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1. Executive Summary

1.1 Project description

The UNDP/EU Project “Enabling civil society to play a greater role in promoting socio-economic rights of vulnerable population” was funded by the EU Delegation to Azerbaijan and implemented by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). The project is designed to support civil society in Azerbaijan in promoting human rights and fundamental freedoms, with a focus on vulnerable groups.

Thus the overall objective of the project is to advance the socio-economic rights of vulnerable populations in particular:

* Women,
* Persons with disability (PWD)
* Children and young people
* Imprisoned persons) in Azerbaijan.

The specific objectives of the action are twofold:

1. Build capacity of civil society organisations to promote social inclusion and a human-rights based approach
2. Support small scale community projects through non-governmental organizations to promote socio-economic rights, issues of equality and non-discrimination.

The areas tackled within the Project include:

a) promotion and protection of the rights of vulnerable groups;

b) promotion and protection of economic, social and cultural rights;

c) promotion of non-discrimination and equality, including gender equality and equality for persons belonging to minorities and vulnerable groups; and

d) promotion of tolerance.

The project beneficiaries are women, people and children with disabilities, prisoners and others socially vulnerable populations. The results of the project are focused upon:

* The development of a vibrant civil society
* Advocating for, and working on, social inclusion
* Advancing the rights of vulnerable groups.

1.2 Project Progress Summary

To achieve the above, the UNDP partnered with 12 civil society organisations (CSO) who have experience and a track record in working with vulnerable groups. Each of these organisations were to tackle the important issues toward the achievement of the expected objectives and results listed above and which is called the ‘Action’ of the project.

The activities were intended to be, and were actually, implemented in different regions of Azerbaijan.

The ***capacity development*** approach constituted the principal methodology for the implementation of all activities proposed by the action. As practiced and promoted by UNDP, an essential ingredient in the capacity development was to bring about a transformation that is generated and sustained over time from within.

More details of the project are given in Annex 10 and 11.

1.3 Evaluation Ratings and Achievement Summary Table

The Table below shows the Evaluator’s overall evaluation ratings of the project’s achievement.

**Evaluation Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for “Enabling civil society to play a greater role in promoting socio-economic rights of vulnerable population” Project**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Achievement Description** | **Achievement Rating** |
| **Project Strategy** | Overall approach | 6 |
| **Progress Towards Results** | **Objective:** to support civil society initiatives at national and local level in Azerbaijan aimed at promoting and advancing rights of vulnerable groups through addressing social inclusion, socio-economic, non-discrimination and equality needs of vulnerable groups, particularly women, PWD, children and young people, imprisoned persons. | 5 |
| **Output 1:** Capacity of targeted civil society organizations increased to utilize human-rights based approach in advancing the social inclusion, equality and socio-economic rights of the vulnerable groups | 5 |
| **Output 2:** Social inclusion and socio-economic rights of vulnerable groups advanced at the local level | 5 |
| **Output 3:** Issues of non-discrimination and equality promoted through active engagement of civil society in community development and social inclusion | 5 |
| **Project Implementation & Adaptive Management** | Overall performance | 6 |
| **Sustainability** | Were the projects sustainable? Good effort despite initial design being forced upon UNDP | 4 |

**Note:** Rating scale is 6. Highly satisfactory - HS, 5. Satisfactory - S, 4. Moderately Satisfactory -MS, 3. Moderately unsatisfactory - MU, 2. Unsatisfactory – U and 1. Highly unsatisfactory – HU.

As can be seen the achievement ratings were very favorable simply because UNDP had been given a difficult task and, as will be seen in the text, performed admirably in the new circumstances created by the Government to control CSOs much more than hitherto.

1.4 Evaluation Findings

The overall finding - in terms of the overall objective described above - was that all CSOs operated well and all conducted capacity building exercises, while ensuring that their activities were designed appropriately to their target groups. Particularly strong contributions came from capacity development of all CSOs involved, dissemination of results and interactions with Government policy makers.

It can be noted that 386 women were educated in empowerment and leadership, 306 PwDs were linked to available resources in the Sheki-Zagatala region, 3531 disadvantaged children were helped in the Shirvan-Goychav regions and major efforts were made to assist prisoners through 17,000 prisoners being covered by prison monitoring visits, 154 Juveniles with disorders and their families received prevention-intervention care, 710 prisoners and their families obtained support or rehabilitation for reintegration into the society, 144 people get free legal aid on their social rights from LDPA.

However, despite admirable coverage of the CSO work it is still a small amount compared with the socio-economic needs of the whole country and difficult to obtain 100% outreach. Now one should never expect a CSO to cover the whole country with physical contact with things and people, except of course those involved in advocacy. When a CSO is involved in activities **two issues** stand out.

The **First issue**, is the need to reach out across the country. To a certain extent, the projects have done that through working with the Government and, in most cases for the Regional activities, the Presidential Office. But it is too early to know whether such ideas will take root for all the CSOs. On the other hand many of the CSOs have had country wide and/or regional impact – CESD with its superb social and economic policy analysis not only affects Government policy at a high, if not the highest level, but is also respected worldwide through for instance the IMF being one of its many clients.

The **Second issue** is that, both MPA and Internews reached out to the regions through newscasts and facebook and the FCC has inspired mental health care throughout the country located in the Mental Health Centre with its excellent Director, head of the health care in the Government. The Evaluator was mightily impressed with the FCC work. The FCC also responded positively to the Evaluator’s musings on whether such a level of distress actually leads to a major negative impact on a country’s GDP. Yes, was the response and the evaluator was presented with some research (from London) that had made such estimates. Certainly an area for *UNDP and EU to follow up*.

The issue of **sustainability** was covered in the evaluation, by which is meant sustainability over the future of the work being done and not necessarily the environmental consequences as important as they are of course). Two findings were particularly highlighted:

The first finding that the notion of ***social enterprise*** should be rolled out as much as is possible. Thus each CSO should have part, or even all in some cases, a cost recovery mode i.e. receiving payment for services as far as is possible. Of course the notion of human rights is as much a mental attitude as it is a cash recovery item. However, evidence is available that those countries with widespread human rights in their makeup do much better, economically and socially, than those who do not.

The second finding is that the Evaluator has noted here (and with many previous UNDP and EU reports) that each project should have a 3-M approach – a Macro part (essentially the policy part), a Meso part (essentially capacity development and ensuring public and private institutions practice suitable policy) and a Micro part whereby specific activities towards things or people are observed and tested.

The capacity building and development constituted a significant component of the overall objective of the project. The Evaluator was not able to visit any actual Capacity Development activities since they had taken place before the end of the project. However, noteworthy were the substantial records kept by the CSOs and shared with UNDP and EU on the number of participants, locations and duration of each training, survey opinions. In fact such record keeping, in the Evaluator’s experience, is (surprisingly) rare indeed across the world. Generally, the Beneficiaries met by the Evaluator generally enthused about the project’s concerns for socio-economic rights.

However, despite training being successfully accomplished Human Rights is still problematic in Azerbaijan hence a target much harder to accomplish but through no fault of the project itself. Some of the participating CSOs (e.g. MPA) already included (and plan to do) a Human Rights Based Approach (HRBA) in their thematic trainings for their target groups.

Besides the UNDP capacity building component, the project created a framework for another cycle of capacity enhancement interventions. A considerable number of people-beneficiaries gained skills and knowledge in their professional fields as well as new areas.

Given the reputation of Azerbaijan internationally of not always being lenient to incarcerated people, it was an awakening for us that progress was being made in even one establishment that was visited in Sheki by the Evaluator. This bodes well for the future since such changes occur slowly and it is encouraging for the future of socio-economic rights for prisoners. One can never know whether such activities will be sustainable as ideas change over time, but that prisoners can re-enter society and create new activities for themselves must be a plus for Azerbaijan in the future. Not only would widespread use of rehabilitation of prisoners cause less crime it would also lead to less costs for prison services as the prison population declines.

Summary visits together with an excellent UNDP monitoring report leads to the conclusion that each of the 12 CSOs produced materials from websites, to Facebook (e.g. Know and Protect Your Rights by LDPA), the policy papers, to promotional materials to handbooks can all be found in the CSO’s work, prison monitoring manual and have been documented in detail by UNDP. It can be noted that the publications viewed by the Evaluator were very professionally produced.

The project produced an excellent report at the beginning of its work on March 16 2016 covering ‘Implementation and Monitoring Stage Quality Assurance’. The project was considered to be ‘Highly Satisfactory’ in its M&E, and led to the conclusion that ‘Closely monitoring the results and feedback from the beneficiaries and target groups’ had benefits in that the close monitoring of ‘results and feedback from the beneficiaries and target groups’ led to the project to ‘initiate new activities to complement the achievements of its already implemented activities’ such as a HRBA guidelines for the Azerbaijani NGOs, organization of Innovation/Social Enterprise training with showcase from the regional successful enterprises.

On evaluation, the Evaluator can attest to the thoroughness of the exercise as, he hopes, is well reported herein this report. The evaluation followed, as can be seen above, the outcome-impact/results-based approach for overall evaluation and used standard, collaborative and participatory methods closely engaging UNDP Country Office, the European Union Delegation, partner CSOs, project team and any key stakeholders as relevant.

It is a fact of life that welcome interventions by essentially charitable bodies do not necessarily continue as noted in the previous paragraphs unless there is a strong sustainable ring to the actions. Of course those areas, such as PwDs and incarcerated people, are examples of where people cannot be necessarily helped to help themselves and benevolent Government action is needed. Right across the world such issues present themselves and it does seem that Azerbaijan does actually care. Yes more can always be done and sometimes Government policy gets in the way, but piece by piece as the project shows, institutions and governance are slowly coming together to address the socio-economic rights issues of vulnerable groups and, of course, Azerbaijan continues to be an oil rich nation that does have funds to continue positive activities such as those addressed in this project. The many communications from the project in their different forms are helping to change the mental environment and encourage systems to be built which are both necessary and therefore difficult to break down should political will change.

Finally in this findings section it is worth noting that none of the projects addressed environmental issues directly. Given the worldwide concern with Global Warming coupled with Azerbaijan’s previously pristine seas, mountains, lakes, rivers and pastures perhaps more could be done to address these longer-term issues.

1.5 Concise Summary of Conclusions

There were six key conclusions from the work undertaken by the Evaluator and each led to a set of recommendations that can be found at the end of the Report.

**First,** due to events outside the control of UNDP leading to a radical change in Government strategy most NGO’s activities were closed down in 2014. Thus during the period 2014 to 2016 the NGO sector was almost demolished – for instance the WARD project assisting women since 2000 nearly closed and its Director informed the Evaluation team that it would have probably closed without EU/UNDP assistance over 2016-2018.

The UNDP inherited a EU funded project originally aimed at NGOs to improve the Human Rights of Vulnerable Groups with a project valued, originally, at approx Euro 6mn. After the 2014 changes, the EU funded a number of projects for a third the latter amount via UNDP so as to preserve the human capital built up in CSOs over the decades. The Evaluator’s overall conclusion is that UNDP rose to the challenge extremely well, helped by a superb project manager, Gulshan Rzayeva with long experience of both the UNDP and the private sector, as well as the excellent staff of the UNDP from its Resident Coordinator and right across the organization. The EU’s close support and engagement during the project implementation is highly valued for the significant achievements.

**Second,** the methodology of evaluation is complex and highly procedural as reading through this report will illustrate. Readers will also see it is not that easy to actually find out the strengths and weaknesses of the project when confronted with so many tables, methodologies and annexes. Hence the Evaluator suggested a revised model to examine projects and one that he had suggested many times to UNDP in the past and which he has called a 3M approach (Macro, Meso, Micro). The first level is the **macro** or upstream policy environment that shapes the macro socio-economic environment which Governments normally concentrate upon and within which programmes, interventions and policies are designed that reach down to the poorest groups in society.

The second level is the **meso** level that links the macro to the micro. It is where most capacity development takes place and is also where more efficient ‘governance’ is required and, arguably, is where most UNDP effort should lie. Thus the meso level is concerned with the translation of macro advice into operational activities. These are the types of interventions that help to improve the Government's ability to deliver policies formulated at the macro level to the base; or, conversely, those formulated at the micro level (or base) to the macro level. They also include what is increasingly being referred to as the "social capital" of a country. Thus the meso level links the upstream to the downstream and the downstream to the upstream i.e. it acts as a river where the current flows in both directions.

The third level is the **micro** or downstream where bottom-up participatory approaches are located. This is where practical approaches will be situated to work with agents (public and private sectors, chambers of commerce, CSOs and CBOs, etc.) that have had proven success in contributing to poverty alleviation. They know who are the really poor and who are not. This includes all activities that directly touch households. The UNDP often refers to "upstream" and "downstream" activities.

For example, the macro level policy might be the provision of health services to those most in need; while at the meso level the delivery institution might be the Ministry of Health or an NGO that can deliver and advise upon primary health care services; and the micro level is the direct contact that people will have with the pharmacists, health workers, midwives etc. At this last level we find actual provision of services to beneficiaries such as assisting grass roots organizations to help people to help themselves out of their own poverty, the provision of sanitation or bio-gas plants or the receipt of targeted support to incapacitated groups.

**Third** because of the sensitivity of the issue of Human Rights in Azerbaijan, as in many other countries since its application is a process as well as highly politically sensitive, the full application of human rights was neither defined in detail in the project nor applied fully. The notion of socio-economic rights was therefore the choice made.

**Fourth** perhaps the most important conclusion emanating from the evaluation – is the issue of ‘sustainability’ and the link to ‘social enterprise’. In that connection it is worth quoting the following *“The reality is that the old NGO model simply cannot be sustained in a time of shrinking government funding and increased calls for efficiency and impact in international development. It is time to realize that NGOs need to become more independent from governments, financially resilient and accountable for their activities.”* [Chris Meyer zu Natrup, “[From NGO to social business](https://www.devex.com/news/from-ngo-to-social-business-why-and-how-84259)[[1]](#footnote-1)”, Devex, September 2, 2014]

Many, but not all, of the project interventions could be made more sustainable by including a cost recovery component. In fact, this is the current vogue through creating social enterprises. For instance, the many training activities could have a price to participants. These would be more of activities where, for instance, professionals such as teachers come to learn more about how data can be presented more attractively so as to increase understanding of difficult to read data sets. Or where a beneficiary is given a small grant to create a business thereby benefitting their family after a traumatic experience such as imprisonment has created family disruption. One could also think of training to produce a business plan (where applies) which would then lead to a partial grant or loan. In that way the loan could be paid back as well as giving an incentive to the small business to be as efficient as possible. It so happens that 50% or so of small businesses do collapse in the first year. But the beneficiary has learned a lot and can take that experience forward. While the benefactor, UNDP in this case, will gain some revenue to re-use to invest in new job creating activities or even help people who cannot help themselves. These latter are beneficiaries such as those in prison or those severely handicapped.

**Fifth,** in relation to the previous conclusion, most CSOs (NGOs) have three huge problems. First, they are partial in that their activities generally only cover a part of the larger problems they tackle (e.g. education, health, agriculture, energy, etc). They are either confined to a limited geographic area or only part of the larger issues (e.g. females in primary education). Often NGOs simply do the work that governments either neglect or can’t afford to do.

Second, their mind set is largely people focused but doesn’t normally include business skills and tends to be more outward than inward focused regarding sustainable funding.

Third, at the end of every project cycle they look for funding in grant form and may spend as much as half their time looking for potential new donors.

Of course, many prominent NGOs such as Amnesty International, Transparency International, Greenpeace, World Wildlife Fund, Médecins Sans Frontières and the International Red Cross are either advocacy organisations or performing tasks across countries that national governments can’t do.

But many, if not most, NGOs are supported by external funds and basically decline or even collapse once their funds dry up. Many governments from the rich world support NGOs through their aid budgets with additional support coming from philanthropic donors in their countries.

But external donor aid is starting to dry up as growing ‘populism’ and ‘illiberalism’ make people and even countries more inward looking and selfish. Even philanthropists are starting to examine socially responsible investments. There, as the Union Bank of Switzerland (UBS) recently noted, an investment in a socially responsible activity could lead to modest returns and help preserve one’s capital. But, philanthropy means all money invested is totally lost and the return on investment is zero. Clearly, an alternative that leads to sustainability through money earning activities that generate some profit is highly attractive. That is why the notion of a Sustainable Social Enterprise has risen so quickly and is becoming so popular around the world.

**Sixth,** was the project SMART i.e. Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound and also relate to the SDGs? As noted in the above the notion of Human Rights was translated into **specific** activities. **Measurement** was not easy as issues such as capacity development are hard to do. The project did, what many have failed to do over the years, and that was to at least count the numbers included in the trainings and evaluate and monitor every training activity. The project certainly **attained** its objectives as discussed above with the high ratings given. **Relevance** was apt as many, if not all, of the CSOs praised the work of the UNDP in helping them to continue their work to help disadvantaged groups while encouraging the Government to re-examine, in a positive light, its own policies. The sustainability of the project, as discussed in the text, was not **Time-bound** since the investments of the project will continue far into the future.

Did the project relate to the SDGs? In fact the SDGs were rarely mentioned in the ProDocs nor the many conversations with the CSOs themselves. Since the SDGS are mainly about development the UN ***Development*** Programme, the UNDP, naturally promotes development and the 17 SDGs. Perhaps the new addition of the SDGs to the UN’s armoury, is the greater involvement of the private sector in development activities.

Finally, it is thus worth noting that structures and systems are important but, in the end, it is talented people who drive major change. The experience of the Evaluator was of surprise that most, if not all of the CSOs involved, had creative, dynamic, eloquent and highly talented individuals both at their helm and in their organisations. From the first meeting to the last the Evaluator was struck by the deep commitment of so many talented individuals who combined grace and hard work with an invaluable characteristic – humour. Such people provide great hope for the future of Azerbaijan and the Evaluator was proud that it was a privilege to be able to help them in some small way. Thus, people are important for the future socio-economic development of their country and international organizations such as the EU and UNDP should continue their efforts to promote and help talented people as much as they can to create human rights, peace and development.

1. Introduction

This document represents the Final Evaluation Report of the Project **“Enabling civil society to play a greater role in advancing socio-economic rights of vulnerable population**” funded bythe European Union (EU) and implemented by UNDP. The Report comprises five chapters, as the framework for assessment, conclusions and recommendations. After the *Executive Summary* the *second Chapter* presents some introductory remarks on the purpose and scope of the evaluation; as well as evaluation design, ethical considerations for the evaluation and the limitations and mitigation approaches taken. The *third Chapter* presents the background information regarding the subject of the evaluation as well as relevant information on the Project, its objectives, problems it sought to address and implementation arrangements as well as who were the main stakeholders of the project. *Chapter 4* presents the key findings that have been derived from the evaluation process. The structure of the key findings follows the required format as presented in the Terms of Reference (ToR) of this evaluation. *Chapter 5* present conclusions and recommendations. The evaluation Matrix, Evaluation ToR are annexed to this Report. The report also contains other relevant annexes (e.g. list of key informants, list of consulted documents, evaluation instruments, etc).

* 1. Purpose and scope of the Evaluation

As per the evaluation ToR, the purpose and overall objective of the Final Evaluation is to assess the progress towards achievement of project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document, and assess the relevance and sustainability of outputs as contributions to long-term development changes. The Final Evaluation covered:

* The extent the project has fully implemented their activities, delivered intended outputs and attained outcomes and specifically measuring development results;
* The generation of substantive evidence-based knowledge through identifying best practices and lessons learned that could be useful for other development interventions at national (scale up) and international level (replicability);
* The measurement to what extend the project has attained the development results to the targeted population, beneficiaries, participants whether individuals, communities, institutions;
* The measurement of the project contribution to the objectives set in their respective specific thematic areas;
* The identification and documentation of substantive lessons learned and good practices on the specific topics of the thematic window - the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) - with the aim to support the sustainability of the project or some of its components;
* Thus the evaluation findings are made in relation to one or more of the related SDG thematic windows.
  + 1. Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation used methodologies and techniques determined for the specific needs of the action and aimed to provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator reviewed all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. the Project Document, project inception and progress reports, project budget revisions, national strategic and legal documents, and many other materials that the evaluator considered useful for this evidence-based review).

The evaluator followed a ***collaborative and participatory approach***[[2]](#footnote-2) to ensure close engagement with the UNDP Country Office, European Union Delegation, partner CSOs, project team and other key stakeholders. Stakeholder involvement included the key informant interviews with the key experts and consultants in the subject area, all twelve CSOs, the project team, partners and beneficiaries.

The final evaluation report was also asked to provide the evaluation methodology and its rationale, describe the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the review. These are discussed in the concluding Chapter.

The Evaluation looked at four categories of project progress: ***1) Project Strategy; 2) Progress Towards Results; 3) Project Implementation and Adaptive Management and 4) Sustainability***.

The overall approach towards the evaluation was ***participatory, result-oriented and forward-looking*** as, illustrated in greater detail below.

*Participatory approach* means a partnership approach, in which stakeholders actively engage in all phases of the evaluation, including the selection of appropriate data collection methods; gathering and analysing data; reaching consensus about findings, conclusions and recommendations; and disseminating results[[3]](#footnote-3). In this context, efforts were made to ensure the active and meaningful participation, through the application of participatory data collection and analysis methods, such as interviews, focus group discussions, etc.

