capacities and issues including the timeliness of outputs, the degree of stakeholders and partners’ involvement in the completion of outputs, and how processes were managed/carried out.

***UNDP contribution:*** The relevance of the outcome and the constituent components specifically for UNDP assistance. Determine whether or not UNDP funded outputs and other interventions – including outputs, soft and hard assistance – can be credibly linked to the achievement of the outcome. Assess the likelihood of the achievement of the outcome within the set timeframe and inputs. Ascertain the prospect of sustainability of UNDP interventions related to the outcome – can it be ensured that the outcome is reached and maintained even after the UNDP interventions?

***Outputs status:*** Are the UNDP outputs still relevant to the outcome? Has sufficient progress been made in relation to the UNDP outputs? What are the factors (positive and negative) that affect the accomplishment of the outputs?

***Output-outcome link:*** Whether UNDP’s outputs or other interventions can be credibly linked to the achievement of the outcome (including the key outputs, projects, and soft assistance). What are the key contributions that UNDP has made/is making to the outcome? With the current planned interventions in partnership with other actors and stakeholders, will UNDP be able to achieve the outcome within the set timeframe and inputs – or whether additional resources are required and new or changed interventions are needed? Whether UNDP’s partnership strategy has been appropriate and effective? Has UNDP been able to respond to changing circumstances and requirements in capacity development? What is the prospect of the sustainability of UNDP interventions related to the outcome?

***Partnership strategy:*** Ascertain whether UNDP’s partnership strategy has been appropriate and effective. What were the partnerships formed? What was the role of UNDP? How did the partnership contribute to the achievement of the outcome? What was the level of stakeholders’ participation? Examine the partnership among UN Agencies and other donor organizations in the relevant field.

***Cross-cutting issues:*** **Sustainability**: an assessment of the likelihood that the projects results will endure after the active involvement of UNDP has ended. To what extent the changes (and benefits) brought by the projects can be expected to last after projects completion. The evaluation consultant should be requested to provide recommendations for potential follow-up interventions, i.e. how feasible the follow-up actions would be, what alternatives can be identified and/or what components can be added to it, what knowledge products could be developed.

During the outcome evaluation the consultant is expected to apply dual approach collecting both quantitative and qualitative data.

The data collection methods should include but not limited to:

* desk reviews of relevant documents
* interviews with key stakeholders and target groups
* focus group discussions
* direct observations during the visits to project sites
* administration of surveys/questionnaires, if applicable

As indicated in the Country Programme, the achievement of the outcome 4 will be measured through the following indicators/baseline/targets:

**Indicator:** 3.1.1Annual qualitative assessment of advocacy skills of NGOs and media outlets

**Baseline:** 4 (“NGO Sustainability Index” by USAID, “Freedom in the World” and “Freedom of the Press” reports by Freedom House, “Global Corruption Report” by Transparency International)

**Target:** 5

However, it is recognized that these indicators may not be the most appropriate indication to measure the progress or the achievement of the outcome. The evaluation consultant is expected to design the additional indicators that can better suit the evaluation purpose.

 **EVALUATION CRITERIA AND QUESTIONS**

The evaluation will be conducted against the following set of criteria and should respond to the following set of questions that may be adjusted as need be:

* 1. **Relevance**
* To what extent do the intended outcome and the relevant outputs address national priorities?
* Have UNDP interventions been relevant to women and other vulnerable groups?
* What are potential area of engagement for UNDP’s next Country Programme in relation to youth development, participation and empowerment?

	1. **Effectiveness**
* To what extent the planned outcome has been or is being achieved?
* How have the corresponding results at the output level delivered by UNDP affected the outcome, and in what ways have they not been effective?
* What are the challenges to achieving the outcome?
* Has UNDP best utilized its comparative advantage in defining and delivering these planned outputs?
* What are the key gaps that UNDP interventions could address within its comparative advantage that would significantly contribute to the achievement of the outcome?
* Has UNDP’s partnership strategy been appropriate and effective in contributing to the outcome?
* To what extent did the results, both at the outcome and output levels, benefit men and women equally?
* Is the current set of indicators effective in informing the progress made towards the outcome? If not, what indicators should be used?
	1. **Efficiency**
* Has there been any duplication of efforts among UNDP’s interventions and interventions delivered by other organizations contributing to the outcome?
	1. **Sustainability**
* How strong is the level of ownership of the results by the relevant government entities and other stakeholders?
* What is the level of capacity and commitment of the Government to ensure sustainability of the results?
* What could be done to strengthen sustainability?
1. **EVALUATION PRODUCTS**

