**Annex V Web-based Survey – Summary and Analyses of Results**

The web-based survey was administered to UNDAF 2010-15 Kazakhstan stakeholders, i.e. to thirty three representatives of UN agencies in Kazakhstan, altogether forming UNCT. The survey contained 20 questions, based on, but not limited to evaluation questions that were elaborated upon the standard DAC and UNEG evaluation criteria and pertinent sub-criteria.

Out of the total number of 20 questions, 14 items offered multiple choice answers, thus the respondents were asked to select the answers that best describe their perceptions about the UNDAF process from the point of view of their working responsibilities and involvement in its implementation. The multiple choices were randomly shuffled from one item to another for methodological reasons, i.e. to prevent the repetition error. In addition to the multiple choices, the respondents were asked to comment/describe their choice in the form of open-end answers, up to 100 words. Beside 14 multiple choice items, six items were designed as questions requiring open-end answers, limited to maximally 100 words, too.

The web-based survey was administered in a form of the SurveyMonkey online tool; email message containing web link and covering letter was sent to addresses of 33 UNCT stakeholders in Kazakhstan. Out of 33 email addressees, 18 responded to the survey, timed from 2nd to 9th December 2015 (7 days). The survey reminder email messages were sent two times during the mentioned seven-day timeline.

Out of 18 responses to the survey, 2 responses were recorded as “incomplete”, meaning that 2 respondents did not answer to all multiple-choice questions, while in case of the six open ended questions responsiveness was recorded at 56.67%.

The fourteen multiple choice survey items all requiring comment/description in open-end form, recorded, at average 4.36 textual responses per item (out of maximal 18 responses per item), i.e. 24.21%.

**Brief Analyses of the Survey Results**

**Q1**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **To what extent are the objectives of the UNDAF consistent with country needs, national priorities, international and regional commitments?** | | |
| **Answer Options** | **Response Percent** | **Response Count** |
| Fully consistent. | 88.9% | 16 |
| Moderately consistent. | 0.0% | 0 |
| Consistent in some sectors. | 11.1% | 2 |
| Not consistent. | 0.0% | 0 |
| Describe (max. 100 words). | | 5 |
| ***answered question*** | | **18** |
| ***skipped question*** | | **0** |

Vast majority of the respondents, 16 out of 18 (88.9%) replied that the objectives of UNDAF are fully consistent with country needs, national priorities, international and regional commitments. Textual comments/descriptions (five only) were in full accord to the full consistency, namely with MDG, national development strategy papers and other relevant national, regional and international documents. Thus, the responses collected by the survey indicate to a very satisfactory relevance of objectives.

**Q2**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **To what extent have UNDAF objectives been adequately programmed to capitalise on UNCT comparative advantage?** | | |
| **Answer Options** | **Response Percent** | **Response Count** |
| Totally inadequate. | 5.6% | 1 |
| Moderately inadequate. | 16.7% | 3 |
| Fully adequate | 77.8% | 14 |
| Inadequate. | 0.0% | 0 |
| Describe (max. 100 words) | | 5 |
| ***answered question*** | | **18** |
| ***skipped question*** | | **0** |

More than ¾ of respondents (77.8%) replied that UNDAF objectives have been fully adequate in respect to programming approach and comprehensiveness aimed to capitalize on UNCT comparative advantages. There were also five comments, out of which four fully supported the “fully adequate” judgment, while one comment was dissonant, saying that “The UNDAF objectives programmed rather to accommodate UN agencies mandates but not comparative advantages”. The collected responses indicate to a very satisfactory relevance of design quality and preparation.

**Q3**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **To what extent are these objectives conducive to sustainable development?** | | |
| **Answer Options** | **Response Percent** | **Response Count** |
| Not conducive. | 0.0% | 0 |
| Fully conducive. | 61.1% | 11 |
| Conducive in some sectors. | 22.2% | 4 |
| Moderately conducive. | 16.7% | 3 |
| Describe (max. 100 words) | | 4 |
| ***answered question*** | | **18** |
| ***skipped question*** | | **0** |

This question builds upon the previous one (Q2) pertaining to the criterion of relevance of objectives, given that Kazakhstan belongs to upper mid-income countries, where sustainable development is an overarching both mid-term and long-term goal. The data collected include almost 2/3 of responses (61.1%) in favour of the judgment that UNDAF objectives are “fully conducive” to sustainable development. The four comments/descriptions (open-end answers) are in compliance with the said judgment. Hence, the respondents confirmed very satisfactory relevance of objectives through this survey item, too.