*The result-oriented[[4]](#footnote-4) perspective* of the evaluation was reflected by the particular attention paid to the assessment of progress towards the enhancement of the role of civil society in advancing the human rights and promotion of economic and social participation of vulnerable groups through civil society organizations. The Evaluator analysed both internal and external factors that contributed to affecting the levels and quality of the contributions of the project to results.

By applying a *forward-looking approach* towards the evaluation, the evaluator drew lessons and formulated recommendations which can be translated into concrete actions for the future support to civil society towards advancing rights of the vulnerable groups studied.

* + 1. Formulation of Evaluation Questions

The inception phase of the evaluation provided for an opportunity to review the Project and activities implemented within its framework and their individual and cumulative contribution to extending the role of the civil society in advancing the socio-economic rights of the vulnerable population.

Within the inception phase, the Evaluator reviewed the Evaluation Questions (EQs) as presented in the ToR, and suggested their reformulation to provide targeted responses for the assessment. A set of indicators was also developed for each proposed EQ to ensure a common understanding on the evaluation questions among all stakeholders (See Annex 2 of the Evaluation report for the full Evaluation Matrix). The process of revision of EQs has been participatory with inputs and feedback from UNDP. The agreed set of EQs is presented in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Evaluation Questions

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Questions** | | **Relevance** | **Efficiency** | **Effectiveness** | **Coordination & Coherence** | **Impact Prospects** | **Sustainability Prospects** |
| **Evaluation category as required by the TOR: Project strategy** | | | | | | | |
| **EQ 1** | To what extent has the Project responded and remained relevant to the country priorities and in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country? | **🗸** |  |  | **🗸** |  |  |
| **EQ 2** | To what extent is the design of the Project concept and its modalities contributing to the effectiveness of the support? Are the project’s objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame? | **🗸** | **🗸** | **🗸** | **🗸** |  |  |
| **Evaluation category as required by the TOR: Project Implementation and Adaptive Management** | | | | | | | |
| **EQ 3** | How efficiently, in terms of quality and quantity, has the Project been managed with regard to the financial and human resources available? |  | **🗸** |  | **🗸** |  |  |
| **EQ 4** | To what extent has the project developed and leveraged partnerships toward efficient and effective delivery of results? What have been drivers/hindering factors? |  | **🗸** |  | **🗸** |  |  |
| **EQ 5** | To what extent has the monitoring system contributed to effective reflection of progress towards delivery of results? |  | **🗸** |  | **🗸** |  |  |
| **EQ 6** | To what extent do communication systems in place for the project contribute to efficient awareness raising and information on project progress and intended impact to the partners and public? |  | **🗸** | **🗸** | **🗸** | **🗸** |  |
| **Evaluation category as required by the TOR: Project Progress Towards Results** | | | | | | | |
| **EQ 7** | To what extent has the project achieved its results? |  |  | **🗸** |  | **🗸** | **🗸** |
| **EQ 8** | What is the level of Project’s contribution to overall objective? |  |  | **🗸** |  | **🗸** | **🗸** |
| **Evaluation category as required by the TOR: Sustainability** | | | | | | | |
| **EQ 9** | What are the sustainability prospects of achieved results? |  |  | **🗸** |  | **🗸** | **🗸** |

* + 1. Activities and deliverables

To meet the evaluation objectives, a number of different activities were carried out in phases as follows:

1. **Inception Phase:** the Evaluator conducted discussions and exchanges with the Project team to agree on the approach and details of the assignment. Based on the discussions, the Evaluator developed and refined the evaluation methodology and work plan (with detailed evaluation matrix with indicators, sources of information and data collection methods), included in the Inception report. This process resulted in the Inception Report approved by UNDP.

2. **The Desk Phase** included review of relevant background documents, such as UNDP documents and specific country documents in detail.

3. **The Field Phase** was conducted over ten working days in Azerbaijan during the period of 1 to 11 April 2018, with interviews with the Directors and associates of all 12 CSOs in the project and with visits to projects in two regions. During the field mission, semi-structured interviews and focus group discussions were undertaken with UNDP, EU, 10 CSOs in Baku and two region-based CSOs – Mingachevir Parent’s Association in MIngachevir and Uluchay in Sheki. The latter included a visit to Sheki prison which included discussions with the prison Governor, his Deputy and a number of prisoners as well as a visit to see the activities of a former prisoner. The HQ of Uluchay was also visited as well as a meeting with the Regional Director of the Justice Ministry in his offices. In Mingachevir, the HQ of MPA was visited where a focus group discussion was held with the leaders of the CSO, a number of beneficiaries of the trainings organised by MPA and senior Government officials who also participated in the project activities in Mingachevir.

The feedback received during focus group discussions was used to assess the Project’s progress per indicators and provide the ratings of indicator achievement presented in Table 2 in Section 3 on Key findings of this report. Before leaving the country, Evaluator provided a detailed de-briefing to both the EU and UNDP, presenting preliminary findings, conclusions and recommendation for discussion and validation.

4. **Synthesis and Reporting Phase,** the data analysis and interpretation were finalised, leading to a careful judgement on the Project’s performance, its results and achievements, translating into a number of concise findings, lessons and actionable recommendations for the future. The M**ixed-method approach** was applied to enable **data triangulation and validation**, whereby the Evaluator used different data sources, methods and theories to test the validity of a given finding. This phase culminated in this draft **Final Report** that was submitted to UNDP.

* 1. Ethical considerations related to the evaluation design

During data collection, the ethical considerations of the evaluation were ensured so that participants in the process could openly express their opinions, protecting the confidentiality of their answers. Overall, the UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System (March 2008) was strictly respected, notably independence of judgement, impartiality, honesty and integrity, accountability, respect and protection of the rights and welfare of the human subjects and communities, confidentiality, avoidance of risks, harm to and burdens on those participating in the evaluation, accuracy, completeness and reliability of report, transparency. The evaluator was sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and acted with integrity and honesty in their relationships with all stakeholders, ensured that contacts with individuals were characterized by respect, protected the anonymity and confidentiality of individual information.

The process of recruiting stakeholders from different institutional levels followed a standard procedure to ensure an informed consent to participate in the evaluation. Participation in the evaluation was voluntary and opinions were presented in the report in an anonymous manner.

Interviews and discussion groups were used not only for data collection and qualitative insights, but also for checking the perceived priorities for the continuation of reforms in increasing socio-economic advancement and CSO activism opportunities in Azerbaijan by the key stakeholders. This was very useful for informing the recommendations of the evaluation based on an open and participatory process carried out during the Field Phase.

Throughout the process, the evaluation was in compliance with the United Nations Evaluation Group norms and standards.

* 1. Limitations of the evaluation

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Limitation** | **Mitigation strategy** |
| There were twelve CSOs in the project all following different paths (see section on Acronyms above for list). As such, in ten days, it was not possible to visit all projects in their own location and interview beneficiaries. | Happily UNDP had produced a number of high quality and detailed reports covering project progress and could also back them up with personal observations. |
| Capacity development is a key issue in the project. Given the shortage of time and the many projects it was not possible to attend any such sessions, many occurred in the beginning of the project. | Happily, and unusually (the Evaluator had visited many training projects around the world in the past and was surprised to note that few even counted the numbers of people trained) the UNDP and the CSOs all took excellent records of training sessions and numbers trained. |
| Numbers trained in capacity provide a useful output but one can never be sure what people actually retained and then applied. | It is rare to find training that has zero impact and in the 12 projects examined the quality of the staff doing the training appeared to be very knowledgeable and competent. No negative comments were received by the Evaluator from any beneficiaries interviewed plus any relevant Government personnel involved were generally enthusiastic about trainings received. |

1. Project Description and Background Context
   1. Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope

Azerbaijan has a relatively well-developed legislative base for protection of socio-economic rights. For instance, the Constitution of the Republic of Azerbaijan guarantees its citizens gender equality and freedom from all kinds of discrimination in all spheres of life. National legislation also stipulates equal rights of men and women to engage in all types of economic and social activity, inherit, own and sell property, receive bank loans and travel in and out of the country. Since Azerbaijan achieved a status of sovereign independent state in 1991, the country ratified all major international agreements on human rights, including the Convention on Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) in 1995 and the Convention on the Right of the People with Disabilities in 2009.

Azerbaijan has considerably reduced poverty and unemployment levels, largely owing to the oil-driven economic growth. However, some segments of the populations (such as people with disabilities, women, young people) remain vulnerable and have special needs. National development strategy Azerbaijan: Vision 2020 recognizes the role that civil society can play in delivering services to the vulnerable population and formulating public policies. EU and UNDP signed a framework agreement to support civil society to address needs of vulnerable groups.

Following the Project Document, the **overall objective** of the action is to *advance socio-economic rights of vulnerable populations (particularly women, Persons with disability (PWD), children and young people, imprisoned persons) in Azerbaijan.*

The **specific objective** of the action is *to support civil society initiatives at national and local level in Azerbaijan aimed at promoting and advancing rights of vulnerable groups through addressing social inclusion, socio-economic, non-discrimination and equality needs of vulnerable groups, particularly women, PWD, children and young people, imprisoned persons.*

The objectives of the action are to be achieved through the delivery of the following Expected Outputs:

**Estimated Output 1:** Capacity of targeted civil society organisations increased to utilize human-rights based approach in advancing the social inclusion, equality and socio-economic rights of the vulnerable groups;

**Estimated Output 2:** Social inclusion and socio-economic rights of vulnerable groups advanced at the local level

**Estimated Output 3:** Issues of non-discrimination and equality promoted through active engagement of civil society in community development and social inclusion

The project will contribute to the achievement of the UNDP Country Programme Outcome *By 2020: the Azerbaijan economy is more diversified and generates enhanced sustainable growth and decent work, particularly for youth, women, persons with disabilities and other vulnerable groups.* The project’s strategy is in line with UNDP corporate strategy on Civil Society and Civil Engagement and supports three goals of UNDP engagement with civil society: invest in civil society and civic engagement; facilitate citizen action for democratic governance and development; strengthen civic engagement for multilateralism and human development.

The project beneficiaries: women, people and children with disabilities, prisoners and others socially vulnerable populations. Project supports implementation of Convention on Children Rights, CEDAW and Convention of Rights of People with Disabilities.

However, in Azerbaijan there is a gap between legislative acts and their enforcement. The UN’s alternative report to CEDAW Convention (2015) points out to a number of challenges faced by women that prevent full implementation of women’s rights. In terms of people with disabilities there are some gaps in existing legislation that should be harmonized with the Convention. The non-exhaustive list of examples of these gaps includes the need to incorporate specific prohibition of disability-based discrimination; recognition of gender equality of women and girls with disability in the legislation; modification of physical environment.

Azerbaijan has also made spectacular achievements in terms of reducing poverty rate (from almost 50% to 5% in a decade) and unemployment (5% for the general population. However, low unemployment rate masks special vulnerabilities in some segments of the population such as youth and women[[5]](#footnote-5). Young people aged 15-24 have the highest unemployment rate of 13.5% against 5% in the general population[[6]](#footnote-6). Azerbaijani women still have higher unemployment rates and higher shares in informal employment than men and are disproportionately concentrated in sectors that pay the lowest wages such as agriculture, education, health care and social work. People with disabilities have also not fully benefited from economic growth. Seventy-four per cent of people with disabilities out of 750 surveyed[[7]](#footnote-7) are unemployed and face obstacles to economic participation. There are also numerous examples where vulnerable people are excluded from the active participation in the economic and social life as well as cannot participate in decision-making at the community level.

Hence, there is an urgent need to translate the successful growth into augmented opportunities for equitable socio-economic participation and inclusiveness. To complement the government efforts in this direction, this project will support civil society organizations to provide legal and social services to the various groups of vulnerable populations, raise awareness on human rights, advocate for inclusiveness and non-discrimination. The non-exhaustive list of specific target groups for this action includes women, people and children with disabilities, prisoners etc.

Despite the fact that over the past decade the economic situation in Azerbaijan has been consistently improving and new employment opportunities have been generated, Azeri women still have higher unemployment rates and higher shares in informal employment than Azeri men. Women also face both vertical and horizontal segregation in many sectors of employment and are concentrated mainly in low-wage sectors, deemed suitable for the ‘female nature’ such as education, health and social services. Disparities are also observed in the level of men’s and women’s participation in entrepreneurial activity. Of total number of entrepreneurs in Azerbaijan only 18 % are women (Source: Ministry of Economy).

* 1. Issues that the project sought to address: threats and barriers targeted

During 2014-2016 the Government made several changes to the Law on Grants, the Law on State Registration of Legal Entities and the State Registry and the Code of Administrative Offences, with the potential to significantly impair the work of both Azerbaijani and foreign organizations. They introduced many obligations for organizations, including new registration requirements, and rules regarding receiving and using grants and reporting to the government. In addition, the new changes established harsh penalties for those who violated both new and previously existing obligations under the law.

On October 21, 2016, the President of Azerbaijan signed a decree on “Simplification of Registration of Foreign Grants in Azerbaijan’. According to the decree, from January 1st 2017 a ‘one-stop-shop’ approach had to be applied to the procedure for registering foreign grants to Azerbaijan. In effect the grants to the many then NGOs (now called Civil Society Organisations or CSOs since there was a fear that NGO meant anti-Government) were sharply curtailed.

There has been some changes to the original decree on 11 Jan 2017 of the Cabinet of Ministers of Azerbaijan to the Rules on Registration of Grant Agreements (Decisions) of the Republic of Azerbaijan (Rules on registration of grants, see <http://cabmin.gov.az/?/az/pressreliz/view/2202/>). Overall, the changes aimed to simplify the process, and were mostly technical nature. Below is a short summary of the four main changes:

1. The deadline for submission of a grant registration application to the Ministry of Justice (MoJ) was extended from 15 to 30 days. This change is a positive, as the previous deadline was too short for proper preparation of documents issued abroad, which includes obtaining their apostle, translation and mailing of originals. (ICNL’s recommendation accepted.)

2. The list of documents which a donor needed to submit to MoJ was shortened. Donors do not need to submit the following documents which were requested before:

a.    Proof of submission of annual financial report to the Ministry of Finances (MoF);

b.    Opinion of the Ministry of Finance;

c.    Copies of donor’s registration documents with MoJ;

d.    Power of attorney.

3.   There is now no need to submit notarized copies of the translations. NGOs can translate these documents themselves, which may save them time and financial resources.

4.   Perhaps, the most important change to the Rules on registration of grants: grant agreements can be registered as service agreements, which exempts donors from additional registration with the MoF, if grant agreements envision provision of services and works.

Thus, as the legislation governing grants registration stands now,  the multi-step complex registration procedure for grants and donors remains in place, and the government represented in the process by MoJ still has unlimited discretion  to decide whether to register a grant or to deny such registration. It remains to be seen to which extend amendments to the Rules on donor registration will further simplify the grants making procedure in Azerbaijan.

Without the UNDP project, the WARD organisation would not have survived, nor have kept staff, nor visibility. We need evolution not revolution.

*Shahla Ismayil, Chair, WARD*

Originally the 12 projects or CSOs included in this project were to obtain a total of around Euros 6 million and that was subsequently reduced to just less than Euros 2 million. Consequently the scope of each CSO was reduced and staff released that led to a loss of experience, difficult to replace.

Other threats and barriers targeted included (from the original project document) those captured in the risk log in the table below. The most immediate short-term macro political risk was the volatile situation in which CSOs operate in Azerbaijan as described above in this section, and political constraints related to this.

Happily, while delays did occur the programme was designed with a high degree of robustness to be able to withstand possible political volatility. In particular, UNDP nominated to implement the twelve CSO projects, has a long and impressive track record in managing political relations with the diverse range of government institutions in Azerbaijan. Of particular importance were the methodologies put in place by the UNDP to monitor each project situation including a continuous dialogue with the government and other relevant stakeholders in the process.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Description of risk** | **Type and Category** | **Risk Management Action** |
| Resistance of national and local authorities to engage in essential reforms relating to vulnerable groups | Political/high | The programmes supported assessments, studies and international practices presentations that provided clear explanations about the impact of the reforms and promoted public debates to garner public support for reforms. |
| Current CSO legislation obstructing work with beneficiaries from vulnerable groups. | Political/high | The programme provided a framework for outreach to vulnerable groups by programme teams composed of 12 organisations. |
| Government’s limited capacity and resistance to change and introduce innovations in social services. | Medium | The Programme supported the CSO partners in their networking and capacity building of the government institutions, taking into account the institutional factors. |
| Reluctance of the local authorities in the targeted regions, possibly causing delays in operationalization | Operational/Medium | Secured support of the President’s Administration that then played a pivotal role for implementation of the activities, also at the regional level, including cooperation and engagement of EXCOMs and municipalities. Programme partners sought the support of the President’s Administration in planning and implementing activities. |
| The government of Azerbaijan reluctant to engage CSOs from policy dialogue | Political/high | The programme enabled the 12 CSOs to react to their constituencies, turning them into a link between the public and political actors. Programme partners also supported regional CSOs to interact with the political process effectively. |
| Regional CSOs might not have sufficient commitment/ resources to engage in extensive capacity building measures | Operational/Medium | The project combined different types of interventions to better address the needs of regional CSOs and their constituencies. In addition to the extensive capacity building (both institutional and related to public policy and effective advocacy), the Programme also provided the members of the regional CSO networks with opportunities to implement their small scale initiatives while addressing locally-defined needs. |

* 1. Project Description and Strategy: objective, outcomes and expected results, description of field sites

The description of the project here was drawn from the original project document that was then modified by the evaluator to reflect the actual situation. Thus the UNDP Project **‘Enabling civil society to play a greater role in advancing the socio-economic rights of vulnerable population’** was funded by the EU to the tune of Euros 1,994,981 and was implemented as a joint action of UNDP and project teams from 12 partner CSOs toward promoting and advancing rights of vulnerable groups. Each of these organisations aimed to tackle important issues towards achievement of the expected results and objectives set by the Action and described in this section. Throughout the process of overall Programme design, particularly in the programme’s inception phase, the draft project document as well as related CSO partner project documents were discussed and consulted internally within UNDP, between UNDP and CSO partners as well as in a wider forum including the EU as the donor.

As explained to the evaluator by the EU, such an approach was critical to form the basis for reaching consensus among all partners and mobilising all efforts and available resources to foster proper implementation of envisaged actions, and hence, the mitigation of potential risks and development gaps. The close cooperation between UNDP, the CSO partners as well as other development partners helped to maximise synergies, ensure coordination, and also reduce transaction costs and avoid duplication of efforts.

# 

# Strategy

The project was designed to support civil society in Azerbaijan in promoting human rights and fundamental freedoms, with a focus on vulnerable groups. The project aimed to support non-government organizations and community-based groups to 1) utilize human-rights based approach in promoting the rights of the vulnerable groups; 2) promote social inclusion and socio-economic rights of the vulnerable groups at the local level; 3) promote the issues of non-discrimination and equality. The activities were implemented in different regions of Azerbaijan, with particular emphasis on the less affluent rayons.

The **overall objective** of the action was to advance socio-economic rights of vulnerable populations (particularly women, persons with disability (PWD), children and young people, imprisoned persons) in Azerbaijan. The **specific objective** of the action was to support civil society initiatives at national and local level in Azerbaijan aimed at promoting and advancing rights of vulnerable groups through addressing social inclusion, socio-economic, non-discrimination and equality needs of vulnerable groups, particularly women, PWD, children and young people, imprisoned persons. The objectives of the action were expected to be achieved through the delivery of the following Expected Outputs:

**Estimated Output 1:** Capacity of targeted civil society organisations increased to utilize human-rights based approach in advancing the social inclusion, equality and socio-economic rights of the vulnerable groups;

**Estimated Output 2:** Social inclusion and socio-economic rights of vulnerable groups advanced at the local level**;**

**Estimated Output 3:** Issues of non-discrimination and equality promoted through active engagement of civil society in community development and social inclusion.

The project aimed to contribute to the achievement of the UNDP Country Programme Outcome ‘*By 2020, the Azerbaijan economy is more diversified and generates enhanced sustainable growth and decent work, particularly for youth, women, persons with disabilities and other vulnerable groups.’* Thus the project’s strategy was in line with UNDP’s corporate strategy on Civil Society and Civil Engagement and supported three goals of UNDP engagement with civil society: invest in civil society and civic engagement; facilitate citizen action for democratic governance and development; strengthen civic engagement for multilateralism and human development.

The Programme was implemented through three inter-related Components: **i):** organisational Development Support to the Implementing partners; **ii)** support to viable models for advancing social inclusion and socio-economic rights of vulnerable groups and iii) non-discrimination and equality framework promotion.

The results of the project are focused upon development of vibrant civil society advocating for and working on social inclusion and advancing rights of vulnerable groups. To achieve this, UNDP partnered with 12 CSOs, each of which has experience and track record in working for and with vulnerable groups. In parallel of implementing the individual actions by the CSOs, the organisational development and capacity enhancement were defined as the prime objectives of the project. To achieve this, all partner CSOs had a chance to define their capacity development needs which included:

1. needs for thematic knowledge building (in areas of thematic focus of each CSO, knowledge on human rights based approach and international conventions and standards in human rights protection);
2. management and organisational development capacity building; and
3. knowledge and tools to better promote and advocate rights of their constituencies and final beneficiaries.