The evaluation consultant is expected to produce the following deliverables:

* Draft evaluation report for Outcome 4 for initial feedback from UNDP
* Final evaluation report for Outcome 4

 The reports should include the following contents:

* Executive Summary
* Introduction
* Description of the intervention
* Evaluation purpose, objective, and scope
* Evaluation methodology
* Key findings
* Lessons learnt and recommendations (forward-looking and actionable)
1. **RESPONSIBILITIES AND COMPETENCY REQUIREMENTS**

The evaluation consultant will perform the following tasks:

* Undertake desktop review
* Prepare the evaluation methodology
* Undertake meetings, field visits, observation and other evaluation activities
* Conduct analyses of the outcomes, outputs and partnership strategies for the two outcomes
* Draft evaluation reports
* Finalize the evaluation report based on the feedback from UNDP

The evaluation consultant is expected to meet the following qualification and competency requirements:

* Advanced university degree in the relevant disciplines (e.g. development planning, public administration or related)
* At least 10 years of international working experience in the field of governance, civil society, youth programmes or related areas
* At least five years of experience in programme evaluation and proven accomplishments in undertaking evaluations for international organizations, preferably including UNDP. Experience in Outcome Evaluations will be an asset.
* Good knowledge of Azerbaijan’s political and economic context, including prior working experience in the country, will be an asset
* Excellent analytical and strategic thinking skills
* Good inter-personal and communication skills
* Excellent written and spoken English and presentation capacities; working knowledge of Azerbaijani or Russian an asset, but not a requirement
* Ability to meet deadlines

1. **EVALUATION ETHICS**

Evaluation in the UN will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in both Norms and Standards for Evaluation in the UN System by the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) and by the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’. The evaluation consultant is required to read the Norms and Standards and the guidelines and ensure strict evidence to it, including establishing protocols to safeguard confidentiality of information obtained during evaluation.

1. **IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS**

The evaluation is commissioned by UNDP Azerbaijan. The Country Office will provide with any logistics and administrative support as needed. The evaluation consultant will work under the direct supervision of the Assistant Resident Representative and in collaboration with the entire Programme Unit and project teams. The Programme Unit and project teams will provide assistance in facilitating field trips, organizing meetings, providing access to information.

# Annex 2. Interview guides

**UNDP Staff**

Identification (name, gender, position, contact details, relevant experience, coordinates), date and location.

1. How do the UNDP Interventions relate to strategic to national goals in the field of youth policy? How did the interventions contribute to achievement of targets within the State Programme of Action on Youth (SPAY)?
2. Tell us about your project/portfolio linkages to the Outcome 4. What specific measures did you implement? Were multi-level interventions conducted (context, organization, individual)? How many?
3. What have been the main achievements of your project?
4. Which long term effects (socio-economic, political, administrative, environmental etc. impacts) can be well attributed to UNDP interventions? How these achievements relate to youth empowerment, civil society engagement in policy making and implementation?
5. What is the evidence of achievement of the Outcome 4 in your view? (i) has been achieved, (ii) has been partially achieved (in which areas) or (iii) has not been achieved? Why?
6. What other possible outputs could have been planned to increase UNDP’s contribution to the achievement of the outcome?
7. Which were the main constraints/challenges during preparation and implementation? (prompt political, social, economic, administrative, etc.)
8. What was the level and quality of dialogue between UNDP, government and young people in planning and implementing interventions within Outcome?
9. How well have the implementation of activities been managed in terms of a) quality, b) timeliness; c) administration; d) finances?
10. What monitoring and reporting tools have been used?
11. How strong is the level of ownership of the results by the relevant government entities and other stakeholders?
12. What is the level of capacity of the Government to ensure sustainability of the results?
13. Are there financial and management mechanisms policies and regulations in place to sustain the achievements after UNDP exit?