**Q4**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **How would you rate the ability of the UNCT to establish and use its partnerships to improve its performance and strengthen cooperation with:** | | | | | | |
| **Adequacy level** | | | | | | |
| **Answer Options** | | **Fully adequate** | **Moderately adequate** | **Inadequate** | **Totally inadequate** | **Response Count** |
| Civil Society | | 7 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 18 |
| Academia | | 9 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 18 |
| Private sector | | 2 | 8 | 7 | 1 | 18 |
| Local government | | 14 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| Parliament/national human rights institutions | | 8 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | | | | | | **Question Totals** |
| Please describe obstacles, difficulties in establishing and effectively maintain partnerships and/or good practices and positive examples (max. 300 words) | | | | | | 9 |
| ***answered question*** | | | | | | **18** |
| ***skipped question*** | | | | | | **0** |

This survey question consists of 5 sub-questions. The respondents were given the choice to rank (through 4-level scale) the adequacy of UNCT partnerships and cooperation with five sectors of Kazakhstan’s society (i. civil society, ii. academic institutions, iii. private sector, iv. LSG, and v. parliamentary/national human rights sector). The highest rank of partnership adequacy respondents gave to the sector of local government, i.e. 14 out of 18 (77.78%) replies included the “fully adequate” mark. Academic sector won the second place with 9 “fully adequate” responses (50%), while the third place is shared by civil society and parliament/national human rights institutions, with 10 “moderately adequate” responses. Finally, private sector was marked as moderately adequate by 8 out of 18 respondents but also as inadequate by 7 out of 18 respondents. Comments were mainly in harmony with the marks given; partnerships with local governments were marked both as an example of good practice and as less sufficient in terms of commitments (due to rapid change of LSG officials), while the engagement of academia and private sector was commented as a new area to address, because low attention was given to them in UNCT meetings so far. Civil society’s context was described as more restrictive in recent years, while partnerships with private sector is commented as “still very far from issues relating to poverty reduction and advancement of the human rights agenda.”

Overall, the collected responses marked the partnerships with five sectors in 44.44% fully adequate and moderately adequate in 41.11%. Thus effectiveness measured through achievements of established partnerships aimed at improved performance and strengthened cooperation was indicated as satisfactory.

**Q5**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **To what extent was the “active, free, and meaningful” participation of all stakeholders (including non-resident agencies) ensured in the UNDAF process?** | | |
| **Answer Options** | **Response Percent** | **Response Count** |
| Not ensured. | 0.0% | 0 |
| Inadequately ensured. | 0.0% | 0 |
| Moderately ensured. | 52.9% | 9 |
| Fully ensured. | 47.1% | 8 |
| Describe (max. 100 words) | | 5 |
| ***answered question*** | | **17** |
| ***skipped question*** | | **1** |

Over 50% of respondents (9 out of 17) marked “active, free and meaningful” participation of all stakeholders as moderately ensured in UNDAF process, while 47.1% (8 out of 17) said that it was fully ensured. Almost all of the comments/descriptions confirmed such positive responses’ trend, with an exception of one comment stating that “Much work is done with national partners. Civil society is 'hidden' or afraid to voice critical opinions.” This exceptional comment seems to be in harmony with the decades-long political settings of the country. Overall, effectiveness measured through stakeholders participation was indicated as satisfactory.

**Q6**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Was transparency in policies and project implementation ensured? Please rate the level of transparency in policies and implementation during the UNDAF process?** | | |
| **Answer Options** | **Response Percent** | **Response Count** |
| Moderately ensured. | 41.2% | 7 |
| Not ensured. | 0.0% | 0 |
| Fully ensured. | 58.8% | 10 |
| Inadequately ensured. | 0.0% | 0 |
| Describe (max. 100 words) | | 5 |
| ***answered question*** | | **17** |
| ***skipped question*** | | **1** |

Almost 60% of respondents (10 out of 17) said that transparency in policies and project implementation was fully ensured during the UNDAF process, which was at great extent reiterated by textual comments, except in one case indicating that “Each agency followed its own understanding of transparency not developing common vision except for the cases when some requests (from government) were unacceptable for UN agencies.”