Mentioned types of support were expert assistance for organisational development and management; enabling CSOs to participate in thematic trainings and events and expert assistance for increasing PR skills and approaches. The Project responded to these needs in order to support partner organisations in their own organisational development towards functional, strong organisations with sustainable structures and networks capable to deliver quality Rights’ Based programmes. To implement activities within this component, UNDP utilised its internal and outsourced expertise (consultants and trainers), while support to CSO partner representatives in educational and other thematic events was given to cover their justified financial costs accrued.

The project advocated for consideration of new approaches for the sustainability purposes of CSOs and till the end of the completion will continue its support (trainings in organisational management, innovation and social enterprise to be organised in May).

The project interventions were designed and implemented as described in the Description of the Action in Annex 10.

* 1. Project Implementation Arrangements

The project was implemented according to the Direct Implementation Modality (DIM) by UNDP in partnership with 12 CSOs, following the contract signed with the EU on 23 December 2015 for the project. The areas to be tackled within the Project include: a) promotion and protection of the rights of vulnerable groups; b) promotion and protection of economic, social and cultural rights; c) promotion of non-discrimination and equality, including gender equality and equality for persons belonging to minorities and vulnerable groups; and d) promotion of tolerance.

Following a series of between UNDP, EU and CSO’s project partners on implementation arrangements, the CSOs were offered the options: i) provision of grants to CSOs; ii) conclusion of service agreements with CSOs; iii) direct implementation by UNDP.

Following the meetings of UNDP with all CSOs to identify their preferred modality of operation, the direct implementation by UNDP was considered as the most relevant mode. This envisaged channeling financial support to the 12 partner CSOs through contracts signed directly by UNDP and supporting the implementation of all activities. Considering the nature of the activities of the CSO partners and following the UNDP procurement rules, two types of contracting were agreed for the direct implementation by UNDP: contract for the Individual Consultant (IC) and professional company contract for the legal entities (LLC) to deliver inputs required for the implementation of the CSO partner activities including but not limited to the provision of trainings, publications, research, equipment, awareness raising, advisory services, etc.

The project organised the networking meetings with participation of CSOs, EU and UNDP as a platform to review and discuss the lessons learned, good practice and advancement of civil activism.

* 1. Project timing

The project officially started on 1 March 2016, after signature of the contract between the EU and UNDP in December 2015. The initial project duration was 24 months to be completed by 28 February 2018. As a result of the efficient management, the project made a considerable budget savings which would avail further support to the CSOs with additional financial support to implement activities that would compliment to the original actions and ensure further sustainability. In this consideration, a three-month extension of the project was approved by EU, meaning that the project was active till 31 May 2018.

* 1. Main stakeholders

The main stakeholders engaged in the project included:

**Civil society organizations**

12 CSOs are the primary stakeholders of the project implementing a number of activities of advocacy and promotion, policy support and research, capacity building, legal and psychological support, bringing international best practices to the local institutions, etc. The partner CSOs engaged a considerable number of regional CSOs in their activities covering 17 regions of the country. By this, significantly multiplying the project support and outreach to address the vulnerable people targeted.

The project partnered with the following CSOs:

1. CESD - Center for Economic and Social Development
2. LGA – “Local Governance Assistance” Public Union
3. EPF - Eurasia Partnership Foundation
4. CRF - Constitution Research Fund
5. ISD - Initiative for Sake of Development
6. HRCA - Human Rights Centre Azerbaijan
7. INTERNEWS Azerbaijan Public Association
8. LDPA - Law and Development Public Association
9. WARD - Women Association for Rational Development
10. MPA - Mingechevir Parents Association
11. Uluchay Social-Economic Innovation Center
12. DM - Democracy Monitor Public Union

**Local authorities in the target regions**

The local authorities – executive power and municipalities - are evident counterparts for the activities happening at local level. The project activities covered 17 regions of the country. To organise the project activities (trainings, awareness-raising / advocacy events, assessment and research) required the support of the regional authorities. The local authorities are the main source of knowledge on the local situation, and have convening power, helping the project in mobilization of communities, provision of inputs into the assessments and selection of target groups and beneficiaries, organization of local events.

In all project activities, the participation of the representatives of the ExComs, branches of the central ministries, Ombudsman office and educational institutions indicated the support of the local actors.

Other local stakeholders are other development partners and donors actively supporting the functioning of CSOs engaged the project.

1. Key findings

This section presents key findings that have been derived from the evaluation process. The structure of the key findings follows the required format as presented in the ToR of this evaluation.

* 1. Project Strategy
     1. Project Design/Relevance

The Project was designed as the joint action of UNDP and project teams from 12 partner CSOs towards promoting and advancing rights of vulnerable groups. Each of these organisations tackle important issues towards achievement of expected results and objectives set by the Action. To achieve consensus among all partners, mobilising all efforts and available resources to foster proper implementation of envisaged actions the project organised modification of the CSO partner project documents have been discussed and consulted between UNDP and CSO partners as well as in a wider forum including the EU as a donor.

As described in the section 3.4., the following options were considered for the project implementation:

1. Provision of grants to CSO project partners
2. Conclusion of service agreements with CSO project partners
3. Direct implementation by UNDP

Consultations were held CSO partners as to the preferred modality of operation. All CSO partners advised their preference for option 3. The selection of option 3 was based on the fact that the current legal and political landscape in the country was not conducive to the normal operation of non-governmental organizations and calls for special measures to enable civic society participation in the development work as discussed above. Amendments made to the NGO-related legislation implied a complicated procedure for registration of the grant both by the grant recipient and the donor, giving the relevant authorities have very broad discretion to decide whether to register or deny grant or service contract. Therefore, it was proposed to change the modality for implementing the project, replacing provision of sub-grants to CSOs (as originally reflected in the Action budget) by UNDP directly implementing all activities.

Direct implementation is a modality whereby UNDP procured all goods and services and other inputs required for the implementation of CSO partner activities. UNDP then entered into contractual arrangements with individuals and legal entities to deliver inputs required for the implementation of the CSO partner activities including but not limited to provision of trainings, publications, research, equipment, awareness raising, advisory services etc. Terms of References defining scope of work, specific deliverables and/or technical specifications were then agreed with CSO partners in advance to ensure that they fully match the expectations of the CSOs. UNDP performed its relatively new role with care, diplomacy and efficiency and the Evaluator could judge that their role was much appreciated by all the 12 CSOs.

During the inception phase, UNDP organised the recruitment of a Project Manager, and Project Assistant in line with UNDP rules and procedures, and identified Project premises. The Project team was fully operational as of 1 July 2016. The plan of work to be done by the project staff was drawn up and activities providing for capacity and training needs assessment in 4 directions in the 12 NGOs established beforehand.

A special methodology was developed by the expert group of ERC for training needs assessment. Under this methodology, a questionnaire which contained 112 questions covering 5 sets of issues, was drawn up covering:

* Basic data of organizations;
* Public relations;
* Human rights;
* Gender equality;
* Monitoring and evaluation.

Once the questionnaire was formulated, a study began in organizations with the assistance of 2 experts specialized in such studies. At the end, results of surveys were processed and summarized, the initial conclusions were made. Focus group discussions were held with the participation of organizations’ representatives who were involved in the areas covered by the study. Results of surveys were debated in these discussions and exchange of views about questions put in each direction took place, also proposals of organizations’ representatives were collected. After conclusion of the assessment process, drawing up of development plans separately for each organization started.

Human rights were a key component of the project and the questionnaire used included a “Human rights” section with the aim at assessing the state of observance of human rights and freedoms of both the staff and employer groups in the working process at organizations. 21 questions were included in the set. Through questions included in this section, such issues as representation of organizations in the Working Group on Universal Periodic Review of the UN Human Rights Council, implementation of requirements of National Action Plan for raising efficiency in protection of human rights and freedoms, level of awareness of international treaties in this area, Millennium Development Goals, UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, employees’ labour rights, coverage of compulsory medical insurance against accidents and diseases, freedom of religion, protection of copyrights were cleared up.

Without the UNDP’s umbrella project, EU money for International Partnerships on Human Rights couldn’t have been implemented.

*Fuad Hasanov, Democracy Monitor*

Thus the project was designed and implemented with close partnership and consultation with the UNDP and the 12 CSOs to ensure that the activities were aligned with and respond to priorities and gaps in government’s response to vulnerable group’s socio-economic rights. Interviews with each of the 12 CSO representatives by the Evaluator confirmed that the partnerships were strong and mutually beneficial, and ensured strong national ownership over results. In this difficult and potentially controversial area within Azerbaijan progress was not easy to achieve and, of course, the projects tended to work with specific groups in specific locations, albeit with Government involvement, but not always with the wider country in mind as, indeed, proposed by this evaluator in his 3-M evaluation approach briefly set out in the Conclusions chapter.

The project results framework present used (see next section) had a strong focus on capacitating civil society organisations and activists to advance the socio-economic rights of the vulnerable groups targeted. The assessment of the project implementation showed balanced focus on capacity building of activists and organisations and vulnerable groups’ empowerment which is important from the perspective of rights-based approach and the dedication of the project to strengthen structures that represent and empower vulnerable groups.

Nevertheless, review of indicators and the change that the project aimed to achieve more broadly shows that baselines for the outputs indicators which could measure the changes in the lives of vulnerable groups as a result of socio-economic advancement are missing. The baselines for the accompanying indicators would allow to properly measure the benefits and indicator would have benefitted from further elaboration of what features of livelihood improvements are meant or to be captured. The Evaluator also recognises the fact that these CSOs were quite new partners for UNDP and therefore, the project conducted the Capacity Needs Assessment to define the development needs of the organisations which could set a baseline for future potential interventions.

One of the substantial impacts that the project created is related with its timing. The project started at the time when the Azerbaijani government launched a fierce crackdown on civil society organizations through legal investigations and prosecutions. Additionally, the legislation on NGOs and Grants was amended correspondingly in 2014, limiting the access of local civil society to foreign funding. As the result, many civil society actors left the country, the majority of international organizations and many local organizations were closed. By the time the project started, the local civil society had already been dispersed. Launched in such a challenging environment, the project offered an oxygen channel for the paralyzed civil society. When the registration of the grant contracts by the government was frozen, the project found an alternative solution. The project was the only action that tested this new mechanism at this scale and opened the path for others to follow by creating a precedence.

*Naila Hashimova, Chair of EPF*

* + 1. Results Framework/Log Frame

The Logframe (see Annex 11) presented a number of assumptions and reflected the risks and related mitigation strategies as discussed above in sections 2.3 and 3.2. The application of the Logframe, its detailed evaluation and progress toward results is given in the next Section 4.2.

The Project Document contained an analysis of risks and related mitigation strategies for the project (reproduced in section 3.2. Taking into account the current rather challenging context for NGO registration and functioning in Azerbaijan at the moment, it was gratifying to see that the management actions taken by UNDP led to the successful outcomes of the project as detailed in the following sections.

* 1. Progress Towards Results
     1. Progress towards outcomes/outputs analysis

As noted in Section 3.3 above, with more details, the project was designed to support civil society in Azerbaijan in promoting human rights and fundamental freedoms, with a focus on vulnerable groups. The project aimed to support non-government organizations and community-based groups to:

1. utilize a human-rights based approach in promoting the rights of the vulnerable groups;
2. promote social inclusion and socio-economic rights of the vulnerable groups at the local level;
3. promote the issues of non-discrimination and equality. The activities were implemented in different regions of Azerbaijan, with particular emphasis on the less affluent rayons.

It is worth noting that Human Rights include all rights including political and civil rights. But for purposes of this project the focus is on social and economic rights. There is no controversy under international law. Socio-economic rights are rights. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights entrenches them. But other treaties, dedicated to the rights of disadvantaged groups (women, children, disabled people, for example) go further in demonstrating that special measures must be taken to ensure equal access to socio-economic rights for such groups.

Importantly, these treaties expose the fallacy of the compartmentalisation of rights into civil and political on the one hand, and socio-economic on the other. All rights are universal and indivisible. This is a fundamental principle and perspective through which to engage and understand international human rights law. Thus, the evaluator understanding of this project is that the rights addressed are more those dedicated to the specific rights of disadvantaged groups (women, children, disabled people, PWDs, prisoners etc.) in terms of social and economic access rather than the full spectrum of human rights.

Analysis of the effectiveness of the project for the purpose of this report is conducted as per the results framework, discussing different activities and outputs/outcomes materialising within the envisaged specific results in order to ensure that all positive effects and shortcomings are adequately analysed and presented. Further, analysis of the extent to which the project has been contributing to envisaged outcomes is also discussed.

A summary of the findings on progress in the project are given in Table 2, based upon the results framework and monitoring information by the UNDP. The Evaluator made the final decisions and much of the commentary. The Table is then followed afterwards by a short commentary.

**Table 2. Progress towards Results Matrix (Achievement of outcomes and outputs against End-of-project Targets) for the final evaluation of the UNDP/EU project “Enabling civil society to play a greater role in advancing socio-economic rights of vulnerable population”**