**Government counterparts**

Identification (name, gender, position, contact details, relevant experience), date and location.

1. Do you consider that the UNDP support given to your institution was adequate and a balanced response to the identified needs?
2. Does UN/DP support correspond to the State Programme of Action on Youth (SPAY)?
3. How would you describe the level of efficiency and effectiveness of the UNDP structures in terms of taking into account country-specific views and needs of your institution?
4. Was project implementation sound and did it deliver the desired outputs and results? What have been the main results achieved?
5. Which were the main constraints during implementation?
6. Are the results of UNDP projects implemented in partnership with your institution (beyond the output level) well documented and if so, what are these?
7. Can you provide an illustration of impact achieved by UNDP project implemented in partnership with your institution?
8. How do you assess the achieved a degree of sustainability of UNDP project implemented in partnership with your institution?
9. What was the level and quality of dialogue between UNDP, government and young people in planning and implementing interventions UNDP projects?

# Annex 3. Focus Group Discussions guide

The focus group discussions will be organized with final beneficiaries of UNDP interventions (Model UN events, summer camps, national and international conferences, etc.)

**Introduction**

* Introduction of the consultant to the group, and of the group members to each other.
* Provision of information on background to the interview:
	+ The purpose of the discussion
	+ The intended recipients of findings and how they will be used
	+ How feedback will be handled (issues of anonymity, confidentiality, data protection, etc).
	+ Rules of the focus group: who speaks when and agreement on how to indicate when one wants to speak
	+ The amount of time the discussion is anticipated to take
* Answering any questions participants may have.

**Discussion Topics**

1. **Overall context**
* *What are the main issues for education of young people in Azerbaijan?*
* *What is the possibility for young people to gain diplomacy and international relations knowledge in universities in Azerbaijan?*
1. **Effectiveness and impacts of the UN/DP interventions**
* *What was your main motivation to participate in this kinds of events?*
* *What was the most important benefit or result of the [type of assistance] you received? (Each to name one.)*
* *How can you use this new knowledge in your future education/carreer?*
* *How do such events contribute to empowerment of youth in your country?*
1. **Efficiency**
* *How were the events organised?*
* *Did you get sufficient support from UNDP team?*
1. **Recommendations**
* *How do you think your experience of this [type of assistance] could have been improved?*
* *What are your recommendations for future support by UNDP (what are the priorities)?*

**Rounding up**

* *Is there anything further anyone would like to add about any of the issues we’ve discussed, that you feel you’ve not had a chance to say?*
* *Is there anything anyone would like to add about any issue we’ve not really covered which you feel reflects an important aspect of your experience?*

**End of Discussion**

Thanking participants for attending and giving feedback.

# Annex 4. List of interviewed persons

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **No.**  | **Name** | **Institution** |
|  | Indira Hajiyeva | Head of Youth Department of the Ministry of Youth and Sport |
|  | Nato Alhazishvili  | UNDP |
|  | Jamila Ibrahimova | UNDP |
|  | Shamil Rzayev | UNDP |
|  | Elmira Mammadova | UNDP |
|  | Azer Abasaliyev | UNDP |
|  | Vugar Allahverdiyev | Office of the UN Secretary-General's Envoy on Youth |