Overall, the criterion of effectiveness, measured through transparency of policies and implementation, according to the data collected by this survey question, was indicated as very satisfactory.

**Q7**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **What mechanisms were created throughout the implementation process to ensure participation? (please list the mechanisms; you may also briefly explain them in up to 100 words)** | |
| **Answer Options** | **Response Count** |
|  | 10 |
| ***answered question*** | **10** |
| ***skipped question*** | **8** |

This is an open ended question. Out of the total of 18 respondents, 10 respondents replied to this question, while 8 of them skipped it. The listed mechanisms include: i) country thematic groups, ii) joint UN teams (for AIDS), iii) steering committees set up for UN joint programmes, iv) Inter-agency Working Group (IAWG) Coordination Meetings at the local level /area-based programmes’ implementation, v) civil society-government round tables, vi) joint inter-agency Technical Working Group, and vii) annual meetings with the government organised at the MFA. The replies were scarce in detailed explanations.

**Q8**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **To what extent did the UNCT undertake appropriate risk analysis and mitigation measures to ensure attainment planned results or the one achieved are not lost?** | | |
| **Answer Options** | **Response Percent** | **Response Count** |
| Totally inadequate. | 12.5% | 2 |
| Moderately adequate. | 62.5% | 10 |
| Inadequately. | 0.0% | 0 |
| Fully adequate. | 25.0% | 4 |
| Describe (max 100 words) | | 3 |
| ***answered question*** | | **16** |
| ***skipped question*** | | **2** |

Almost 2/3 of respondents (62.5%) replied that risk analysis and measures to mitigate or alleviate risks are moderately adequate. Comments/descriptions enlisted Common Country Assessment (CCA), joint reports on UN JPs implementation, and UNCT regular meetings. However, one of the comments stated lack of ownership by governmental actors for some projects/programmes, thus indicating improper risk analysis, which confirms 2 out of 16 (12.5%) “totally inadequate” replies.

Overall, the criterion of effectiveness, measured through adequacy of risk analysis, was indicated as satisfactory.

**Q9**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **To what degree has the UNDAF been operationalised, through projects and specific activities, during the implementation period?** | | |
| **Answer Options** | **Response Percent** | **Response Count** |
| Fully operationalised. | 62.5% | 10 |
| Not operationalised. | 0.0% | 0 |
| Moderately operationalised. | 37.5% | 6 |
| Inadequately operationalised. | 0.0% | 0 |
| Describe (max. 100 words) | | 5 |
| ***answered question*** | | **16** |
| ***skipped question*** | | **2** |

This question assesses effectiveness’ sub-criterion of achievements. Almost 2/3 of the respondents (10 out of 16) viewed the UNDAF process as fully operationalised through projects and specific activities, during the implementation period 2010-15. Nonetheless, there was a certain discrepancy in textual answers/descriptions; three out of five respondents stated that UNDAF is very broadly defined and that it was not operationalised itself but agencies make links to UNDAF and “whatever was conducted could fit into UNDAF framework without real analysis how it contributed to UNDAF objectives.” Therefore, the data collected through this survey question indicate that achievements in UNDAF operationalisation through projects/programmes implementation were very satisfactory, with reservation pertaining to textual answers that are in discrepancy with answers chosen (out of offered multiple choices) by the respondents.

**Q10**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **To what extent the UNCT contributed to, or is likely to contribute to, the outcomes defined in the UNDAF?** | | |
| **Answer Options** | **Response Percent** | **Response Count** |
| Contributed to some extent. | 20.0% | 3 |
| Fully contributed. | 46.7% | 7 |
| Not contributed. | 0.0% | 0 |
| Moderately contributed. | 33.3% | 5 |
| Describe (max. 100 words) | | 5 |
| ***answered question*** | | **15** |
| ***skipped question*** | | **3** |

This question assesses impact/outcomes[[1]](#footnote-1). A bit less than a half of respondents (46.7%) considered that the United Nations Coordination Team fully contributed to the outcomes as planned and defined by UNDAF, while 1/3 (33.3%) indicated that UNCT’s moderately contributed to the defined outcomes. In other hand, two out of the total of five textual answers/descriptions are incongruent to the multiple choice responses; one respondent stated that “outcomes are too broadly formulated so UNCT can easily say that it contributed”, while another commented that “most of the activities under outcomes were defined and undertaken by agencies separately”, which excludes the role of UNCT.