Fixed cut-off descriptors (highly satisfactory - HS, satisfactory - S, moderately satisfactory -MS, moderately unsatisfactory - MU, unsatisfactory – U and highly unsatisfactory - HU) were applied as well as the following Indicator Assessment Key.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Green= Achieved** | **Yellow= On target to be achieved** | **Red= Not on target to be achieved** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Strategy** | **Indicator** | **Baseline Level** | **End-of-project Target** | **Achievement** | **Status** | **Justification for Rating** |
| **Overall Objective:** to advance socio-economic rights of vulnerable populations (particularly women, PWD, children and young people, imprisoned persons) in Azerbaijan | **Indicator 1**. *Number of targeted members of vulnerable groups (particularly women, PWD, children and young people, imprisoned persons) benefitting from improved social and economic policies and services* | **N/A** | * 306 PwDs in Sheki-Zagatala region * 135 Juveniles with disorders and their families * 710 prisoners and families get rehabilitation support * 17,000 prisoners covered by the prison monitoring visits * 150 imprisoned benefit from the business training * 800 prisoners better exercise human rights * 200 disadvantaged children and youth in Shirvan - Goychay regions * 150 people participate in the seminar to increase their skills on social rights * 144 people get free legal aid on the social rights * 30 female leaders, 10 journalists, 30-40 youth representatives trained in equality and non-discrimination | HS | * 306 PwDs in Sheki-Zagatala region are linked to the available resources * 154 Juveniles with disorders and their families receive prevention-intervention care * 710 prisoners and their families get support or rehabilitation and reintegration to the society * 17,000 prisoners are covered by the prison monitoring visits * 150 imprisoned benefit from the business training * 800 prisoners better exercise human rights * 3531 disadvantaged children and youth benefitted from social services in Shirvan and Goychay * 171 people increased their skills on social rights through 6 seminars * 144 people get free legal aid on social rights * 12 children with disabilities realise their artistic skills in the performance puppet show coming together with the healthy children * 386 women 10 journalists, 25 youth representatives educated in socio-economic empowerment, leadership, anti-discrimination and equality * 10 women of violence victims trained on the business skills and gain income opportunities | All 12 CSOs operated well and all conducted capacity building exercises  All CSO conducted activities designed and focused to their target groups |
| **Specific Objective:** to support civil society initiatives at national and local level in Azerbaijan aimed at promoting and advancing rights of vulnerable groups through addressing social inclusion, socio-economic, non-discrimination and equality needs of vulnerable groups, particularly women, PWD, children and young people, imprisoned persons | **Indicator 1.** Number of relevant CSO initiatives claiming right | N/A | All 12 CSOs engaged | S | CSOs clearly engaged but most need continuing funds and sustainability an issue | Difficult to get 100% coverage but the specific examples and reach out to public policy had some positive effect |
| **Indicator 2.** Number of measures, platforms and models developed with engagement of right-holders and duty-bearers to promote respect and protection of rights of vulnerable groups |  | * Family and Child Care Centre (FCCC), established, staffed and operational * Platform for para-legal assistance to PwDs in Sheki-Zagatala region created; 30 SWs, 20 lawyers, 60 DB, 100 school teachers and 50 health personnel sensitized * Legal Aid Centre established and provides free legal aid * Prison Monitoring service * Civil Coordination Platform in Guba, Shirvan and Mingachevir * Int experience in prison administration * Partnerships with 4 municipalities in Shirvan-Goychay regions * Infrastructure and Documentation Resource for National Women Machinery established * Date enthusiastic Network created * Legal support and mentoring, business education systems in Sheki prison * Women Social Network created | S | * FCCC is established in Narimanov district, Baku and functioning properly; staffed with 9 specialists trained, service protocols elaborated, electronic database for ASD created and linked to the MoH * Network of 20 CSOs created to deliver better para-legal assistance to PwDs; 42 CSO members trained * 30 SWs, 20 lawyers, 60 DB, 100 school teachers and 50 health personnel trained; 100 visits made to the families of 306 PwDs * Legal Aid Centre established in Baku, provides free legal aid to the socially vulnerable, 144 applicants received aid in 156 different issues; * 3 informal prison monitoring groups established in Baku, Ganja and Sheki * Regional Civil Society Platform of 30 NGOs created and integrated with the Civil Society - Government Dialogue Platform for Promotion of the Open Government * 48 prison officers are informed on international best practices in prison administration and international conventions * MoUs with 4 municipalities in Shirvan-Goychay regions, joint social projects * Gender School established with 8 experts, scope of work of gender focal points defined; resource package is in the process of printing * Open data concept is introduced to the CSOs, government and media; date enthusiastic Network created * Free legal aid, physiological mentoring, business education and support provided to the imprisoned * 2 Women Social Networks * Gender School established, 8 publications are prepared to enhance the gender focal system | Many positive experiences simply hard to cover all policies and centres, monitoring of activities continually done and reports produced |
| **Expected Result 1.** Capacity of targeted civil society organisations increased to utilize socio-economic rights based approach in advancing the social inclusion, equality and socio-economic rights of the vulnerable groups | **Indicator 1.1 *Evidence of improved M&E capacities of CSO Project partners*** |  | Capacity Needs Assessment (CNA) for CSOs’ capacity building conducted | HS | CNA for the CSOs was conducted, 10 CSOs participated. The CD plans prepared and defined the capacity building areas | CNA was the main focus of the project and was carried out diligently |
| Training on M&E for 12 CSOs conducted | M&E training was held on 6-7 July 2017, 18 people from 12 CSOs developed their knowledge and skills in monitoring and evaluation techniques, results chain, innovation in M&E, reports structure, etc. | Training professionally accomplished. 12 CSOs confirm the training enhanced their knowledge in M&E |
| ***Indicator 1.2 Evidence of improved capacities of CSO partners to apply human-rights based approach*** |  | A thematic training for 2 CSOs on issues of human rights conducted | HS | HRBA training was conducted on 13-14 February 2018, 17 people from 12 CSOs participated in the training. The HRBA guidelines for the CSO modified for Azerbaijan is being prepared | Training successfully accomplished but Human Rights still problematic in Azerbaijan hence a target much harder to accomplish but through no fault of the project itself |
| ***Indicator 1.3 Evidence of CSOs becoming more effective in their communication/PR strategies towards donors, policy makers, media etc.*** |  | Training on PR / Communication conducted | HS | Training on Communication and Advocacy was conducted on 25-26 January 2018. The 18 representatives from 12 CSOs enhanced their knowledge and skills in PR/communication and advocacy strategies and tools. | Training professionally accomplished. CSOs note that they started redesign of their PR/Communication strategies |
| **Expected Result 2.** Social inclusion and socio-economic rights of vulnerable groups, particularly women, PWD, children and young people, imprisoned persons, advanced at the local level | ***Indicator 2.1. Share of models, services and best practices generated by the Project for advancement of socio-economic rights of vulnerable groups that have been taken into consideration in relevant policies and legislation;*** |  | * The challenges of PwDs addressed and advocated to a broader public; * 30 SWs, 20 lawyers trained, 60 DBs, 100 school teachers and 50 health personnel sensitized to deliver social services to PwDs; * Prevention-oriented multidisciplinary Family Care Centre (FCC) piloted in Baku,   Narimanov District (on the experience of Georgia), staffed and functioning properly for addressing the needs of the vulnerable and at-risk children;   * 30 policy-makers provide an evidence on effectiveness of preventive intervention; * An online base for theoretical resources and electronic database created * The prison monitoring service is set in Baku, Ganja and Sheki; * The prison libraries supported in Baku, Salyan, Ganja and Sheki; * Legal aid and psychological mentoring service established in Sheki Prison, fully operational; * Vocational woodcutting class established in Sheki Prison and functioning; * International experience in prison administration presented in the Sheki prison; 100 prison staff with improved service respecting human rights; |  | * The concerns of PwDs were addressed in public awareness raising meetings in 3 regions with participation of 300 people; in 2 TV programs (400,000 people watched) on the protection of PWDs rights; * “Guide to the Rights of Persons with Disabilities” was published in 1000 copies and disseminated; * Action plans for 2018-2021 on ensuring the rights of PWDs in Sheki-Zagatala developed to address the concerns and better social services for PwDs; * FCC established as the identification and intervention model for vulnerable children with ASD and families; staffed with 9 specialists enhanced their capacities in ToT conducted by the foreign experts; * 35 policy makers, local authorities, and community representatives discussed the JJ issues in 2 round -table discussions and meeting; * More than 100 people from government and public raise their awareness on mental health and juvenile delinquency via two informational campaigns * Six guidelines developed based on the best international practices; for the diagnostics and treatment of common mental health problems in children and adolescents; * Pre-service desk research to study the situation in JJ in Azerbaijan and post research carried out to study the effects of FCC, 200 copies of report printed and disseminated. * www.mhjj.az website on issues related to child/ adolescent mental health and juvenile justice created. Electronic off-line database, with information on 153 cases related to children and families receiving care at the FCC, created to systematize all the medical and social records. FCC staff trained on data management and subsequent supervision; * Prison monitoring groups established in Baku, Ganja and Sheki; 6 trainings provided; 2 educational books produced for the prisoners (human rights, legislation, etc); Manual for prison monitors produced, disseminated to the relevant structures; informal prison monitoring groups in Baku, Ganja and Sheki established * 710 prisoners received legal and psychological aid; * 150 prisoners benefitted from business trainings, 7 business ideas supported; * About 200 prisoners are engaged in the woodcutting workshop; * 3 social enterprises were established within the Sheki Penitentiary Service * 150 entrepreneurs are advocated about the employment concerns of the ex-prisoners | Government policymakers were consistently involved and addressed across the Regions  Action Plans for of Sheki-Zakatala and Baku prepared and submitted to the MLSPP, MoH, MoE  Network of governmental and non-governmental bodies established for facilitation of preventive component of JJ reforms; policy recommendations elaborated and presented to MoH and other stakeholders  Prison monitoring manual has been accepted as textbook for the Law Department of Baku State University and Training Academy of the Ministry of Justice  Regional Office of Ministry of Justice and Sheki Penitentiary Service are the partners |
| ***Indicator 2.2 Number of final beneficiaries from targeted vulnerable groups, particularly women, PWD, children and young people, imprisoned persons benefitting from healthcare, social protection, legal aid and economic policies;*** |  | * 300 PWDs and their family members educated on the PWDs rights, legislation, existing services/resources; * 135 juveniles and their families receive prevention-intervention care; * About 17,000 prisoners (450-500 women) covered by the prison monitoring visits in Baku, Ganja, Salyan and Sheki; * 15 prisons are monitored, legal assistance provided; * 300 prisoners receive legal assistance; * 150 prisoners benefit from the mentoring programmes * 250 prisoners benefit from the vocational class * 150 prisoners receive business education * 9 business ideas received technical support; * 800 prisoners better exercise human rights); | **HS** | Beneficiaries met by the Evaluator generally enthused about the project its concerns for socio-economic rights | * The needs assessment conducted for 306 PWDs in Sheki-Zagatala region; * 100 follow-up visits held by 30 social workers to link them to the healthcare and social services; * 153 children and their family members benefited from FCC provided multidisciplinary services; * 3 social enterprises established within the Sheki Penitentiary Service * 150 entrepreneurs become more aware of importance of supporting former prisoners through their employment; * 710 prisoners received face-to-face and group legal and psychological aid; * 150 prisoners increased their skills and knowledge on basics of business and 7 business ideas of prisoners received support; * 750 booklets on major needs and problems of prisoners developed and disseminated among stakeholders and public; * About 200 prisoners involved to the vocational education workshop and gained knowledge and skills on woodcutting profession; the action continues * CSOs, MoJ Divisions, Penitentiary Service and local authorities increased their skills through 5 capacity building trainings; |
| ***Indicator 2.3 Number of Azeri CSOs with increased capacity to address rights and needs of targeted*** |  | * Network of 20 CSOs created to deliver better social and para-legal assistance to PwDs in Sheki-Zagatala region * 30 GPs, child doctors and nurses, kindergarten/school teachers, police officers, SWs, 15 psychologists and mental health specialists increase their capacities on ASD; * 30 civil activists (CSO, journalists and lawyers) trained in prison monitoring; | **HS** | Capacity development was a key target and its impact to increase capacity was much improved over the beginning of the project | * A network of 20 CSOs created; * 41 CSO members increased their organisational and management capacities and raised their awareness and skills on working with the PWDs and their families through 2 trainings; * 20 CSOs discussed the disability entitlements in 7 meetings * 15 psychologists were trained in international experience in early identification and intervention methods and ASD, two 6-day workshops conducted; * 27 child specialists, nurses, psychologists, teachers, police officers and social workers enhanced on ASD and related; * Prison monitoring groups (10 persons in each) created in Ganja and Sheki; 6 training seminars in Baku (2), Ganja (2) and Sheki (2) conducted for (20 participants in each) * Interaction between local authorities and civil society organizations created opportunities for future cooperation (30 rep-s and 25 CSOs/ min 25 CSOs take active role on improving human rights |
| **Expected Result 3.** Issues of non-discrimination and equality promoted through active engagement of civil society in community development and social inclusion | **Indicator 3.1** Number andquality of comprehensive publications produced on issues of targeted vulnerable groups (particularly women, PWD, children and young people, imprisoned persons); |  | * 5 policy paper * Data Journalism Book * Prison Monitoring Manual * “Guide the Rights of Persons with Disabilities” * Compilation of prison-related laws and regulation * Training manual for CSOs on watchdog and advocacy * ToT Manual * Know and Protect Your Rights * Handbook on Restoration of Your Social Rights | **HS** | Publications viewed by Evaluator very professionally produced  The 8 Resource Pack for Gender Focal points are in the process of print  CSOs were granted with additional funding and more publications are planned to be produced by the end of the project | Summary visits together with an excellent UNDP monitoring report leads to conclusion that each of the 12 CSOs produced materials from websites, to facebook (eg Know and Protect Your Rights by LDPA), the policy papers, to promotional materials to handbooks can all be found in the CSO’s work, prison monitoring manual and have been documented in detail by UNDP.  More use of short videos and graphical presentation of data would have helped e.g. done by MPA and Internews |
| I**ndicator 3.2** Share of evidence-based policy recommendations elaborated by rights advocates for the improvement of the situation of vulnerable groups in the timeframe of the Project implementation; |  | Strategic plans, policy papers, researches, RoundTables, GFPs for gender encouraged along with, for instance, a Women’s Social Network across the country | **HS** | * 5 policy papers on social issues published and presented to the government * Action Plans targeted to PwDs developed and submitted to the MLSSP * 9 research papers analysed socio-economic challenges * A research on access and quality of drinking advocated and helped escalate the issue to the attention of the local and central government and accelerated release of a Presidential decree to improve drinking water supply in Mingachevir * Policy briefs on women’s social-economic empowerment and financial inclusivity were presented to the government structures for consideration; * Analytical report on development of JJ was published and presented to the MoJ and MoH * 2 year action plans for the social services by 4 municipalities in Goychay and Shirvan regions * Legislation of social protection was analysed and summary of the analysis and recommendations published in 500 copies and disseminated * 8 publications for the Gender Focal Points will improve CEDAW reporting by the country * 2 TV programs on the protection of PWDs rights transmitted on Public TV * 4 online TV debates on anti-discrimination, equality and women empowerment | For example by MPA:   * 121 people raised awareness and understanding on the open data concepts and ensured wider participation from the local communities, promoted creation of data tools to enhance access of communities to information and services through 6 consultation meetings for government officials; * 20 participants from media, CSOs, students, state officials got introduced on the concepts of data visualisation, application of open data by foreign media in a data journalism workshop;   CESD:   * 21 meetings were held with 11 leading CSOs in Ganja and 9 meetings with MLSPP; * Training manual for CSOs on watchdog and advocacy function was developed; * 7 analytical research papers, the policy recommendations on provision of the social protection services to low-income families prepared and distributed electronically to the government authorities; * 245 representatives of Executive bodies, NGOs, municipalities, media, businessmen, PWD family members increased skills in 10 Capacity-building trainings and workshops for CSOs; * Final conference for assessing the outcomes and presenting policy recommendations and analytical research on social service provision was attended by more than 90 people (MPs, officials, CSOs, media); * 17 people were supported in preparation of their documents and submitting to the e-government portals; * Partnerships established with ExComs of Ganja and Samukh, regional branches of SSPF, Ombudsman Office, MLSPP, MinFin, MPs; 5 NGOs, municipality and ExCom rep-s from 2 regions strengthened their network;   In Shirvan, local NGO “ARAN” Human Rights Centre made a significant contribution to standardizing the work of the district agencies responsible for maintenance and repair of the city’s residential buildings which made both government and public monitoring of these agencies more transparent |
| Indicator 3.3. Number of CSOs with strengthened CSO networks and relations with local authorities |  | 12 CSOs implement their activities in the regions, engaging the local government and civil society | **HS** | Improved  The project activities covered Baku and 17 regions of Azerbaijan.  All CSOs implemented their activities in close collaboration with the ExComs, Ombudsman Office and regional branches of the central ministries.  In total, 12 project CSOs engaged over 150 local NGOs  Inter-relations within 12 CSOs were strengthened through the project implementation | EPF example showed:   * + 30 NGOs in Guba, Shirvan and Mingechevir regions joined Civil Society Platform and integrated to the Open Government Platform   + 24 NGOs enhanced their organizational capacities   + 9 NGOs were engaged in the research with the significant outcomes   CESD example showed:   * + Improving quality, efficiency and transparency of social policies in Azerbaijan advocated and discussed in Ganja and Samukh regions   + Partnership established with ExComs of Ganja and Samukh, regional branches of SSPF, Ombudsman Office   + 5 policy papers including recommendations produced on social policies in Azerbaijan and submitted to the relevant gov. institutions   + 40 rep-s from local CSOs, communities and municipalities participate 2 networking meetings   + Capacities of 20 CSOs (engaged in the project) in social policy issues enhanced through 8 workshops in Ganja and Samukh regions   Internews example showed:   * + [www.svp.az](http://www.svp.az) website of the initiative on Civil Society Empowerment was created   + “Be the voice of silence!” campaign was conducted for “International Deaf & Dumb” Day with participation of 25 CSOs;   + Partnership established with the Ombudsman Apparatus, Min. of Education, Baku ExCom, Council on State Support to NGOs, Parliament |

**The overall objective to advance socio-economic rights of vulnerable populations (particularly women, PWD, children and young people, imprisoned persons)** in Azerbaijan were undoubtedly ***positive***. Particularly strong contributions, as can be seen from the results, came from capacity development of all CSOs involved, dissemination of results and interactions with Government policy makers. It can be noted that 386 women were educated in empowerment and leadership, 306 PwDs were linked to available resources in the Sheki-Zagatala region, 3531 disadvantaged children were helped in the Shirvan-Goychav regions and major efforts were made to assist prisoners by prison monitoring visits, 154 Juveniles with disorders and their families received prevention-intervention care, 710 prisoners and their families obtained support or rehabilitation for reintegration into the society, 144 people get free legal aid on their social rights from LDPA.

**The specific objective of the action was to support civil society initiatives at national and local level in Azerbaijan** aimed at promoting and advancing rights of vulnerable groups through addressing social inclusion, socio-economic, non-discrimination and equality needs of vulnerable groups, particularly women, PWD, children and young people, imprisoned persons.The wide variety of projects covered by the 12 CSOs engaged attests to the focus of each of the specific objectives as can be seen from Table 2 above and the commentary in the previous paragraph.

However, despite admirable coverage of the CSO work it is still a small amount compared with the socio-economic needs of the whole country and difficult to obtain 100% outreach. Now one should never expect a CSO to cover the whole country with physical contact with things and people, except of course those involved in advocacy. When a CSO is involved in former activities **two issues** stand out.

**First**, the need to reach out across the country. To a certain extent, the projects have done that through working with the Government and, in most cases for the Regional activities, the Presidential Office. But it is too early to know whether such ideas will take root for all the CSOs. On the other hand many of the CSOs have had country wide and/or regional impact – CESD with its superb social and economic policy analysis not only affects Government policy at a high, if not the highest level, but is also respected worldwide through for instance the IMF being one of its many clients. Second, both MPA and Internews reach out to the regions through newscasts and facebook and third, FCC has inspired mental health care throughout the country located in the Mental Health Centre with its excellent Director, head of the health care in the Government. The Evaluator was mightily impressed with the FCC work and to discover that as many as one in four people around the world probably suffer from some form of mental illness during their lifetime. The FCC also responded positively to the Evaluator’s musings on whether such a level of distress actually leads to a major negative impact on a country’s GDP. Yes, was the response and the evaluator was presented with some research (from London) that had made such estimates. **Certainly an area for *UNDP and EU to follow up*.**

With my experience of 15 years in the civil society sector at it was the first time that the city-based NGOs so closely worked with the regional NGOs, in capacity development as well as advocacy interventions.

*Rovshan Agayev, EPF Expert*

**Second,** is the need for sustainability (by which is meant sustainability over the future of the work being done and not necessarily the environmental consequences as important as they are of course). It is unfortunate that much of the work of the CSOs, especially those who provide a free public service, is where payment cannot be anticipated. Our conclusions spelled out below are twofold. First, the notion of ***social enterprise*** should be rolled out as much as is possible. Thus each CSO should have part, or even all in some cases, a cost recovery mode i.e. receiving payment for services as far as is possible. Of course the notion of human rights is as much a mental attitude as it is a cash recovery item. However, evidence is available that those countries with widespread human rights in their makeup do much better, economically and socially, than those who do not.

Second, the Evaluator has noted here (and with many previous UNDP and EU reports) that each project should have a 3-M approach – a Macro part (essentially the policy part), a Meso part (essentially capacity development and ensuring public and private institutions practice suitable policy) and a Micro part whereby specific activities towards things or people are observed and tested. More on this below in our conclusions. But one important issue not to be forgotten is the use of Capacity Development to embed ideas and actions into people’s mindsets which is covered next in examining Expected Result One. A training notion such as planning a piece of wood or using a metal lathe once learned can never be forgotten.

As well as the overall view expressed above, the specific objectives of the action were intended to be achieved through the delivery of three Expected Outputs or Results and these are discussed in turn next.

**Expected Result (a.k.a. Estimated Output) 1:** Capacity of targeted civil society organisations increased to utilize human-rights based approach in advancing the social inclusion, equality and socio-economic rights of the vulnerable groups.

This output was a complete responsibility of UNDP to organise the capacity building activities for the participating CSOs in the thematic areas where the need was expressed. The capacity building and development constituted a significant component of the overall objective of the project. The Evaluator was not able to visit any actual Capacity Development activities since they had taken place before the end of the project. However, noteworthy were the substantial records kept by the CSOs and shared with UNDP and EU on the number of participants, locations and duration of each training, survey opinions. In fact such record keeping, in the Evaluator’s experience, is (surprisingly) rare indeed across the world – many examples of CD activities are given in Table 2 and won’t be repeated here. Generally, the Beneficiaries met by the Evaluator generally enthused about the project’s concerns for socio-economic rights.

As it happens an initial Capacity Needs Assessment (CNA) was the main focus of this part of the project and initially 10 CSOs participated. The capacity development plans prepared and defined the capacity building areas and CNA was carried out diligently. Followed soon after the M&E training when 18 people from all 12 CSOs developed their knowledge and skills in monitoring and evaluation techniques, results chain, innovation in M&E, reports structure, etc. Training professionally accomplished the UNDP reported that the 12 CSOs confirmed that the training enhanced their knowledge in M&E.

The most important skill learned was the cooperation with UNDP and EU and not the task of a single NGO but the tasks of different stakeholders. I was impressed with the project.

*Vusal Mirzayev, President, LGA*

Human Rights training was conducted on 13-14 February 2018, when 17 people from 12 CSOs participated in the training. The HRBA guidelines for the CSO modified for Azerbaijan was also prepared.

However, despite training being successfully accomplished but Human Rights is still problematic in Azerbaijan hence a target much harder to accomplish but through no fault of the project itself. Some of the participating CSOs (e.g. MPA) already included (or plan to do) HRBA in their thematic trainings for their target groups.

Training on Communication and Advocacy was conducted on 25-26 January 2018. The 18 representatives from 12 CSOs enhanced their knowledge and skills in PR/communication and advocacy strategies and tools. Once the training was professionally accomplished the UNDP found that the CSOs (e.g. WARD, CRF, CESD) noted that they started redesign of their PR/Communication strategies.

All beneficiaries/CSOs the Evaluator met during the mission in Baku, Sheki and Mingachevir acknowledged the capacity building support of UNDP in several dimensions: in parallel to the trainings in the thematic areas like monitoring and evaluation, communication/advocacy, gender and human rights, the project also supported the CSOs, providing day-to-day advice and guidance in procurement processes, reporting, visibility and other areas. The project also connected the NGOs with other NGOs outside of the project framework where the NGOs sought advice.

For instance, in the meeting in Baku with Naila Hashimova, Chair of Eurasian Partnership Foundation, the Evaluator was struck to hear from the expert that with his experience in many projects for almost 15 years and that it was the first time that he had seen that city-based NGOs so closely worked with the regional NGOs, in capacity development as well as advocacy interventions.

Besides the UNDP capacity building component, the project created a framework for another cycle of capacity enhancement interventions. A considerable number of people-beneficiaries gained skills and knowledge in their professional fields as well as new areas. For instance:

* A math’s teacher had attended a MPA training session on how to portray better her subject matter through graphical data. She was enthused about the CD course and was keen to attend a follow-up should there be one. Further, even though the course she attended was without charge, she said she was willing to pay for future training suggesting an undiscovered and sustainable benefit for future courses – at least for those who could afford them;
* EPF confirmed those regional NGOs benefitting of their CD trainings, became more skillful to generate funds from the State NGO Council for the first time.

**Expected Result (a.k.a. Estimated Output) 2:** Social inclusion and socio-economic rights of vulnerable groups particularly women, PWD, children and young people, imprisoned persons advanced at the local level

The challenges of PwDs were addressed and advocated to a broader public through trainings that included 30 SWs, 20 lawyers 60 DBs, 100 school teachers and 50 health personnel, all sensitized to deliver social services to PwDs.

Evidence and examples on how to include prevention-oriented multidisciplinary service for vulnerable children was piloted in Baku via FCC. The training provided to the FCC staff and specialist drew upon international experience (such as, for instance, that of Georgia and Lithuania), to ensure that staffing and modalities functioned properly so as to address the needs of the vulnerable and at-risk children in Azerbaijan. The trained FCC staff multiplied the CD outreach to the regional specialist through trainings and mentoring. A website [www.mhjj.az](http://www.mhjj.az) was created to promote the resolution of issues related to child/ adolescent mental health and juvenile justice. An electronic off-line database, with information on 154 cases related to children and families receiving care at the FCC was created to systematize all the medical and social records. FCC staff were trained on data management and subsequent supervision. It should also be acknowledged that the public sector was involved through a network of governmental and non-governmental bodies, especially the MoH, that were established for the facilitation of the preventive component of JJ reforms. In the meeting with the Director of the Mental Health Centre, where FCC is located, it was confirmed that the MoH will establish more such early-intervention and identification centres using the experience and resources of the FCC.

The prison population in Azerbaijan was an acute concern of the project with prison monitoring services set up in Baku, Ganja and Sheki and prison libraries supported in Baku, Salyan, Ganja and Sheki. The aim of the work in prisons, where many were incarcerated for the lesser charge of drug use, was rehabilitation so that the prisoners could return to private life and not be damaged by their experience to such an extent that they would soon commit misdemeanours again and be back in prison (known as recidivism).

Some of the activities were legal aid and psychological mentoring service established in Sheki Prison, that is now fully operational; vocational woodcutting class established in Sheki Prison and functioning; International experience in prison administration presented in the Sheki prison; 100 prison staff with improved service respecting human rights.

Some of the businesses in the prisons we work with will continue into the future thereby sending a message to Government that CSOs can do useful things.

*Rahman Mammadov, Regional Director of the Ministry of Justice.*

The Evaluator visited Sheki Penitentiary (Prison) along with the CSO Uluchay and was briefed by the Prison Governor who then accompanied us on a tour of the prison. We saw where rehabilitation projects were taking place such as gardening and carpentry and met with some of the prisoners. Refreshing was that we were allowed to ask any question we wished and noted that tools were readily available for the prisoners in the workshop. The object of prison training, as noted above, was to allow the prisoners to gain a skill that could then be used on the outside. It was impressive to meet an ex-prisoner in his home whose wife had been given a sewing machine that was being used to create local products for sale. The arrangement looked very harmonious. We didn’t know how often such activities were carried out around the country but a later meeting with the Regional Director of the Ministry of Justice in Sheki showed understanding of the project and sympathy to the issue of socio-economic rights for prisoners. The Director acknowledged that while legal and psychological aid is provided in various prisons, this project’s uniqueness is also lies in its support related to business, i.e. business trainings, small business set-up, which definitely serve to address the employment concerns of the prisoners after release.

Given the reputation of Azerbaijan internationally of not always being lenient to incarcerated people, it was an awakening for us that progress was being made in even one establishment. This bodes well for the future since such changes occur slowly and it is encouraging for the future of socio-economic rights for prisoners. One can never know whether such activities will be sustainable as ideas change over time, but that prisoners can re-enter society and create new activities for themselves must be a plus for Azerbaijan in the future. Not only would widespread use of rehabilitation of prisoners cause less crime it would also lead to less costs for prison services as the prison population declines.