**Focus group discussion with youth leaders**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| No. | **Name** | **Project activities in which they participated** |
|  | Gunay Alibayli  | Dashkesen Summer SchoolMilliMUNYouthMUN 2016 (by ADA University MUN Club)NaxchivanMUN |
|  | Aygun Ahmadli  | MilliMUNUNECMUN 2016 (University of Economics MUN Club)YouthMUN 2016NaxchivanMUN |
|  | Yasmeen Abdlhak  | MilliMUNQafqazMUN 2015 (Qafqaz University)Great Silk Way MUN 2016  |
|  | Inji Nabiyeva  | DashkesenMUNYouthMUN 2015MilliMUN |
|  | Jamila Axundova  | MilliMUNUNECMUN 2016BSU MUN 2016 (Baku State University)Qafqaz G20 simulation |
|  | Ilgar Hashimov  | MilliMUNUNECMUN 2016BSU MUN 2016Qafqaz G20 simulationYouthMUN 2016  |
|  | Narmin Sultanli  | MilliMUNNaxchivanMUN  |
|  | Ujal Agamemmedov  | MilliMUNNaxchivanMUNQafqaz G20 simulation |
|  | Neriman Namazov  | MilliMUNNaxchivanMUN |
|  | Fasli Nabiyev  | MilliMUNUNECMUN 2016YouthMUN 2016Qafqaz G20 simulation |
|  | Leila Abdulrahimova  | MilliMUNYouthMUN 2016ADAMUN 2015 |
|  | Khagani Gasimov  | MilliMUNYouthMUN 2015UNECMUN 2016NaxchivanMUNDashkesen Summer School |
|  | Kubra Mustafayeva  | MilliMUNUNECMUN 2016 |
|  | Nermin Hacizade  | MilliMUNQafqaz G20 simulation |
|  | Gulnar Hacizade | MilliMUNQafqaz G20 simulation |
|  | Turana Aliyeva  | Dashkesen Summer SchoolMilliMUNNaxchivanMUNQafqaz G20 simulationQafqazMUN 2015 |
|  | Jama Poladova  | MilliMUNUNECMUN 2015UNECMUN 2016 BSU MUN 2016Paris International MUN 2016  |
|  | Faiq Isazade  | Dashkesen Summer SchoolMilliMUNBSU MUN 2016KazanMUN 2015 |
|  | Eltur Qasimov  | Dashkesen Summer SchoolMilliMUNNaxchivanMUNQafqaz G20 simulationUNECMUN 2016 BSU MUN 2016 |
|  | Turkan Muxtarova  | Dashkesen Summer SchoolMilliMUNQafqazMUN 2015UNECMUN 2016 YouthMUN 2015YouthMUN 2016 RomeMUN 2014 |
|  | Zibeyde Ibrahimova  | Dashkesen Summer SchoolMilliMUNNaxchivanMUN |
|  | Madina Amiraslanova  | Dashkesen Summer SchoolMilliMUNNaxchivanMUNQafqaz G20 simulationUNECMUN 2016 BSU MUN 2016APAMUN 2015 (Academy of Public Administration Club) |
|  | Nadir Mehdiyev  | Dashkesen Summer SchoolMilliMUNQafqaz G20 simulationUNECMUN 2016 UNECMUN 2015APAMUN 2015YouthMUN 2016 BSU MUN 2016 |
|  | Sabrina Ramazanova  | Dashkesen Summer SchoolMilliMUN |
|  | Vusal Abasov  | Dashkesen Summer SchoolMilliMUNUNECMUN 2016 UNECMUN 2015 |
|  | Etibar Etibarli  | Dashkesen Summer SchoolMilliMUNNaxchivanMUNUNECMUN 2016 UNECMUN 2015APAMUN 2015YouthMUN 2016 BSU MUN 2016 |
|  | Parvin Rahimli  | Dashkesen Summer SchoolMilliMUNNaxchivanMUNUNECMUN 2015YouthMUN 2016  |
|  | Sabuhi Khalili  | Dashkesen Summer SchoolMilliMUNYouthMUN 2016 YouthMUN 2015ADAMUN 2015QafqazMUN 2015BSU MUN 2016RomeMUN 2014RomeMUN 2015ViennaMUN 2014 |
|  | Hevva Samedova  | MilliMUNYouthMUN 2016 BSU MUN 2016QafqazMUN 2015 |
|  | Javanshir Bayramov  | MilliMUNYouthMUN 2016 BSU MUN 2016QafqazMUN 2015 |
|  | Kamran Dashdemirov  | Dashkesen Summer SchoolMilliMUNNaxchivanMUNUNECMUN 2015 |
|  | Eltac Rustamli | Dashkesen Summer SchoolMilliMUNNaxchivanMUNUNECMUN 2016  |

# Annex 5. Survey Questionnaire

(submitted as separate pdf. file)

# Annex 6. Survey results

 (submitted as separate pdf. file)
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