Therefore, the data collected through this survey question indicate that outcomes in respect to UNCT’s contribution were very satisfactory, with reservation pertaining to 40% of textual answers that are incongruent with answers chosen (out of offered multiple choices) by 80% of respondents.

**Q11**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Have there been any notable unintended results (positive or negative)? If yes, please state them and briefly explain how have they affected national development?** | | |
| **Answer Options** | **Response Percent** | **Response Count** |
| No. | 80.0% | 12 |
| Yes (please state them in the field below). | 20.0% | 3 |
| Please state unintended results and describe impact on national development (max 100 words) | | 4 |
| ***answered question*** | | **15** |
| ***skipped question*** | | **3** |

This question assesses impact in terms of unintended (positive or negative) changes, resulted by UNDAF process that affected national development. The respondents largely (12 out of 15, i.e. 80%) replied negatively. Among the positive answers, there is one describing the following: “Among the positive unintended results (mostly driven by UNDP) is support of the Government's international aspirations. Govt. establishes its own system for international development (ODA): KazAID. Aiming to render assistance to neighbouring countries, Kazakhstan has initiated a sub-regional multilateral diplomacy hub in Almaty, to help address regional issues across Central Asia, the South Caucasus and Afghanistan. The hub strengthens Kazakhstan’s international standing and should bolster stability in the region.” However, if this result is driven by UNDP, within the framework of UNDAF process, it can hardly be regarded as unintended.

**Q12**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **To which extent have outcomes been achieved with the appropriate amount of resources and maintenance of minimum transaction cost (funds, expertise, time, administrative costs, etc.)?** | | |
| **Answer Options** | **Response Percent** | **Response Count** |
| Somewhat achieved with appropriate resources. | 40.0% | 6 |
| Fully achieved with appropriate resources. | 60.0% | 9 |
| Not achieved. | 0.0% | 0 |
| Describe (max. 100 words) | | 2 |
| ***answered question*** | | **15** |
| ***skipped question*** | | **3** |

This question assessed efficiency in terms of cost-efficiency. The respondents mostly (9 out of 15, i.e. 60%) replied that the outcomes have been fully achieved with appropriate resources, while the remaining 6 respondents marked the option of “somewhat achieved with appropriate resources”. The two textual comments/descriptions were scarce/ insignificant.

Thus, the criterion of efficiency, measured through cost-efficiency, was indicated as very satisfactory.

**Q13**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **To what extent have funding become available to meet the planned outcomes as per UNDAF implementation plan?** | | | |
| **Answer Options** | | **Response Percent** | **Response Count** |
| Not at all. | | 0.0% | 0 |
| Moderately. | | 40.0% | 6 |
| Fully. | | 53.3% | 8 |
| Inadequately. | | 6.7% | 1 |
| Describe (max. 100 words) | | | 3 |
| ***answered question*** | | | **15** |
| ***skipped question*** | | | **3** |
|  |  |  |  |

This survey item measures efficiency of programme/project implementation plan in relation to sufficient and timely funding. Over a half of the respondents, 6 out of 15 (53.3%) replied that the funding fully followed the implementation, as planned, while 40% of respondents stated “moderately”. One of the textual comments included that “the government funding for UN JPs helped a lot in UNDAF implementation”, which, in fact, describes the UNDAF implementation funding in Kazakhstan in ratio of 80:20 in favour of national contribution.

Overall, the programme efficiency measured through implementation management related to secured ant timely funding was indicated as very satisfactory.

**Q14**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **To what extent are the benefits being, or are likely to be, maintained over time. Please rate the level of sustainability of the results achieved during the 2010-2015 UNDAF?** | | |
| **Answer Options** | **Response Percent** | **Response Count** |
| Fully sustainable. | 35.7% | 5 |
| Sustainable in some specific areas. | 50.0% | 7 |
| Moderately sustainable. | 14.3% | 2 |
| Not sustainable. | 0.0% | 0 |
| Describe (max. 100 words) | | 4 |
| ***answered question*** | | **14** |
| ***skipped question*** | | **4** |

This question assesses the criterion of sustainability in terms of institutional and financial/economic sustainability. A half of the respondents (7 out of 14) replied that UNDAF 2010-15 results were likely to be maintained over time, but in some specific areas, while one third of respondents stated that the results were fully sustainable. Textual comments/descriptions were in accord with the chosen answers, pointing out that “full ownership of national partners is obvious in many projects”; however, one of the answers mentioned that “…taking into account the economic downturn the sustainability issue becomes quite acute.”