Some figures show the impact on the prison population with prison monitoring groups established in Baku, Ganja and Sheki; 6 trainings provided; 2 educational books produced for the prisoners (human rights, legislation, etc); manuals for prison monitors produced, disseminated to the relevant structures; it also been approved as the textbook for the law department of the State university, to better educate the future law enforcement structures; informal prison monitoring groups in Baku, Ganja and Sheki were also established. Then 710 prisoners received legal and psychological aid; 150 prisoners benefitted from business training, 9 business ideas were supported; about 200 prisoners were engaged in the woodcutting workshop; and 3 social enterprises were established within the Sheki Penitentiary Service. Then 150 entrepreneurs have been informed about the employment concerns of the ex-prisoners. The Government policymakers were consistently involved and addressed across the Regions.

Other concerns in this ‘Expected result’ were the conditions of PwDs. These were addressed in public awareness raising meetings in 6 regions with the participation of 300 people; coupled with 2 country-wide TV programs on the protection of PWD rights, with outreach to about 400,000 people.

Then a “Guide to the Rights of Persons with Disabilities” was published in 1000 copies and disseminated and Action Plans for 2018-2021 on ensuring the rights of PWDs in Sheki-Zagatala region were developed to address the concerns and provide better social services for PwDs. It is also noteworthy that Action Plans are submitted to the MLSPP, MoH, and MoE for their consideration. As noted in the interview/meeting with CRF working with PwDs, it was the first time to prepare Regional-level action plans to boost the development challenges of PwDs.

Through this project we did not only raise the challenges of the PwDs, but also helped to enhance capacities of the social workers of the Social Protection Fund. It was also the first time we developed the regionally focused development plans for PwDs.

*Alimammad Nuriyev, President, CRF*

**Expected Result (a.k.a. Estimated Output) 3:** Issues of non-discrimination and equality promoted through active engagement of civil society in community development and social inclusion

Summary visits together with an excellent UNDP monitoring report leads to the conclusion that each of the 12 CSOs produced materials from websites, to Facebook (e.g. Know and Protect Your Rights by LDPA), the policy papers, to promotional materials to handbooks can all be found in the CSO’s work, prison monitoring manual and have been documented in detail by UNDP. It can be noted that the publications viewed by the Evaluator were very professionally produced.

But these days, the attention span of readers is limited as they are bombarded with social media for almost everything. Hence more use of short videos and graphical presentation of data would have helped spread the CSO messages e.g. as done by MPA and Internews.

The project activities covered Baku and 17 regions of Azerbaijan. All CSOs implemented their activities in close collaboration with the ExComs, Ombudsman Office and regional branches of the Central Ministries.

In total, the main 12 project CSOs engaged over 150 local NGOs. For instance, 30 NGOs in Guba, Shirvan and Mingechevir regions joined the Civil Society Platform and were integrated with the Open Government Platform; 24 NGOs enhanced their organizational capacities; 9 NGOs were engaged in the research with significant outcomes.

In particular, the CESD showed an impact on improving the quality, efficiency and transparency of social policies in Azerbaijan and these were advocated and discussed in both the Ganja and Samukh regions. They also established a partnership with the Executive Committees of Ganja and Samukh, and the regional branches of the SSPF, Ombudsman Office. In addition CESD produced 5 policy papers including recommendations produced on social policies in Azerbaijan and submitted to the relevant Government institutions.

In turn, Internews created the www.svp.az website of the initiative on Civil Society Empowerment; launched the “Be the voice of silence!” campaign for “International Deaf & Dumb” Day with the participation of 25 CSOs.

For policy purposes, Internews established a partnership with the Ombudsman Apparatus, the Ministry of Education, Baku ExCom, and the Council on State Support to NGOs in Parliament.

Many examples may follow. The details are described in the Table 2.

* + 1. Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective

The project has reached its end and, as shown above, has accomplished its main objectives.

* 1. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management
     1. Management Arrangements

The main management arrangements of the project are feasible and are a driver for the project results. The Project’s efficiency was enhanced by the experienced team of national and international experts. The UNDP team is extensively experienced to support the programme activities. The CSOs teams were composed by the specialists with have long experience in the sector. The Executive Group (Project Board) together with the CSOs and experts met three times over the course of the project with one more meeting to be held at the end of May 2018 to wrap up the project.

Quarterly progress data have informed regular reviews of the project work plan to ensure that the activities implemented are most likely to achieve the desired results according to the UNDP’s ‘Implementation and Monitoring Stage Quality Report’. Evidence presented showed that data and lessons learned were used to inform course corrections as needed. Budget revisions were made accordingly.

The project targeted specific groups and geographic areas and then engaged regularly with the targeted groups to continually assess whether they benefitted as expected and, if not, adjustments were made where necessary to refine targeting.

* + 1. Work Planning

Work planning and project implementation flows were efficient according to the Monitoring Report and discussions held with all CSOs by the Evaluator. Document review and stakeholder consultations pointed to the fact that outputs were delivered in a timely manner and that the project approaches and interventions were viable and efficient in achievement of results. Also, the interviews revealed the Project’s openness and inclusion of partners from the government and civil society at all levels of interventions in planning and implementation of the project activities, strengthening the relevance of the project to the development context of Azerbaijan. Details of the work planning is given in Annex 3 (Matrix of Partner Activities) of the Inception report – there it can be seen that the attention to detail was indeed impressive in such a complex project.

* + 1. Finance

The project monitors its own costs and, because of the many activities, can only cover anecdotal evidence of cost effectiveness such as spending less to get the same result. There is systematic analysis of costs and the expected quality of results delivered. The project coordinates activities with other projects to achieve cost efficiency gains as far as is possible. It has also maintained a regular control and monitoring over the flow of project funds. These have also been coordinated with other UNDP projects as has the cost of international consultants for the training of the CSOs on M&E, gender issues and in SDG links. Following the efficient use of the project funds, a considerable saving was available for the additional funding of the CSO interventions and CD support.

* + 1. Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems

The project produced an excellent report at the beginning of its work on March 16 2016 covering ‘Implementation and Monitoring Stage Quality Assurance’. The project was considered to be ‘Highly Satisfactory’ in its M&E, and led to the conclusion that ‘Closely monitoring the results and feedback from the beneficiaries and target groups’ had benefits in that the close monitoring of ‘results and feedback from the beneficiaries and target groups’ led to the project to ‘initiate new activities to complement the achievements of its already implemented activities’ such as HRBA guidelines for the Azerbaijani NGOs, organization of Innovation/Social Enterprise training with showcase from the regional successful enterprises.

On evaluation, the Evaluator can attest to the thoroughness of the exercise as, he hopes, is well reported herein this report. The evaluation followed, as can be seen above, the outcome-impact/results-based approach for overall evaluation and used standard, collaborative and participatory methods closely engaging UNDP Country Office, the European Union Delegation, partner CSOs, project team and any key stakeholders as relevant.

**Table 3: Evaluation Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for “Enabling civil society to play a greater role in promoting socio-economic rights of vulnerable population” Project**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Achievement Description** |
| **Project Strategy** | Overall approach Rating: 1 |
| **Progress Towards Results** | Objective Achievement Rating: 2 |
| Outcome 1 Achievement Rating: 2 |
| Output 2 Achievement Rating: 2 |
| Output 3 Achievement Rating: 2 |
| **Project Implementation & Adaptive Management** | 1 |
| **Sustainability** | 2 [as noted why below and hardly the result of UNDP interventions simply how the original projects were set up] |

* + 1. Stakeholder Engagement

The stakeholder model of institutional activity, pioneered by Prof. Ed Freeman of the Darden School in USA, identified key stakeholders as those who have power to affect the roll-out of an activity such as a project and those who are affected by the project. In the case of this project the key stakeholders are the CSOs, EU, and UNDP with engagement of the local authorities and general public at large. While the latter case includes not only the general population of Azerbaijan, but particularly vulnerable groups, including women, PWD, children and young people, imprisoned persons. Further, it was expected that improved legal and social services to PWDs would reach out to families and individuals, and PWDs in the targeted regions. Final beneficiaries of activities focusing on protecting and promoting economic and social rights of prisoners for their rehabilitation and reintegration of into society were the prisoners in the penitentiary institutions in Baku and surrounding regions (about 15.000 persons), Salyan region (550), Ganja city (530) and in Sheki city (900 people). It was also expected that the activity would provide benefit for about 450-500 women. Finally, activities for support to the vulnerable people in the project context enhanced the institutional arrangements, skills and knowledge availability and increased advocacy profile of CSOs to better address the challenges of the target people.

* + 1. Reporting

The contractual obligations between the UNDP and the EU, ensured that all Reports should be approved by the EU Contracting Authority. In line with this but also similar to UNDP’s standards and procedures for reporting, the project reporting complied with the requirements as specified in the Section 4.2 of the Description of the Action and was followed during the project over 2016-2018.

* + 1. Communications

The project worked on designing and implementing communication and advocacy strategies to ensure awareness-raising and understanding of the socio-economic rights framework to the potential stakeholders, beneficiaries and concerned authorities, especially the most vulnerable and affected communities and groups of population. One of the most important aspects covered by the Project advocacy and awareness raising efforts were the rights and opportunities for the vulnerable groups targeted by this action, particularly women and children. The main communication activities included press-releases, publications and other promotional documents. The social media and other tools were used as per the project activities. Finally, all publications and other promotional documents acknowledge the EU support.

* 1. Sustainability
     1. Financial Risks to Sustainability

The main problem with grant based projects is whether there are continuing needs for finance to achieve continuing success or whether the project’s activities can either be adopted as Government policy activities or start to generate their own funds. Thus the risk of curtailment, once donor support ends, is a real constraint. Unfortunately, few of the 12 CSOs are in the situation of continuing sustainability without donor support. Consequently, the conclusions in the section below address the sorts of actions that could be envisaged through converting all or part of the 12 projects into social enterprises (or part of them as relevant).

* + 1. Socio-economic Sustainability

There are clear risks that the political situation in Azerbaijan may change, almost at any time thereby curtailing ‘human rights’ type activities. However, as the Government gradually becomes aware that the CSOs are providing a service to vulnerable groups, there is little doubt that this project has set the ball rolling in many directions and that that particular ‘socio-economic’ rights ball will be difficult, if not unwelcome to stop. The many stakeholders involved who have been awakened by the project will certainly find new ways to continue many of the activities simply because they make sense – mental health, prisoner rehabilitation, gender rights etc. will simply not go away and the project and the CSOs should be congratulated for their efforts.

* + 1. Institutional framework and governance risks to Sustainability

It is a fact of life that welcome interventions by essentially charitable bodies do not necessarily continue as noted in the previous paragraphs unless there is a strong sustainable ring to the actions. Of course those areas, such as PwDs and incarcerated people, are examples of where people cannot be necessarily helped to help themselves and benevolent Government action is needed. Right across the world such issues present themselves and it does seem that Azerbaijan does actually care. Yes more can always be done and sometimes Government policy gets in the way, but piece by piece as the project shows, institutions and governance are slowly coming together to address the socio-economic rights issues of vulnerable groups and, of course, Azerbaijan continues to be an oil rich nation that does have funds to continue positive activities such as those addressed in this project. The many communications from the project in their different forms are helping to change the mental environment and encourage systems to be built which are both necessary and therefore difficult to break down should political will change.

* + 1. Environmental risks to Sustainability

As it happens, none of the projects address environmental issues directly. Given the worldwide concern with Global Warming coupled with Azerbaijan’s previously pristine seas, mountains, lakes, rivers and pastures perhaps more could be done to address these longer-term issues. One hopeful, if small, sign was this Evaluator noticing how the Caspian Sea showed fewer oil slicks on its shore in Baku than a decade ago suggesting there is a concern which is positive not only for Azerbaijan but also the world at large.

1. Conclusions and Recommendations

**Conclusion 1:** Due to events outside the control of UNDP leading to a radical change in Government strategy most NGO’s activities were closed down in 2014. Thus during the period 2014 to 2016 the NGO sector was almost demolished – for instance the WARD project assisting women since 2000 nearly closed and its Director informed the Evaluation team that it would have probably closed without EU/UNDP assistance over 2016-2018. The UNDP inherited a EU funded project originally aimed at NGOs to improve the Human Rights of Vulnerable Groups with a project valued, originally, at approx Euro 6mn. After the 2014 changes, the EU funded a number of projects for a third the latter amount via UNDP so as to preserve the human capital built up in CSOs over the decades. The Evaluator’s overall conclusion is that UNDP rose to the challenge extremely well, helped by a superb project manager, Gulshan Rzayeva with long experience of both the UNDP and the private sector, as well as the excellent staff of the UNDP from its Resident Coordinator and right across the organization.

**Recommendation 1:** The UNDP is a very helpful ally to the EU and the Government of Azerbaijan in working on complex development projects and related activity. As such the UNDP should be first choice in future development projects that have a strong human development and rights flavor.

**Conclusion 2:** The methodology of evaluation is complex and highly procedural as reading through this report illustrates. Readers will also see it is not that easy to actually find out the strengths and weaknesses of the project when confronted with so many tables, methodologies and annexes.

**Recommendation 2:** The evaluation methodology could be sharply revised and reduced. Some suggestions to do this through adopting a 3M approach (Macro, Meso, Micro) are made below.

**Conclusion 3:** Because of the sensitivity of the issue of Human Rights in Azerbaijan, as in many other countries since its application is a process as well as highly politically sensitive, the full application of human rights was neither defined in detail in the project nor applied fully. The notion of socio-economic rights was therefore the choice made but not fully spelled out, however.

**Recommendation 3:** Even if not fully utilized, the concept behind what the project is trying to do should be clearly specified as far as is possible.

**Conclusion 4:** Perhaps the most important conclusion emanating from the evaluation – is the issue of ‘sustainability’ and the link to ‘social enterprise’. In that connection it is worth quoting the following *“The reality is that the old NGO model simply cannot be sustained in a time of shrinking government funding and increased calls for efficiency and impact in international development. It is time to realize that NGOs need to become more independent from governments, financially resilient and accountable for their activities.”* [Chris Meyer zu Natrup, “[From NGO to social business](https://www.devex.com/news/from-ngo-to-social-business-why-and-how-84259)[[8]](#footnote-8)”, Devex, September 2, 2014]

Many, but not all, of the project interventions could be made more sustainable by including a cost recovery component. In fact, this is the current vogue through creating social enterprises. For instance, the many training activities could have a price to participants. These would be more of activities where, for instance, professionals such as teachers come to learn more about how data can be presented more attractively so as to increase understanding of difficult to read data sets. Or where a beneficiary is given a small grant to create a business thereby benefitting their family after a traumatic experience such as imprisonment has created family disruption. Instead of giving a grant, one could think of training to produce a business plan which would then lead to a partial grant or loan. In that way the loan could be paid back as well as giving an incentive to the small business to be as efficient as possible. It so happens that 50% or so of small businesses do collapse in the first year. But the beneficiary has learned a lot and can take that experience forward. While the benefactor, UNDP in this case, will gain some revenue to re-use to invest in new job creating activities or even help people who cannot help themselves. These latter are beneficiaries such as those in prison or those severely handicapped.

**Recommendation 4:** Projects, in general, should be composed of a mixed strategy of cost recovery (though social enterprise) and grants to people who cannot help themselves.

**Conclusion 5:** In relation to the previous conclusion, Most CSOs (NGOs) have three huge problems.

First, they are partial in that their activities generally only cover a part of the larger problems they tackle (e.g. education, health, agriculture, energy, etc). They are either confined to a limited geographic area or only part of the larger issues (e.g. females in primary education). Often NGOs simply do the work that governments either neglect or can’t afford to do.

Second, their mind set is largely people focused but doesn’t normally include business skills and tends to be more outward than inward focused regarding sustainable funding.

Third, at the end of every project cycle they look for funding in grant form and may spend as much as half their time looking for potential new donors.

Of course, many prominent NGOs such as Amnesty International, Transparency International, Greenpeace, World Wildlife Fund, Médecins Sans Frontières and the International Red Cross are either advocacy organisations or performing tasks across countries that national governments can’t do.

But many, if not most, NGOs are supported by external funds and basically decline or even collapse once their funds dry up. Many governments from the rich world support NGOs through their aid budgets with additional support coming from philanthropic donors in their countries.

But external donor aid is starting to dry up as growing ‘populism’ and ‘illiberalism’ make people and even countries more inward looking and selfish. Even philanthropists are starting to examine socially responsible investments. There, as the Union Bank of Switzerland (UBS) recently noted, an investment in a socially responsible activity could lead to modest returns and help preserve one’s capital. But, philanthropy means all money invested is totally lost and the return on investment is zero. Clearly, an alternative that leads to sustainability through money earning activities that generate some profit is highly attractive. That is why the notion of a Sustainable Social Enterprise has risen so quickly and is becoming so popular around the world.

**Recommendation 5:** The UNDP, together with the Azerbaijani Government, should be encouraged to investigate how best to shift their grant giving projects to those involving, at least in part, a cost recovery component through the practice of social enterprise methodology.

**Conclusion 6:** Many, if not all, of the 12 CSOs focused upon service delivery more than policy dialogue or capacity development.

Given the EU and UNDP understandable concern both with improving policy and with capacity development. The Evaluator has suggested elsewhere to UNDP that projects/programmes in general should always have three components - the 3-M (Macro/Meso/Micro) approach. Each project or programme has macro, meso and micro components although the weight given to each level will be different in each case.

The first level is the **macro** or upstream policy environment that shapes the macro socio-economic environment which Governments normally concentrate upon and within which programmes, interventions and policies are designed that reach down to the poorest groups in society.

The second level is the **meso** level that links the macro to the micro. It is where most capacity development takes place and is also where more efficient ‘governance’ is required and, arguably, is where most UNDP effort should lie. Thus the meso level is concerned with the translation of macro advice into operational activities. These are the types of interventions that help to improve the Government's ability to deliver policies formulated at the macro level to the base; or, conversely, those formulated at the micro level (or base) to the macro level. They also include what is increasingly being referred to as the "social capital" of a country. Thus the meso level links the upstream to the downstream and the downstream to the upstream i.e. it acts as a river where the current flows in both directions.

The third level is the **micro** or downstream where bottom-up participatory approaches are located. This is where practical approaches will be situated to work with agents (public and private sectors, chambers of commerce, CSOs and CBOs, etc.) that have had proven success in contributing to poverty alleviation. They know who are the really poor and who are not. This includes all activities that directly touch households. The UNDP often refers to "upstream" and "downstream" activities.

For example, the macro level policy might be the provision of health services to those most in need; while at the meso level the delivery institution might be the Ministry of Health or an NGO organisation that can deliver and advise upon primary health care services; and the micro level is the direct contact that people will have with the pharmacists, health workers, midwives etc. At this last level we find actual provision of services to beneficiaries such as assisting grass roots organizations to help people to help themselves out of their own poverty, the provision of sanitation or bio-gas plants or the receipt of targeted support to incapacitated groups.

**Recommendation 6:** The 3-M methodology should be an essential part of most if not all UNDP projects. Thus the macro level asks the questions: Did Government policy change? Were new laws enacted? E.g. law against the discrimination of women? Were new institutions created or existing ones revamped or eliminated. Did women improve their level of participation?

The meso level asks such questions as: Was capacity development carried out? Was sustainability included? Was the project efficient? Was the modality of execution appropriate? Was a participatory approach adopted? How many people were trained? Could the project be replicated across the country?

Then the micro level asks specific questions such as: How many children now in school compared with start of programme? How many new jobs created? Need to apply a living standards questionnaire to assess impact at micro level which would then be applied at the beginning and end of programme and also to a control group.

**Conclusion 7:** Was the project SMART i.e. Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound? As noted in the above the notion of Human Rights was translated into **specific** activities. **Measurement** was not easy as issues such as capacity development are hard to do. The project did, what many have failed to do over the years, and that was to at least count the numbers included in the trainings and evaluate and monitor every training activity. The project certainly **attained** its objectives as discussed above with the high ratings given. **Relevance** was apt as many, if not all, of the CSOs praised the work of the UNDP in helping them to continue their work to help disadvantaged groups while encouraging the Government to re-examine, in a positive light, its own policies. The sustainability of the project, as discussed in the text, was not **Time-bound** since the investments of the project will continue far into the future.

**Recommendation 7:** In fact no specific recommendation is given by the Evaluator who, in turn, thought the SMART acronym was well handled within the project.

**Conclusion 8:** Did the project relate to the SDGs? In fact the SDGs were rarely mentioned in the ProDocs nor the many conversations with the CSOs themselves. Since the SDGS are mainly about development the UN ***Development*** Programme, the UNDP, naturally promotes development and the 17 SDGs. Perhaps the new addition of the SDGs to the UN’s armoury, is the greater involvement of the private sector in development activities.

**Recommendation 8:** In line with the SDGs the UNDP should make even more efforts, than now, to involve the private sector in their work. In particular the CEOs of the richest companies who, as will be discovered, are very keen to leave a legacy more than merely a great company but a legacy that contributes to the building of their nation i.e. development.

**Conclusion 9:** It is thus worth noting that structures and systems are important but, in the end, it is talented people who drive major change. The experience of the Evaluator was of surprise that most, if not all of the CSOs involved had creative, dynamic, eloquent and highly talented individuals both at their helm and in their organisations. From the first meeting to the last the Evaluator was struck by the deep commitment of so many talented individuals who combined grace and hard work with an invaluable characteristic – humour. Such people provide great hope for the future of Azerbaijan and the Evaluator was proud that it was a privilege to be able to help them in some small way.

**Recommendation 9:** Never forget that people are important for the future socio-economic development of their country and international organizations such as the EU and UNDP should continue their efforts to promote and help talented people as much as they can to create human rights, peace and development.

Annexes

Annex 1: Agenda of the field mission



Annex 2. Evaluation Matrix

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Question (EQ)** | **Indicators** | **Sources of Information** | **Data collection methods** |
| **EQ 1.** To what extent has the Project responded and remained relevant to the country priorities and in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country? | **Indicator 1. 1 Project** Objectives and results have linkages to the Azerbaijan’s national sector development priorities and plans of the country with regards to gender equality and the role of civil society.  **Indicator 1. 2** The Project intervention concept is aligned to identified needs regarding implementation of the HRBA (see Annex 1 above) as well as overall Human Rights for Vulnerable Groups priorities (High/Medium/Low). | Country Strategies, government gender related strategies/policy documents | Document analysis  Key Informant Interviews  Group discussions |
| **EQ 2** To what extent is the design of the Project concept and its modalities contributing to the effectiveness of the support? Are the project’s objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame? | **Indicator 2.1.** Project concept includes a sound intervention logic/results framework with SMART indicators and targets, in line with best practices, that enables most effective route towards expected/intended results  **Indicator 2.2.** Project concept provides clear definition of the problem to be addressed and the underlying assumptions  **Indicator 2.3.** Evidence of Project partners’ attempt to reviewany incorrect assumptions or changes to the context in order to ensure achievement of the project results as outlined in the Project Document.  **Indicator 2.4.** Percentage of lessons learned and recommendations from previous similar projects integrated in the project design.  **Indicator 2.5.** Project design and implementation was done in close consultation with the government partners to ensure country ownership | Project documentation, Key Informants | Document analysis  Key Informant Interviews |
| **EQ 3.** How efficiently, in terms of quality and quantity, has the Project been managed with regard to the financial and human resources available? | **Indicator 3.1.** Project implementation coordinated, monitored and reported within an overall supervision system (including the Project Board)  **Indicator 3.2**. Degree of respect of reporting requirements, cases reporting delays and their causes  **Indicator 3.3.** Adequacy of staffing vis-à-vis perceived/realized workload  **Indicator 3.4.** Degree of implementation delays and their causes  **Indicator 3.5.** Degree of adequacy of the budget vis-à-vis the volume of tasks carried out  **Indicator 3.6.** Work-planning processes are results-based and contribute to effectiveness of support  **Indicator 3.7.** Possible adjustments to the projects’ design (logical framework) and budget are justified, appropriate and relevant, accompanied by a sound analysis and communicated to the donor.  **Indicator 3.8.** Fiduciary and sound financial management rules allowed cost-effective and conscious implementation of project and informed decisions to allow for timely flow of funds  **Indicator 3.9.** Co-financing being is used strategically to help the objectives of the project as evidenced through regular meetings of all co-financing partners in order to align financing priorities and annual work plans | Project documentation, Key Informants | Document analysis  Key Informant Interviews |
| **EQ 4.** To What extent has the project developed and leveraged partnerships toward efficient and effective delivery of results? | **Indicator 4.1.** Collaborative leadership of the cooperation with direct and tangential stakeholders is efficient and effective, with transparent and timely decision-making  **Indicator 4.2.** Roles and responsibilities are agreed and clear  **Indicator 4.3.** The Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) execute their tasks with quality  **Indicator 4.4.** Degree to which lessons derived from the adaptive management process are documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.  **Indicator 4.5.** Support provided by the Project Beneficiary CSOs contributes to efficiency and effectiveness of support | Project documentation, Key Informants | Document analysis  Key Informant Interviews |
| **EQ 5.** To what extent has the monitoring system contributed to effective reflection of progress towards delivery of results? | **Indicator 5.1.** Monitoring system and related tools effectively tracks progress of individual project activities and the broader development aspects  **Indicator 5.2.** Monitoring system setup is accessible for involvement of key partners and aligned with national systems  **Indicator 5.3**. Adequacy of resources allocated to monitoring and evaluation | Project documentation, Key Informants | Document analysis  Key Informant Interviews |
| **EQ 6.** To what extent do the communication systems in place for the project contribute to efficient awareness raising and information on project progress and intended impact to the partners and public? | **Indicator 6.1.** The project’s Communication strategy is in place and contributes to regular and effective communication with key stakeholders (to ensure no key stakeholder is left out of communication)  **Indicator 6.2.** Communication tools include feedback mechanisms **I**  **ndicator 6.3.** Degree to which communication with stakeholders contributes to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and investment in the sustainability of project results **I**  **Indicator 6.4.** Evidence of appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns to raise awareness of public on project progress and intended impact | Project documentation, Key Informants | Document analysis  Key Informant Interviews |
| **EQ 7.** To what extent has the project achieved its results? | **Indicator 7.1**. CSO beneficiaries for each of the 12 CSOs various capacity building interventions (trainings, workshops, etc.) feel confident to work on advancement of the application of the human-rights based approach  **Indicator 7.2.** CSOs, beneficiaries of various capacity building interventions (trainings, workshops, etc.), have opportunity to apply and practice their acquired skills to work on advancement of the application of the human-rights based approach  **Indicator 7.3.** VG (Vunerable Group) activists, beneficiaries of various capacity building interventions (trainings, workshops, etc.) feel confident to better exercise their right to social participation  **Indicator 7.4.** VG activists, beneficiaries of various capacity building interventions (trainings, workshops, etc.), have opportunity to apply and practice their acquired skills to exercise their right to human rights  **Indicator 7.5.** VGs, beneficiaries of Project activities, feel confident to exercise their human rights.  **Indicator 7.6.** VulnVGs, beneficiaries of various project support activities, have opportunity to apply and practice their acquired skills to exercise their human rights.  **Indicator 7.7**. Supported CSOs are institutionalised where necessary to fulfil their missions  Main drivers and hindering factors affecting achievement of results | Project documentation, Key Informants | Document analysis  Key Informant Interviews  Focus Group discussions  Site observations |
| **EQ 8** What is the level of Project’s contribution to overall objective? What are the sustainability prospects of achieved results? | **Indicator 8.1.** Evidence of positive contribution of the project to beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, human rights, improved governance etc.)  **Indicator 8.2.** Evidence that the projects activities made a visible contribution to enhanced role of civil society in advancing human rights of VGs  **Indicator 8.3.** Level of commitment of local and national government stakeholders to support the objectives of the project  **Indicator 8.4.** Local and national government partners continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation  **Indicator 8.5.** Mechanisms in place to ensure sustainability of results at local and national levels | Project documentation, Key Informants | Document analysis  Key Informant Interviews  Focus Group discussions  Site observations |

Annex 3 Terms of Reference

**For the final evaluation of the UNDP/EU project**

**“Enabling civil society to play a greater role in advancing socio-economic rights of vulnerable population”**

**Title:** Evaluation Consultant Dr. Michael Hopkins

### Location: Baku, Azerbaijan

### Type of contract: Individual Contract

**Starting date:** 05 March 2018

**End date:** 31 May 2018

**PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

The project titled “Enabling civil society to play a greater role in advancing socio-economic rights of vulnerable population” is funded by the EU Delegation to Azerbaijan and implemented by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). The project is designed to support civil society in Azerbaijan in promoting human rights and fundamental freedoms, with a focus on vulnerable groups.

The overall objective of the action is to advance socio-economic rights of vulnerable populations (particularly women, Persons with disability (PWD), children and young people, imprisoned persons) in Azerbaijan.

The specific objectives of the action are the followings:

1. Build capacity of civil society organisations to promote social inclusion and human-rights based approach
2. Support small scale community projects through non-governmental organizations to promote socio-economic rights, issues of equality and non-discrimination.

The areas tackled within the Project include: a) promotion and protection of the rights of vulnerable groups; b) promotion and protection of economic, social and cultural rights; c) promotion of non-discrimination and equality, including gender equality and equality for persons belonging to minorities and vulnerable groups; and d) promotion of tolerance. The project beneficiaries are women, people and children with disabilities, prisoners and others socially vulnerable populations.

The results of the project are focused upon development of vibrant civil society advocating for and working on social inclusion and advancing rights of vulnerable groups. To achieve this, UNDP partners with 12 civil society organisations (CSO) with experience and track record in working for and with vulnerable groups. Each of these organisations tackles the important issues towards achievement of expected results and objectives set by the Action. The activities are implemented in different regions of Azerbaijan.

Capacity development approach constitutes the principal methodology for the implementation of all activities proposed by the action. As practiced and promoted by UNDP, an essential ingredient in the capacity development approach is to bring about transformation that is generated and sustained over time from within.

The indicative project activities are structured under the three Expected Results as below:

**Expected Result 1. Capacity of targeted civil society organisations increased to utilize human-rights based approach in advancing the social inclusion, equality and socio-economic rights of the vulnerable groups;**

**Activity 1.1** Develop and conduct detailed Capacity Development Needs Assessment

**Activity 1.2** Capacity Building for utilisation of human rights based approach

**Activity 1.3** Develop and implement Monitoring and Evaluation, and quality assurance systems

**Activity 1.4** Develop and implement PR/communication strategy

**Expected Result 2: Social inclusion and socio-economic rights of vulnerable groups, particularly women, PWD, children and young people, imprisoned persons, advanced at the local level**

**Activity 2.1** Increasing Capacities of state and non-state actors for provision of legal and social services to PWDs

**Activity 2.2** Increasing Capacity of CSOs in the field of Juvenile Delinquency prevention, early detection and intervention

**Activity 2.3** Preparation and delivery of prison monitoring services

**Activity 2.4** Protecting and promoting economic and social rights of prisoners for their rehabilitation and reintegration of into society.

**Expected Result 3: Issues of non-discrimination and equality promoted through active engagement of civil society in community development and social inclusion**

**Activity 3.1** Build partnership with national and local government and advocate for and promote the issues of non-discrimination and equality

**Activity 3.2** Develop networking and partnerships with and between CSOs working on the issues of non-discrimination and equality

**Activity 3.3** Build Infrastructure and Documentation Resource for civil society and National Women’s Machinery

**Activity 3.4** Enhance Technical and practical civil society capacity to improve the legal, institutional and policy framework for socio-economic empowerment of women in remote areas

**EVALUATION GOAL AND OBJECTIVES**

The overall objective of the Final Evaluation is to assess the progress towards achievement of project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document, and assess the relevance and sustainability of outputs as contributions to long-term development changes. In general, the Final Evaluation will:

1. Measure to what extent the project has fully implemented their activities, delivered intended outputs and attained outcomes and specifically measuring development results;
2. Generate substantive evidence-based knowledge by identifying best practices and lessons learned that could be useful for other development interventions at national (scale up) and international level (replicability);
3. Measure to what extend the project has attained the development results to the targeted population, beneficiaries, participants whether individuals, communities, institutions;
4. Measure the project contribution to the objectives set in their respective specific thematic areas;
5. Identify and document substantive lessons learned and good practices on the specific topics of the thematic window, Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) with the aim to support the sustainability of the project or some of its components;
6. Evaluate the findings in relation to one or more of the related SDG thematic windows.

**EVALUATION APPROACH & METHODOLOGY**

The evaluation will use methodologies and techniques determined for the specific needs of the action and must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. the Project Document, project inception and progress reports, project budget revisions, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based review).

The evaluator is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach[[9]](#footnote-9) ensuring close engagement with the UNDP Country Office, European Union Delegation, partner CSOs, project team and other key stakeholders. Stakeholder involvement should include the key informant interviews with the key experts and consultants in the subject area, project team, partners and beneficiaries, etc.

The final evaluation report should provide the evaluation methodology and its rationale, describing the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the review.

**DETAILED SCOPE OF THE FINAL EVALUATION**

The scope of the final evaluation will cover all activities undertaken in the framework of the project. The evaluator will compare planned outputs of the project to actual outputs and assess the actual results to determine their contribution to the attainment of the project objective.

The evaluator will assess the following four categories of project progress.

1. **Project Strategy**

Project design:

* Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
* Assess to what extend this model of initiatives was the best option to respond to the development challenges in a sustainable way?
* Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?
* Review how the project addresses country priorities. Was the project concept in line with the national development priorities of the country?
* Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?
* If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

Results Framework/Logical Framework Matrix:

* Undertake a critical analysis of the project’s logframe indicators and targets, assess how “SMART” the end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound).
* Are the project’s objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame?
* Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women’s empowerment, improved governance etc...) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.
* Verify whether the broader development aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. Develop and recommend SMART ‘development’ indicators.

1. **Progress Towards Results**

Analysis of Progress towards Outcomes:

* Review the Logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix and colour code progress in a “traffic light system” based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as “Not on target to be achieved” (red).

**Table. Progress towards Results Matrix (Achievement of outcomes and outputs against End-of-project Targets)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Strategy** | **Indicator[[10]](#footnote-10)** | **Baseline Level[[11]](#footnote-11)** | **End-of-project Target** | **Achievement Rating[[12]](#footnote-12)** | **Justification for Rating** |
| **Outcome 1:** | Indicator 1: |  |  |  |  |
| **Output 1:** | Indicator 1.1: |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 1.2: |  |  |
| Indicator 1.3: |  |  |
| **Output 2:** | Indicator 2.1: |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 2.2: |  |  |
| Indicator 2.3: |  |  |
| **Output 3:** | Indicator 3.1: |  |  |  |  |
| Indicator 3.2: |  |  |
| Indicator 3.3: |  |  |

**Indicator Assessment Key**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Green= Achieved | Yellow= On target to be achieved | Red= Not on target to be achieved |

In addition to the analysis of progress towards outcomes and outputs:

* Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project.
* By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits.

**Project Implementation and Adaptive Management**

Management Arrangements:

* Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.
* Review the quality of execution of the Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.

Work Planning:

* Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved.
* Are work-planning processes results-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results?
* Examine the use of the project’s results framework/Logframe as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start.

Finance and co-finance:

* Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.
* Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.
* Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds?

Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:

* Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive?
* Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively?

Stakeholder Engagement:

* Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?
* Participation and country-driven processes: Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in support of efficient and effective project implementation?
* Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?

Reporting:

* Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Stakeholders.
* Assess how well the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfil reporting requirements.
* Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

Communications:

* Review internal project communication with stakeholders: Is communication regular and effective? Are there key stakeholders left out of communication? Are there feedback mechanisms when communication is received? Does this communication with stakeholders contribute to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and investment in the sustainability of project results?
* Review external project communication: Are proper means of communication established or being established to express the project progress and intended impact to the public.

1. **Sustainability**

Assess the following risks to sustainability:

Financial risks to sustainability:

* What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the EU grant assistance ends (consider potential resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and other funding that will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project’s outcomes)?

Socio-economic risks to sustainability:

* Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project?

Environmental risks to sustainability:

* Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?

1. **Conclusions & Recommendations**

The evaluator will include a section of the report setting out the evaluation’s evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.

Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant.

The evaluator should make no more than 15 recommendations total.

1. **Ratings**

The evaluator will include the ratings of the project’s results and brief descriptions of the associated achievements in *Evaluation Ratings & Achievement Summary Table* in the evaluation report. See Annex E for ratings scales. No rating on Project Strategy and no overall project rating is required.

**Table. Evaluation Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for “Enabling civil society to play a greater role in promoting socio-economic rights of vulnerable population” Project**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Achievement Description** |
| **Project Strategy** |  |
| **Progress Towards Results** | Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |
| Outcome 1 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |
| Output 1 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |
| Output 2 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |
| Output 3 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale) |
| **Project Implementation & Adaptive Management** | (rate 6 pt. scale) |
| **Sustainability** | (rate 4 pt. scale) |

**TIMEFRAME**

The total duration of the final evaluation will be approximately 3 months starting 05 March 2018.

Total number of working days: 25.

The tentative evaluation timeframe is as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **TIMEFRAME** | **ACTIVITY** |
| 16-26 March 2018 | * Desktop review of materials; * Preparing evaluation methodology (“Inception Report”); * Planning of evaluation mission to Azerbaijan. |
| 2 April -12 April 2018  20 April - 10 May 2018 | During the mission in Azerbaijan (10 days in April):   * Debriefing with project administrators * Evaluation mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, visits, 2-3 field visits as necessary; * Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings   Home-based work upon completion of mission:   * Submission of draft report * Preparation & Issue of Management Response * Submission of final report |

**DELIVERABLES**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Deliverable** | **Description** | **Timing** | **Responsibilities** |
| **1** | **Inception Report** | Evaluator clarifies objectives, methods, and deadlines of evaluation | 1 week before the evaluation mission to Azerbaijan | Evaluator submits to project management |
| **2** | **Presentation** | Initial Findings | End of evaluation mission | Evaluator presents to project management and UNDP CO |
| **3** | **Draft Final Report** | Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes | Within 4 weeks after the mission | Sent to the UNDP CO, reviewed by Project Coordinating Unit, EUD |
| **4** | **Final Report** | Revised report detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final report | Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft | Sent to the UNDP CO |

**All deliverables must be in English.** If applicable, the UNDP may choose to arrange for a translation of the report into a language more widely shared by national stakeholders.

**Inception Report** should be prepared by the evaluator before going into the full-fledged data collection exercise. It should detail the evaluator’s understanding of what is being evaluated and why, showing how each evaluation question will be answered by way of: proposed methods, proposed sources of data and data collection procedures.

**IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS**

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP Country Office (UNDP CO) in Baku, Azerbaijan.

The commissioning unit will contract the consultant and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluator. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the evaluator to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange visits.

**Qualifications and Competencies**

One independent evaluator will perform the evaluation. The evaluator should have prior experience in reviewing or evaluating similar projects. Experience with UNDP/EU financed projects is an advantage. The consultants have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) cannot apply for this consultancy and should not have a conflict of interest with project’s related activities.

The selection of consultants will be aimed at maximizing the overall qualities in the following areas:

* Minimum Master’s Degree in business administration, economics, regional development/planning, project assessment, or any other related fields **(15 points)**
* Experience and knowledge on gender equality and women’s empowerment, civil society or related **(15 points)**
* Recent experience (minimum 5 years) with result-based management evaluation methodologies and applying SMART indicators, reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios; **(15 points)**
* At least five years of experience in programme/project evaluation and proven accomplishments in undertaking evaluations for international organizations, strong knowledge of United Nations development agenda, the civil society and working with government authorities **(15 points)**
* Experience working with the EU or EU-evaluations will be considered as an asset; **(10 points)**

**Competencies**

* Strong reporting and communication skills;
* Excellent communication skills with various partners including donors;
* Demonstrable analytical and strategic thinking skills;
* Excellent written and spoken English and presentation capacities; working knowledge of Azerbaijani or Russian will be an asset;
* Result oriented.

**PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS**

* Payment will be done in three installments and based on completion of deliverables:
  + 1st instalment – 20% advance payment to cover travel costs, after signing the contract, March
  + 2nd instalment – 40% - deliverable 1 and 2 (inception report and presentation of initial findings), April
  + 3rd instalment – 40% - deliverables 3 and 4 (draft and final evaluation reports), May
* Financial proposal should be done as a lump sum in consideration of supposed travels (including accommodation, ticket and DSA).
* The breakdown is necessary.
* Daily allowance for Baku/Azerbaijan is 176 USD.
* Total working days should be no more than 20 days.
* Total no of days in the country/field (evaluation mission in Azerbaijan): 10 days
* Only economy class is applied to international consultant travel.

**APPLICATION PROCESS[[13]](#footnote-13)**

Interested individual consultants must submit the following documents/information to demonstrate their qualifications:

**1. Cover Letter**

(i) Explaining why they are the most suitable for the work

(ii) Providing a brief methodology on how they will approach and conduct the work.

**2. Financial proposal,** i.e. total amount for completion of works, indicated in ToR

**3. A filled out and signed P11 form** with names and contacts of at least 2 referees.

**Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal:** Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined Scoring method – where the educational background and experience on similar assignments will be weighted at 70%and the price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring. The applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score that has also accepted UNDP’s General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

Additional requests stipulated in the ToR

The ToR stipulated fulfilment of the following task which are presented below together with an explanation how these will be tackled:

* The ToR outlined a request to fill in an indicator assessment table (See Table 4 below). Evaluator will add this assessment in the form of the table to the Effectiveness section of the Evaluation report.
* The ToR requires a note that summarizes the project’s progress towards results in terms of contribution to SDGs. The Evaluator will add this as an Annex to the Evaluation report.
* Develop and recommend SMART ‘development’ indicators. The Evaluator will recommend areas of improvement for indicators to make them more SMART.

Challenges and Opportunities

There are both theoretical and operational challenges to evaluating support to capacity building of civil society. Aside from the typical methodological challenge of assessing causality and determining attribution, the Evaluator will also need to devise a suitable analytical evaluation framework which enable him to assess the effectiveness and outcomes of support. Within the context of this evaluation, specific challenges include:

* A theoretical perspective: while there are certain definitions that are common to the concept of capacity development approach and its contribution to transformation that is generated and sustained over time from within, it will be a challenge to come to joint and clear definitions that are shared by all stakeholders when it comes to measuring the project results and outcomes. The Evaluator will address this challenge by working with clear definitions, and by taking great care in aligning the theoretical background with the research design and methodological tools.
* The nature of the process to improve the capacities of CSOs for advancing human rights of vulnerable groups. Analysing data in an evaluation is prone to delivering snapshot moments of certain phenomena, however capacity building programmes engage in a very complex field, and aim to influence development of the fundamental mechanisms of how civil society and societies interact. Change may be gradual in nature, and may take time to unfold and to have measurable effects. This makes the attribution of causality particularly challenging.