Overall, the sustainability in terms of institutional and financial/economic sub-criterion was indicated as likely.

**Q15**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **To which extent are the benefits from a development intervention likely to continue after the current UNDAF will have been completed in 2015?** | | |
| **Answer Options** | **Response Percent** | **Response Count** |
| Likely in some sectors/areas. | 60.0% | 9 |
| Very likely. | 33.3% | 5 |
| Not likely. | 0.0% | 0 |
| Somewhat likely. | 6.7% | 1 |
| Describe (max. 100 words) | | 2 |
| ***answered question*** | | **15** |
| ***skipped question*** | | **3** |

This survey item relates to sustainability, too. Similarly to the data collected by the previous survey question (Q14), most of the respondents (60%) answered that the UNDAF sustainability was “likely in some sectors”, while one third of respondents stated that the results were very likely to remain sustainable. One of the two textual comments was quite vivid and perceptive: “they will continue if other support interventions are provided at a different level of engagement from the UNCT.”

Overall, data collected by this survey question also indicated sustainability as likely.

**Q16**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **To what degree have complementarities, collaboration and / or synergies fostered by UNDAF contributed to greater sustainability of results of Country Programmes and projects of individual UN agencies?** | | |
| **Answer Options** | **Response Percent** | **Response Count** |
| Greatly contributed. | 46.7% | 7 |
| Contributed to a limited extent. | 13.3% | 2 |
| Moderately contributed. | 33.3% | 5 |
| Not at all. | 6.7% | 1 |
| Describe (max. 100 words) | | 2 |
| ***answered question*** | | **15** |
| ***skipped question*** | | **3** |

Almost a half of the respondents (46.7%) answered to this question in outstanding marks, i.e “greatly contributed”, while the opinion of “moderately contributed” was expressed by one third (33.3%) of the respondents. There were only two textual comments, and one of them listed good practices, such as “cooperation of UNICEF and WHO on child mortality prevention programme, Multiple Indicator Cluster Surveys (MICS) implemented by UNICEF and UNFPA and used by other agencies.”

Overall, data collected by this survey question indicated sustainability as very likely.

**Q17**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **What have been the lessons learned from the UNDAF 2010-2015? (please list those you consider important for future implementation)** | |
| **Answer Options** | **Response Count** |
|  | 9 |
| ***answered question*** | **9** |
| ***skipped question*** | **9** |

This is another open ended question (in addition to Q7). Only 9 respondents answered this question and listed some of the lessons learned from 2010-15 UNDAF: “**i)** Appropriate identification of collaboration among agencies dealing with the similar sector(s)/objectives needs to be identified at the beginning of the process; **ii)** Less territoriality of agencies is needed; **iii)** UNDP needs to share more information on resource mobilization from the host country; i**v)** Communication for UNDAF needs to be properly developed and addressed; **v)** effective meeting of thematic groups is needed to ensure appropriate coordination and collaboration; **vi)** Mid-term evaluation could be beneficial; **vii)** More attention should be given to clearer and feasible M&E framework, there is a need to have real evaluations for outcomes and UNDAF overall; **viii)** The outcome thematic groups with the engagement of the programme staff could be a solid driving force especially with the new modality of partnership with the government, **ix)** Agencies may wish to develop certain collaborative projects prior to the UNDAFs, **x)** Need to have a truly joint modality of implementation- joint advocacy initiatives, policy briefs, joint events and conferences, joint training sessions, etc, **xi)** a. Improved monitoring of the UNDAF, which has proven difficult, as the results matrix was viewed as a one-off product for planning and reporting, rather than for use as a day-to-day tool in programme management; b. Obtaining and disaggregating raw data for improved monitoring of the UNDAF;c. Monitoring and reporting on the roles and responsibilities arising from UNDAF results;d. Encouragement of demand (internally and externally) for UNDAF result information; ande. Supporting Kazakhstan in framing its ambitious plans to become a regional leader and a more active participant of international processes.”