ANNEX 4: List of Documents reviewed by the Evaluator

1. UNDP Application to the EU Delegation, along with the Logical Framework Matrix
2. Description of Action
3. UNDP Project Document
4. Project Inception Report
5. All Project Progress Reports
6. Financial and Administration guidelines used by Project Team
7. Programme and Operations Policies and Procedures
8. UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
9. CSOs progress reports
10. Project site location maps
11. Handbook on Planning M&E Evaluation for Development Results

12. Minutes of the “Steering Committee” meetings

13. UNDP Human Rights Approach

14. UNDP Social and Environmental Standards (14 July 2014)

15. Environmental Standards (14 July 2014)

ANNEX 5: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants[[14]](#footnote-14)

**Evaluators/Consultants:**

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people’s right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people’s right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders’ dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study limitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

**Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form**

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System:

Name of Consultant: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.**

Signed at *\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (Place)* on *\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ (Date)*

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

ANNEX 6: Evaluation Ratings

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Ratings for Progress Towards Results:** (one rating for each outcome and for the objective) | | |
| 6 | Highly Satisfactory (HS) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve or exceed all its end-of-project targets, without major shortcomings. The progress towards the objective/outcome can be presented as “good practice”. |
| 5 | Satisfactory (S) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets, with only minor shortcomings. |
| 4 | Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets but with significant shortcomings. |
| 3 | Moderately Unsatisfactory (HU) | The objective/outcome is expected to achieve its end-of-project targets with major shortcomings. |
| 2 | Unsatisfactory (U) | The objective/outcome is expected not to achieve most of its end-of-project targets. |
| 1 | Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | The objective/outcome has failed to achieve its midterm targets, and is not expected to achieve any of its end-of-project targets. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Ratings for Project Implementation & Adaptive Management:** (one overall rating) | | |
| 6 | Highly Satisfactory (HS) | Implementation of all seven components – management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications – is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. The project can be presented as “good practice”. |
| 5 | Satisfactory (S) | Implementation of most of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management except for only few that are subject to remedial action. |
| 4 | Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | Implementation of some of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management, with some components requiring remedial action. |
| 3 | Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) | Implementation of some of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive, with most components requiring remedial action. |
| 2 | Unsatisfactory (U) | Implementation of most of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. |
| 1 | Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | Implementation of none of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Ratings for Sustainability:** (one overall rating) | | |
| 4 | Likely (L) | Negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes on track to be achieved by the project’s closure and expected to continue into the foreseeable future |
| 3 | Moderately Likely (ML) | Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained due to the progress towards results on outcomes at the Review |
| 2 | Moderately Unlikely (MU) | Significant risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on |
| 1 | Unlikely (U) | Severe risks that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained |

ANNEX 7: Final Evaluation Report Clearance Form

*(to be completed by the Commissioning*

**ToR ANNEX G: EVALUATION ETHICS**

**Final Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared By:**

**Commissioning Unit**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**UNDP Programme Advisor**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

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.

Annex 8 Matrix of partner activities

The Matrix was created from the relevant sections of CSO proposals presenting the activities and methodology.