**Q18**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **How can coordination and collaboration of UNCT be improved?** | |
| **Answer Options** | **Response Count** |
|  | 11 |
| ***answered question*** | **11** |
| ***skipped question*** | **7** |

This open ended, general question collected 11 answers, while 7 respondents skipped it. The answers vary from “not needed to be improved” and “to do as you say you would do”, to quite detailed and, at certain extent, critical comments, such as: “**i)** Through regular UNCT meetings, ad hoc meetings when needed, UNCT retreats, meetings of the WG at the programme specialists level, joint events, joint reporting, etc; **ii)** Regular working groups with clearly identified agenda; sharing of working plans; **iii)** UNCT can improve information sharing with other programme staff responsible for the achievement of the results; **iv)** Through on-line planning and reporting tools (not by e-mails, track changes, additions to files, etc; **v)** Need to stop competing against each other, but rather work together and capitalize on our strengths. Developing truly joint initiatives would really help boost our image; **vi)** UNCT has not been coordinated at all over the last period. Each agency has mainly been working in its own silo. Even joint programmes are not real joint programmes. New UN RC needs to lead UNCT on coordination and collaboration and HoA need to invest time and energy in coordination and collaboration, as only a few do. Coordination and collaboration should be enhanced through active participation of agencies,e.g. in, Results Groups, GTG, etc; **vii)** Establishment of joint Results Groups with Governemnt along UNDAF outcomes. Development of Joint Work Plans; **viii)** By understanding that there is a little to coordinate. The mantra of better efficiency and effectiveness do not apply in a limited country presence, upper middle income country.”

**Q19**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **How can cooperation and collaboration with national and local stakeholders be improved? (please describe, max. 100 words)** | |
| **Answer Options** | **Response Count** |
|  | 10 |
| ***answered question*** | **10** |
| ***skipped question*** | **8** |

This survey question is similar to the previous one, but relates to the cooperation with actors external to UN and INGO. There were 10 answers, while 8 respondent skipped this survey item. The answers vary from no-need-for-change attitude (“collaboration is well established”, “cooperation with the national and local stakeholders is good”, and “the majority of work is agency specific.”) to proactive proposals/recommendations, such as: “i) More ownership is needed at the higher level of ministries, so that it becomes a framework the ministries relate to and are willing to use; ii) More actively involve local partners, NGO and people living with AIDS for collaboration and for participation in our events and activities; iii) Full involvement in the planning and implementation process; contribution of local budgets to be ensured during the planning process; iv) Extended involvement of the Government at all levels; v) Have more joint, regular meetings between UNCT and national/local stakeholders. Once a year meeting is not enough. New RC is called up to lead this process; vi) Participation of partners in results groups. Close collboration with the committee on statistics to obtain data to monitor results.”

**Q20**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Please describe the cooperation and coordination with other agencies/organizations such as the EU, OSCE, USAID, DIFID. (max. 100 words)** | |
| **Answer Options** | **Response Count** |
|  | 9 |
| ***answered question*** | **9** |
| ***skipped question*** | **9** |

Only 9 out of 18 respondents (50%) answered the question requiring description of cooperation and coordination with UN-external actors represented as major donors and other intergovernmental and governmental organisations. The answers could be divided into three groups:

1. There is not cooperation and collaboration with them (“none that I am aware of’)
2. Cooperation/coordination is good (“joint project, regular meetings and updates”, “Investment Case Project/ with USAID is example of best practice”, “UN collaborates with the OSCE and USAID very closely…”
3. Cooperation/coordination can be improved (“better fund raising, common issues discussions should be enforced”; “done by individual UN agencies but not by UNCT. would be good to have at least a once a year fora between UNCT and other agencies/organizations. there is no donor council in Kazakhstan, but some sort of similar fora could be created and it would be very useful for coordination and collaboration”; “invite them to annual meetings and involve into joint projects under UNDAF outcomes”).

1. Impact is to be understood as direct or indirect, positive or negative changes, as compared to the previous situation. Outcomes are to be understood as usually direct and immediate results of activities and their outputs.

   [↑](#footnote-ref-1)