| **Organisation** | **Activities** | **Methodology** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| CRF | Activity 1: CRF will identify and select CSOs from urban and rural areas through open competition to provide PWDs with para-legal assistance and advocacy  Twenty CSOs will be identified and selected from already existing network previously engaged in a project implemented in Azerbaijan by World Vision, which will contribute to the sustainability of the action. However, the selection will not be limited to the existing network of CSOs. The call for participation will be circulated among other civil society organisations. Activity 2: CRF will carry out institutional assessment of selected group of disability focus CSOs and individual capacity assessment of up to 30 social workers (SW) to identify capacity gaps  Activity 3: CRF will organise tailor-made CB for selected group of CSOs (20 representatives) and 30 SWs based on assessment findings  Activity 4: CRF together with the group of CSOs and in partnership with SWs and Ombudsman’s Office educate 300 PWDs and their family members on the rights of PWDs, legislation, Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD), existing services/resources, etc. Activity 5: CRF will sensitize 60 representatives of DBs (primary social/legal protection service providers), 100 school teachers and 50 health personnel on state entitlements and commitments, CRPD and National Action Programme 2013-2018 on Rights of PWDs Activity 6: CRF will support Network of CSOs to facilitate 7 discussions related to disability entitlements with target groups to generate gaps hindering from implementation of state commitments Activity 7: CRF will mobilise CSOs to facilitate development of an Action Plan per 6 districts of Sheki-Zakatala and Baku with participation of community residents and duty bearers based on the barriers/gaps identified Activity 8: CRF will support CSO Network to develop report embedding policy recommendations to present to respective DBs attention CRF will lead the CSO Network to develop a comprehensive report, including an analysis of policy implementation and recommendations to address the policy gaps and barriers. The report will be presented to the attention of the MLSPP and other respective agencies.  Activity 9: CRF will conduct capacity-building workshops for 20 local Lawyers in selected regions Activity 10: CRF will support state-employed 30 social workers to provide need-based direct support to PWDs and their family members in their districts by linking them with selected lawyers Activity 11: CRF will support social workers to carry out 100 follow-up visits to families and individual persons with disabilities to monitor the implementation of decisions made after legal services are provided  Activity 12: CRF will mobilise the lawyers to provide direct legal services to PWDs and their families in coordination with CSOs and Social Workers Activity 13: CRF will develop/publish/disseminate information/education material on the rights of PWDs Activity 14: CRF will organise 2 TV talk shows on district/national/internet TV channels to circulate via social networks Activity 15: CRF will organise 3 public awareness raising events with participation of PWDs/CWDs | The project employs: (1) A system strengthening method, which helps to enhance institutional and individual capacities of various target groups and prepare them for action. A part of the system strengthening is the network building used for the civil society organisations to represent a platform for advocacy and mobilisation; (2) CRF will use the Citizen Voice and Action method, adopted once by the World Vision, which will raise awareness, mobilise, plan further action, advocate and monitor. All methods chosen for the project implementation will be employed at macro, meso and micro levels. The action is expected to spread the anticipated impact on the following levels of society:  Macro level: by adopting the Citizen Voice and Action/CV&A methodological framework , the action is designed to bring gaps up and barriers, which hinder the implementation of state entitlements for PWDs/CWDs, identified in action plans from grassroot level up to the national level evidence-based advocacy – which will result in the elaboration of a report embedding policy and legislative recommendations developed by CSOs to advocate with the state. Meso level: at the meso level, the action will leverage the knowledge and capacities of CSOs, lawyers, respective DBs, social workers and the wider public on disability-related issues. By achieving the three expected results, the action will further breed increased demand for quality social and legal aid serviced at region/district level. In total, 20 disability-focused civil society organisations will be identified and selected from an existing network, who will act jointly at the regional level in Sheki-Zakatala region and the Baku area. Micro level: at the micro level, the project will enhance the awareness of people with disabilities, including children with disabilities and family members, on their rights and entitlements, boost their capacities to fight for their rights and provide them with social, legal and para-legal aid through different service providers. After capacitation social workers will also provide para-legal assistance to the PWDs/CWDs and their family members, i.e. provide consultations on subsidiary legal matters but not being fully qualified as lawyers. The project will build on the former collaboration with the Ministry of Labour and Social Protection and its Rehabilitation Centers, namely in Sheki and Baku enhancing capacities of Social Workers and linking them to legal aid providers. After the project is finished, the trained SWs will continue their work in the Rehabilitation Centers. |
| CESD | Activity 1: Contacting and selecting local CSOs; identifying multipliers Months: 1-2 Location: Ganja City and Samux District Target: 20 local civil society organizations. 60 civil society actors Output: About 20 civil society organizations including communities and municipalities from targeted regions are identified and engaged into the project; 2 networking meetings are conducted; 40 representatives from local CSOs including communities and municipalities from targeted regions are engaged into networking activities  Description: Relevant CSOs including communities and municipalities from the targeted regions will be identified and contacted. 2 networking meetings with overall 40 participants will be organized in relevant targeted regions (one per region) in order to conduct preliminary needs assessment and identify future multipliers.   Each networking event will focus on (1) introduction of the action, (2) capacities, strengths and weaknesses of CSOs regarding policy monitoring and advocacy, (2) oversight challenges faced by state law and policy, (3) upcoming activities of the action.     Justification: The lack of capacity of CSOs to engage into policy monitoring and advocacy negatively affects the prospects for successful implementation of social protection policies in Azerbaijan..    Responsibilities: “Regional Development Enlightenment” Public Union in Ganja will be responsible for the organization of the round table meetings together with CESD  Activity 2: Development of training manual for CSOs on watchdog and advocacy function  Months: 3-5 Location: Baku Target: At least 200 Civil society organizations will be provided with manuals with watchdog and advocacy function on social services Output: Training manual for CSOs with 500 hardcopies    Description: The project team together with local experts will develop a training manual for CSOs on watchdog and advocacy strategies and tactics. The detailed thematic coverage of the manual will be drafted after the assessment of the abovementioned round table meetings in order to ensure that the needs of CSOs are properly addressed by the resource. The manual shall be published as hard copy (500 copies) and as digital version. The purpose of the manual is to provide a stringent methodology and practical guideline for conducting capacity-building in the fields of policy monitoring and advocacy.  Justification: Findings, lessons learned and experiences gained from the implementation of Activity 1 will provide a foundation for the manual content-planning process.  Responsibilities: CESD will be responsible for the content of the manual and will have the lead in the overall development of the manual. CESD will give administrative support, as well as select local experts to contribute to the manual content and design.  Activity 3: Capacity-building trainings and workshops for CSOs  Months: 5-10 month Location: Ganja city and Samux District  Target: 60 trained civil society actors Output: 8 Capacity building trainings for members of civil society organizations    Description: In Azerbaijan, a shortage of qualified and committed civil society activists is one of the major impediments for enabling CSOs including communities and municipalities to monitor the implementation of social protection policies and engage in advocacy work. Throughout this action, 8 capacity-building trainings (one workshop per four regions twice throughout project lifetime) for in total 90 members and grassroots activists from 20 CSOs including communities and municipalities (selected under Activity 1) will be conducted in the target regions. The capacity-building activities will be based on training manual developed as an output of Activity 2. Participants of half day trainings will be selected from the most active and engaged activists and members of selected CSOs. The training will be conducted by invited independent short term experts as well as representatives of the Ministry of Labour and Social Protection. Participants of the trainings will not only gain new knowledge and skills in the fields of policy monitoring and advocacy, but also become multipliers of the action. The trainings will be conducted on following topics: (1) Basics of policy monitoring and watchdog strategies, (2) Approaches to policy advocacy, campaigns and information dissemination, (3) Usage of different communication channels and messaging, (4) main characteristics of major state social programs. After the first two trainings there will be a review meeting with the project team and trainers to discuss feedback from participants and lessons-learnt in order to adapt and improve training agenda.  Justification: After the training, the participants will be able to actively prepare a monitoring strategy regarding the implementation of social protection policies on the local and regional level. In addition, they will be capacitated to inform final beneficiaries in in target regions about accessibility to relevant social programs. Furthermore, civil society actors will be enabled to jointly implement policy advocacy campaigns.   Responsibilities: “Regional Development Enlightenment” Public Union in Ganja together with project team will be responsible for planning, organizing and recruiting the short term experts, as well as for the implementation and reporting. CESD will give administrative support. KAS will supervise the whole process will be involved in the selection process of the expert.   Activity 4: Analytical research and policy recommendations on social protection service provision for low-income families in rural Azerbaijan  Months: 2-10 month (5 policy papers) Location: Baku, Ganja, Samux district  Target: decision makers on local and national level; CSO members; state authorities  Output: 5 analytical paper with policy recommendation  Description: A comprehensive analytical paper on social protection service provision for low-income families in rural Azerbaijan will be developed based on desk research, focus group discussions and interviews. The analytical paper will analyze and assess public accessibility, coverage, effectiveness, cost-efficiency, transparency and propensity to corruption of key social protection policies. Policy recommendations regarding improving the legislative framework and optimizing the provision of services will be integral part of the analytical paper, with a specific focus on stronger participation of civil society. The research will provide detailed background analyses of the design and provision of social protection policies in the four rural areas of Azerbaijan with a description of intervention needs. The research will thus contribute to a better understanding of the necessary legal amendments of policies and areas for increased CSO watchdog activities and policy advocacy. 350 hard copies of analytical paper will be published during the last year of the project lifetime.   Justification: Pre-project observations have proven that there are significant gaps in legislation, budgetary structures, transparency as well as accessibility frames and requirements of social protection programs.   Responsibilities: CESD, and with its vast experience in socio-economic research, will be responsible for the drafting of the analytical research and the policy papers.   Activity 5: Final conference for assessing the outcomes and presenting policy recommendations and analytical research on social service provision  Months: 11-12 months Location: Baku Target: Civil society actors, state authorities, think tanks, media Output: Multimedia presentation; Final publication about project outcomes; informed stakeholders about project progress and final outcomes.  Description: In order to provide first-hand information for the broader public about the results of the action a final conference with participation of 150 participants from the capital as well as from targeted regions will be organized. All project multipliers from targeted 30 CSOs, representatives of local authorities as well as from Ministry of Labour and Social Protection, relevant stakeholders from media and Think tanks will be invited to participate in final conference.   Justification: In order to assess outcomes and achievements of proposed action, final conference will be held during the last month of the project. Proposed action will help to provide broader audience detailed information about project achievements and outcomes which is necessary asset for project sustainability.  Responsibilities: CESD in cooperation with project team will be in charge of preparation and conducting the final conference. | The project will be implemented through a well-orchestrated combination and sequence of activities: § Needs assessment meetings with local civil society actors § drafting and publication of practical manual; § training of key stakeholders; § innovative monitoring instruments and capacity building trainings for the main target groups; § development of an organizational framework of regional forums;  § analytical research and policy recommendations for improving current status quo; § regular dialogue forums between decision makers and local civil society actors; § intensive information campaigns though local media as well as first hand reach out; § promotion of dissemination of results through target groups (and institutional stakeholders and through a final conference; § quality assurance through continuous internal evaluation (monitoring) and several external evaluations. §  The different activities will be linked with each other and build one on another. Local and international short term experts will be mainly the same during preparation activities and the implementation of the training, monitoring and consultation activities in order to provide thematic continuity. Together with the Project Staff they will ensure linkages and synergies between all different activities of the action.  The project’s progress will be followed up along the lines of the “logical framework method”. This method creates links between the proposed activities, the defined results and correspondent indicators, the overall and specific objectives of the proposed action and the correspondent indicators, the defined intervention strategies and methods. Thereby a continuous observation will be possible of the current status of the project’s progress, whether the agreed timetable is being adhered to and whether the expected results, the objectives and indicators are being met. The approach demands:  § Specifying the indicators which will allow to measure the results of the proposed activities, the specific and the overall objective during the Inception Workshop; § Defining the working procedures required in order to carry out measurement methods and reporting (“who is going to measure/report what, when and how”); § Understanding and consent of the project team that transparency on all levels of the whole project is needed for follow-up and evaluation;  § Understanding and consent of the target groups and the stake-holders that transparency on all levels of the whole project is needed for follow-up and evaluation;  All activities will be subject to a careful continuous internal monitoring (process evaluation). State of the art evaluation methods will provide the necessary information for the internal evaluation of each of the proposed activities. The Project Manager will carry out the internal monitoring activities, analyse the compiled information and report to project director. On the basis of the internal monitoring, activity reports will be written on each of the proposed activities and will be delivered to the project manager and the project director. Based on this information, the project manager and the project director will be responsible for taking all necessary measures in order to secure the proposed actions effectiveness with regard to its overall and its specific objective.  The following methods will be used for the internal monitoring of the outcomes of each activity and for the overall outcome of the action: § manual, publications, video clips: methods of content analysis, expert and peer-group reviews will evaluate whether the content and presentation is state of the art; § Capacity building trainings of civil society actors: knowledge tests, partaking observation and a sample of (ex-post) qualitative interviews will assess the knowledge impact and behavioral change achieved by the activity; § Regional forums and networking platforms between CSOs: analysis of coordination and communication mechanisms among CSOs; (ex-post) qualitative interviews will assess the knowledge impact and behavioral change achieved by the activity; § Structural changes within stakeholders: institutional analysis on samples of the participating CSOs and government, parliament and relevant local agencies indirectly involved in the project through their representatives; institutional analysis of the social protection strategies of Ministry of Labour and Social Protection; institutional analysis of the Teachers Association.  Based on the compiled information by the above described measurement-methods, a yearly internal monitoring report will be summing up the findings on the carried out activities. A final report will assess the overall outcome of the proposed action after the end of the 36-month of project duration.  The Centre for Economic & Social Development (CESD) will be responsible for:  § Relations to national authorities in cooperation with all the partners § Conducting analytical research and policy notes; § Organizing dialogue forums; § Facilitating process of production of video clips; § Facilitating Information campaigns; § Planning final conference; § Identification, contracting and implementation of the missions of local experts; § Evaluation of the local experts work; “Regional Development Enlightenment” Public Union in Ganja will be responsible for organizing all events within the project in Ganja city and Samux district. |
| EPF | Activity 1 – To identify regional NGOs to participate in the Civil Society Platform.  Activity 2 – To assess institutional capacity gaps and needs of the regional NGOs and 3 NGO Resource Centres and provide follow-up targeted support in form of ToT, technical assistance and coaching. Activity 3 – To organize trainings for NGO members of the 3 regional networks on a range of topics related to the public policy realm. While the composition of the trainings will depend on the needs and knowledge gaps of the regional NGOs, it is envisaged that the whole training package will consist of three separate blocks: 1) The first part will cover respective thematic domain: Ø Provision of public services at the local level: accountability, transparency and effectiveness; Ø Socio-economic development of the target regions: social security and employment, infrastructure development and development of agriculture and agro-industry; Ø Local self-governance: role of local self-governance authorities in community development. 2) The second part will be focused on evidence-based research methodologies and use of evidence-based data for public policy recommendations. 3) The third part will cover such topics as strategic communication for change, advocacy, lobbying, and networking.  Activity 4 – To undertake field studies of the NGO enabling environment.  The field study will cover the following issues: Ø Assessing the relevance of local socio-economic strategies and polices to local needs and opportunities; Ø Monitoring the implementation of policies/strategies; Ø Measuring achievements; Ø Identifying gaps; and  Ø Developing recommendations, with a special focus on local solutions. Activity 5 – To identify and fund by means of service contracts 6 small scale initiatives of regional NGOs for improving strategic cooperation and coordination on regional development and governance issues. Activity 6 – To run 3 thematic regional workshops. Activity 7 – To organize 3 thematic coordination meetings in Baku on region-focused strategy development and cooperation. | The project will address the development of mechanisms of input to policy processes by civil society organizations through the promotion of innovative forms of interactions, such as regional networks, regular coordination meetings, thematic working groups between civil society organizations on the one hand and local and national authorities, including municipalities, EXCOMs and other governmental institutions on the other hand, and achieving enabling environment for such actions both at local and national levels. It is envisaged that at least 80% of the members of the Azerbaijani Civil Society Platform for Strategic Cooperation and Coordination in Development and Governance will have improved their ability to engage in public policy development, as evidenced by increased organizational commitment, existence of relevant decision-making structures, well-defined policy agendas, improved relationships and credibility with policymakers, increased understanding of the political climate, and enhanced technical expertise in developing appropriate strategies, as evidenced by the organizational assessment pre-/post-scores. The Azerbaijani Civil Society Platform for Strategic Cooperation and Coordination in Development and Governance will be established based on the regional networks of civil society organizations established in 3 target regions (Guba-Khachmaz, Mingechevir, Shirvan) within the project, engaging around 30 regional and Baku-based NGOs.  EPF will identify regional NGOs based on a number of sources. First and foremost, the regional NGO Resource Centres have the lists of NGOs in their regions. These lists normally include only those NGOs, which are the users of or have in the past used the services of the Centres. It is worthwhile to note, that each of the regional NGO Resource Centres has a close affiliation with the NGO Support Council. This affiliation in some ways a priori limits the Centres’ ability to reach certain NGOs, especially those engaged in a more sensitive work, as well as smaller NGOs in remote locations, and unregistered civic activists groups. EPF will also utilize the local knowledge on regional NGO environment of such ongoing projects as Socio-Economic Development Activity in Azerbaijan (SEDA), implemented by the East West Management Institute, Azerbaijan Partnership for Transparency, implemented by Transparency Azerbaijan, and Support to Local Initiatives on Regional and Rural Development in Azerbaijan, implemented by UMID Support to Social Development PU. In addition, EPF has also its own rooster of NGOs in the targeted regions.  In order to ensure participative and inclusive process, EPF will ensure that: 1) The “regional network” is not limited to NGOs of the respective region (Guba-Khachmaz, Mingechevir, and Shirvan), but is also open for NGOs from the neighbouring regions, who are willing to participate in the work of the Civil Society Platform; 2) The notion of an NGO is given a broader frame and is inclusive of those civic activists groups, who are not currently registered in the Ministry of Justice, those NGOs who have not been able to prolong their registration, or who were forced to close their offices due to the increasing pressure on civil society in the country. When opening the space for civic activists groups, EPF will specifically look for the demonstrated ability to play a leadership role in the community; clear understanding of the community’s priority challenges; experience working with different stakeholder groups; familiarity with implementing small scale projects. The Civil Society Platform will work on 3 broader thematic areas (Local Self-Governance, Regional Socio-Economic Development and Public Services at Local Level). NGOs engaged under the Local Self-Governance thematic area will work on the issues of increasing the role of municipalities in planning and implementation of local development strategies by improving capacities and engagement of self-governance institutions in local needs assessments, analysis, forecasting and preparation of local development programmes, enhancing public participation in budgeting mechanisms of local self-governance institutions, facilitating cooperation between municipalities, EXCOMs, local businesses and civil society organizations, and other related topics. The thematic area of Regional Socio-Economic Development will cover the issues of enhancing civil society’s involvement in monitoring and evaluation of regional development strategies in the fields of agriculture and agro-industry, infrastructure development, and social security and employment. The third thematic area of Public Services at Local Level will comprise such issues as monitoring effectiveness and accessibility of the key social services, in particular in relation to vulnerable groups, improving mechanisms of citizens’ feedback on provision of social services, developing cooperation and coordination mechanisms between local civil society organizations and local authorities for maintaining public accountability in provision of public services. The project will support NGOs to accomplish their role as transparent, representative and accountable actors in shaping local policy agendas, monitoring State programmes’ implementation and reinforcement of public accountability systems. A special focus is given to regional NGOs, as they are more excluded, compared to the Baku-based ones, from the policy-making processes. This support will be provided through hands-on trainings and follow-up coaching in public policy formulation, advocacy and strategic communication for change and evidence-based policy making. The NGOs will also be given an opportunity to conduct field studies of NGO enabling environment and implement small scale initiatives to address identified gaps. |
| Initiative for the Sake of Development | Expected results  1. Piloting the early identification and intervention model for vulnerable children by setting up the effective service for at-risk children and families in Baku, Narimanov District, through developing multidisciplinary team for addressing needs of at-risk children, via training and adopting evidence based international methods, establishing the fluent referral system, offering interventions and analysing impact of the program 1.1. Prevention-oriented multidisciplinary Family Care Centre (FCC) is staffed and founded; staff consists of child psychiatrist, psychologists (2), social worker, speech therapist, occupational therapist, a nurse, center director, and accountant (totally making 9 persons) 1.1.1. The staff (9 persons) of Family-oriented Care Centre for juveniles (FCC) is recruited; 1.1.2 Two foreign experts have provided advanced ToT trainings to FCC staff members (excluding accountant and adding program coordinator); in total 5 training/days; Knowledge and skills are built in: Early identification scheme to pick out the problem cases, both families and children; Early intervention: outcome-driven programs for children and youth, also their parents/careers. During the training modules for further trainings are created; 1.1.3 Two international experts have provided advanced 6-day training to 15 persons (FCC staff members and other specialists); Knowledge and skills are built in: Autistic spectrum disorders and linkage with the juvenile delinquency; Early identification scheme to pick out the problem cases, both families and children; Early intervention: outcome-driven programs for children and youth, also their parents/careers. 1.1.4 The FCC is founded as a pilot model service in the Baku, Narimanov District to address juveniles with autistic spectrum, emotional and conduct disorders and their families’ problems; Prevention-intervention care is effectively functioning for 9 months serving 135 families and children of high-risk (4-18 years old). Protocols of the service functioning are elaborated: guidelines, inner regulations, job descriptions, ethical codes. 1.2. Promotional and informational leaflets on new service published (1750 in total) and distributed among the Narimanov and neighboring Districts’ population;  1.2.1. The analytical report on lessons learned is drafted and 200 copies are published; 1000 leaflets on the best practices elaborated and published; 300 copies of protocols and 250 social advertisement posters created; 1.2.2. Two informational campaigns organized to raise public awareness over the issue of juvenile delinquency, and distribute informational materials. 1.3. The clear referral pathways and procedures are elaborated to provide chain of comprehensive multidisciplinary care to juveniles in need and their families; 2 trainings (2 days-long, with 15 participants per group) are conducted for 5 target groups to assure awareness and involvement of the key specialists on the newly establishing service and importance of system of referral in the field of JJ. 1.3.1 30 specialists (GPs, nurses, teachers, police officers and social workers) from Narimanov and other neighbouring districts are trained and also well- informed of the new services established in the district via 20 trainings conducted for these 5 target groups.  1.3.2 Two trainings (2 days-long, with 15 participants per group) are conducted for 5 target groups to assure awareness and involvement of the key specialists on the newly establishing service and importance of system of referral in the field of JJ. 1.4. An online base for theoretical resources is created. 1.4.1 A website of online resources is created, all the translated protocols, professional literature, promotional materials, training modules are uploaded on the website for the consideration of the professional society and interested citizens. 1.4.2 The website is updated regularly with newly translated documents and literature. 1.5. Creation, implementation and maintenance of an electronic database for medical and social records. 1.5.1 An electronic database is created, all the medical and social records are placed in the online database. 2. Mobilizing support for actions for advocating the preventive approach toward the juvenile delinquency by facilitating dialogue between different stakeholders 2.1.A network of governmental and non-governmental bodies is established Representatives of Ministry of Health, Ministry of Youth and Sports, Ministry of Education, the State Committee for Women, Children and Families, international organizations, such as UNICEF and WHO, along with other relevant NGOs, “accompanying” project’s policy dialogues and round table meetings, and providing facilitation of preventive component of JJ reform in the country. 2.1.1 A network is functional to assure direct communication of the project with the key national agencies;  2.1.2 Several articles in newspapers printed; 2.1.3 Specific policy recommendations on preventive part of JJ reform are elaborated and presented to MoH and other stakeholders. 2.2. Two round table discussions and two meetings with policy makers, for awareness rising are conducted involving specialists, local authorities, members of Narimanov district community, etc. During the meetings, pre and post research evidence will be used to advocate for the JJ reform in the country. 2.2.1 Two round table discussions for awareness rising are conducted involving specialists, local authorities, members of Narimanov and neighbouring districts’ communities;  2.2.2 Several articles in newspapers printed; 2.2.3 Two meetings with policy-makers are hold;  2.2.4 Specific policy recommendations on preventive part of JJ reform are elaborated and presented to MoH and other stakeholders. 3.Organizing pre and post research, to study current situation in the country and effectivity of the established service 3.1. Pre Post research is organized. Pre-research considers desk research of the current situation in the field of juvenile justice in Azerbaijan, statistics of juvenile delinquency, most vulnerable areas and seasons; Post research considers studying effects of FCCC, including interviews with the beneficiaries and their families, statistical data, etc. The effectiveness of the intervention is measured and evidenced. 3.1.1 Pre-service establishment desk research is organize, to study situation of JJ in Azerbaijan, know the statistics of juvenile delinquency, to use during policy dialogue meetings. 3.1.2 Post service establishment research is organized, the effectiveness of the intervention is measured and evidenced, to be used during advocacy campaigns. | In many countries in transition the approach of the problem of juvenile delinquency is rather punitive. There is little attention for prevention, delinquents are locked up and there are no programs or services for them. Negative group standards (“it is cool to be a criminal”) are not fought but only strengthened by the group processes within and even outside the prison system and affect communities.  It is rather urgent to change this perspective. The methodology broadly utilized in the proposed action turns this approach from the punitive one into a more supportive and positive direction and is heavily planted into the prevention concept. Primary and secondary prevention of delinquency rest on the principle of identifying individuals and environments at risk for delinquent activity before the behavior has occurred and then either removing risk factors or strengthening resistance to the risk factors; support the development of the child’s personality, abilities, and potential.  The main target group of the project is – children with emotional, conduct and autistic spectrum disorders (ASD). Children with ASD are considered as a target group of the project, because of the statistics, supporting association of crime, with some of the features, characterising children with ASD. There are a number of characteristic features of Asperger’s syndrome [and autism] that predispose individuals to criminal offending (Berney, 2004). According to a study by the British Institute for Brain Injured Children (BIBIC), up to 37% of youngsters in the youth offending teams questioned, among other disorders, were found to have conditions such as autism (BIBIC, 2007). This research highlights the number of children with autistic spectrum disorders that are being put on a path that sends them towards the criminal justice system and possibly into custody. In a research by Tantam (1988) of long-term users of mental health services who were regarded as socially isolated and eccentric (77% having Asperger’s syndrome (ASD), 44% of the sample had committed isolated offences and 23% had committed actual criminal offences, primarily involving violence against other people. Why family oriented approach? The family is one of the most logical starting places for prevention efforts. Because of the weight of recent empirical evidence relating family functioning to various forms of adolescent antisocial behavior, early family intervention receive wide endorsement as a locus for preventive intervention from professional communities. More recent interventions are showing international evidence of positive impact; there is general agreement that family intervention is beneficial to disadvantaged families. Establishment of FCCC with well-trained team members will ensure early detection and preventive interventions to troubled families. FCC centre will be duplication of the Georgian model, which served effectively and was undertaken by the Ministry of Education and Science of Georgia and continues its’ effective functioning till now. Georgian experience will be presented to the project network of governmental and non-governmental bodies, to use as additional evidence to be used in the advocacy process.  Key components of the innovative service  The family-directed psychosocial care canter is the community-based service that will provide the high-risk families and juveniles with preventive intervention both at centre and in community/families. This service has the advantage that young people are not taken from their trusted environments. Clinical care should be avoided where possible in order to prevent stigmatisation and breaking of the connection with the home environment.  FCC team members will represent different professions - psychologists, social workers, nurse, and medical doctor. The centre will be managed by director and financial person. This multidisciplinary team is providing both at-centre/day care and outreach services. The team will be selected from the trained Network members by the selection committee together with European experts based on agreed ToR for each member. There will be 9 members in the team; besides the task of care about the families and disturbed kids this team will have the task of involvement into the extensive trainings of target stakeholders and also a very important task of advocacy (see below). Family and Child Care Centre’s (FCCC) services’ range will include Day-care, In-home intervention (via mobile teams), Care Coordination, Psychosocial assessment (Family and Child&Adolescent Functional Assessment), Parents’ aide (e.g. training parents in family management techniques), Supervision. The program developed and implemented by FCC will be aiming to provide families with the opportunity to learn about parental roles and obligations as regards child development and child care, promoting positive parent-child relationships, sensitizing parents to the problems of children and young persons and encouraging their involvement in family and community-based activities. Day-care – implies at-centre individual and family support and also group sessions.  This is the community-based service that offers a broader and more intensive scope of intervention than outpatient clinical care while at the same time preserving the relationship with home and parents.  In-home intervention Team (Outreach, mobile team) - A team that will target children and youth with severe behavioural problems, especially (early) anti-social behaviour will be established. Care coordinators/case managers will perform strengths-based assessments, assemble FT, conduct plan-of-care meetings, help to determine needs and resources with the youth and family, assist the team in identifying appropriate intervention, arrange the referral pathway and mobilization of various agencies and monitor the implementation of the case plan.  The supervision will ensure the staff care, quality of care, constant development of staff members via sharing, couching and directing.  Referral system establishment – for effective coordination of various agencies and structures the clear referral pathways and reasons for referring will be identified, agreed and protocolized. The referral will include policlinics, schools and kindergartens, social agencies, mental health institutions (psycho-neurological dispensary), police stations, NGOs, etc. Advocacy - In general, advocacy connects youth and families with a variety of social networks and service providers to integrate services that agencies provide, ensure continuity of care, and facilitate the development of a youth’s social skills (Sheldon, 1997). Advocacy is a “client-level strategy for promoting the coordination of human services, opportunities, or benefits” (Macallair, 1994) that helps youth and families move through this crossroads of different systems.  Advocacy can help parents and other family members overcome distrust of and hostility toward the system. FT members can assist youth and families in gaining improved access to different services and in understanding their legal rights. They also facilitate coordination between the justice system and other services. Assessment of service effectiveness – to meet standards of the model program the service effectiveness should be proved in the course of careful assessment of the intervention. The evaluation process will be planned together with foreign experts and success - indicators will be defined. The assessment course will be carried out by the Network members and/or Georgian researchers – service effectiveness assessment team (3 experts) who have experience in the field.  The evidence produced will justify the success and usefulness of the service. The effective model could be replicated in other communities, however should be adapted to each unique situation. Trainings - ToT approach was selected as most beneficial for the action. The specialized team of trainers who got ToT from European experts will be tasked with training school teachers and kindergarten careers, GPs/family doctors, social workers, police officers. Trained specialists will serve as focal points into the referral chain. In total 300 persons will be trained in early detection of risk factors, problem behavior, disturbed interaction, family malfunction patterns reflected at child development, etc; the basic skills of dealing with such families and youth will be provided; trainees will be equipped with relevant hand-outs and clear picture of referral process. |
| HRC | The Project includes the identification of the prospective members of the prison monitoring groups in Ganja and Sheki among the local activists of civil society. As result, two groups of 20 activists in Ganja and Sheki will be selected for series of 4 seminars.  After the trainings, 10 successful trainees in each group will be selected and trained in Baku as future groups of prison monitors which will be established in Ganja and Sheki, while about the same number of thee trained activists will be in reserve to substitute them if necessary. The education component of the Project includes the training seminars in Baku (2), Ganja (2) and Sheki (2), for about 20 participants each. The trainings will cover all aspects of the monitoring of prisons. The training activities will include also the study visits to the prisons and the learning of monitoring work of PC and National Prevention Group. The participants will be educated by the experienced trainers of HRCA, with further fellowship at the HRCA offices in Baku and Ganja, in cooperation with the PC, National NGO Forum, regional offices of the Human Rights Commissioner (Ombudsman).  At the next stage, a regular monitoring of prisons in Baku, Salyan, Ganja and Sheki will be conducted, with regular reports to the Ministry of Justice, mass media and international organizations. The prison monitors will visit about 15-20 prisons to assess the conditions and to provide the recommendations. The reports and media articles about prison conditions and actual problems will be issued, with a goal to promote the prison reforms. Some reports will be used by the PRI in its researches. For the goals of training and legal education of prisoners, two books will be published: manual for prison monitors and its annex, a compilation of basic legal norms on prisons (about 500 copies). The books will be prepared by the experienced HRCA staff in consultations with the PRI. The publications will be used during the trainings and distributed among the NGOs, mass media and prison libraries in various regions of the country (e.g. in Nakhchivan).  During the prison visits, the lawyers of each monitoring groups will receive the prisoners and provide them the legal consultations related to the convictions and detention. The published compilation of laws will be used for the consultations. Other books on human rights of prisoners and prison standards presented by the HRCA and PRI will be distributed in prison libraries and among the NGO activists as a part of human rights education. During the Project, the HRCA and PRI staff will be open for consultations of concerned NGO activists. | The preparatory activity will include the hiring of staff, selection of trainees and preparation of manual. The project staff will include the HRCA members and volunteers who have necessary experience. The trainees will be selected by the HRCA in cooperation with the Azerbaijan NGO Forum taking into account the experience, motivation and personal characteristics of the candidates.  The manual will be prepared by the HRCA staff.  Training of the NGO activists This activity will be conducted in the form of seminars with the Q&A sessions and discussions. The participants will be informed on 4 sets of issues: - international prison standards, - domestic law on prisons, - monitoring techniques,  - reporting. Some of seminars will be accompanied by study visits to the prisons. Ten successful participants from every group will receive the additional in-depth trainings in Baku.   Public monitoring groups  After the seminars, two groups of 10 monitors each will be finally formed in Sheki and Ganja. The rest of trainees will be in reserve as substitutes.  The groups will act in the close contact with the PC and use the similar methodology of the monitoring and reporting. The HRCA will assist the groups to establish the working contacts.  Regular monitoring of prisons  Traditionally, a monitoring of prisons by the HRCA includes the prison visits by small groups with evaluation of prison conditions. In some cases, the interior of prison premises is photographed and measured.  After every prison visit, a report and a press release are prepared. During repeated visit of the same prison, the monitors compare the situations and assess the development. The results of are regularly discussed with the officials. The same methodology will be proposed to the new monitoring groups in Ganja and Sheki.   Legal education and consultations of prisoners During the prison visits, the prison monitors will receive the prisoners and consult them on legal issues related to the detention as well as provide the prison libraries with the books including the manual prepared for this Project. Between the prison visits, the members of monitoring group will consult the lawyers and family members on the same issues.  The consultations will be provided by lawyers or experienced human rights defenders.  The knowledge of law will prevent the conflicts between the convicts and personnel as well as help in preparation of complaints against the allegedly wrong acts of administration.  Stakeholders The National NGO Forum and the Ministry of Justice officials have positive attitude to the idea of the Project in general and are aware about the proposed Project. The Forum has the human resources for future provincial prison monitors, and MoJ is to solve issues related to the prison visits by the newcomers. |
| INTERNEWS | Specific Objective 1:  Activity 1.1.1. Public Outreach Training: This training will introduce participants to tools for effectively serving their target groups and constituencies. 4 training sessions of 4 days each will be conducted in Baku. Each session will be attended by 10 individuals (3 from regions and 7 Baku –based).   Activity 1.1.2. Advocacy Training: 2 training sessions of 3 days each will be conducted in Baku. Each session will be attended by 10 individuals (3 from regions and 7 Baku –based). This training will build on the Public Outreach training and provide participants with tools and approaches to turn the power of a crowd into meaningful change.   Activity 1.1.3. Prototyping Advocacy: Internews Azerbaijan will hold 2 prototyping events (1 in Baku and 1 in Sumgait). During each of these day-long events, training participants will come together in small groups and develop ideas for advocacy initiatives using the tools and knowledge they gained during training. By the end of the day, each group will create a working prototype of an advocacy campaign. Then after the events the participants will test it with at least 15 real stakeholders/targets of that initiative. These events will teach participants to get into the habit of testing their ideas and assumptions before they invest significant resources – time and money – into rolling out comprehensive campaigns and other advocacy products. Approximately 15 individuals will take part in each of the events. 30 individuals will attend the events (15 participants x 2 events). As a result of each event 4 advocacy initiative will be supported (4 advocacy initiative: 2 event x 2 advocacy initiative for each event) Activity 1.1.4: Small awards to CSOs: Internews Azerbaijan will provide small awards to help training participants advance their outreach and advocacy goals. 5 small awards will be given to training participants 1000 EUR in size. Special jury (consisting of external experts) will be defined for the selection of the projects. The duration of actions will not exceed 30 days. The awards will be given to active CSO members and legal persons.  Specific Objective 2: Activity 2.1.1. Online Networks. As Facebook is the most commonly used social networking platform in Azerbaijan, Internews Azerbaijan will create and moderate a closed Facebook group for all training participants. Some thematic groups may choose to create off-shoots for themselves and include people who may not have attended the project training.   Activity 2.1.2. Offline Networks. Internews Azerbaijan will designate one CSO in each of the targeted locations to hold 10 tea meet-ups for CSOs and local authority members in the region and capital. Each tea meet –ups will involve at least 8 persons.   Activity 2.1.3. Roundtables with CSO and local government representatives organized - 3 x roundtables will be conducted (2 in Baku & Sumgait and 1 in Ganja) which will involve 45 (3 roundtable x 15 participants for each one) CSOs and local authorities where cooperation will be established. Day-long roundtables will be held in Baku, Sumqayit, and Ganja. | Internews Azerbaijan proposes a methodology that will engage media, civil society and government institutions with the project of increasing access to independent and reliable information and enhancing cooperation between stakeholders in democracy and human rights. Currently, a number of CSOs are carrying out democracy projects, conducting research, working on analytical reports, and gathering statistical data. Government institutions are implementing programs within their own initiatives, as well as in line with recommendations from international partners. However the limitations of traditional media in Azerbaijan, as well as the communication deficit between government and civil society actors, means that activities are not well coordinated and do not complement one another. Internews Azerbaijan has established constructive cooperation with both governmental and civil society stakeholders in the past, and will aim to do so in the framework of this action.  Internews Azerbaijan is confident that the establishment of a dialogue between CSOs and governmental institutions is achievable. By bringing stakeholders together in neutral, safe environments for cooperation, it is possible to build a bridge of trust and mutual understanding. It is very important to involve well-known experts, who can independently present their recommendations to government institutions and ministries.   Stakeholders and their roles: Online news agencies and websites like: www.novator.az; www.transparency.az; www.gafgazinfo.az, www.aznews.az, www.publika.az, www.ganja.az etc. There will be exchange and reference of information amongst these news agencies. IA will work closely with CSOs. IA has already established constructive cooperation with a number of CSOs .In the framework of this program; IA will utilize these relationships, particularly, with resource centers, using their evidence-based and statistical database. IA will establish their relations and network. IA will engage Government and local authorities (regional Executive Committees and local authorities etc.) to push for more accountability of local authorities, as well as establish an interactive dialogue and partnership with CSOs. During the project preparation, IA had consultations and meetings with abovementioned key stakeholders in order to get their opinions, needs and expectations. IA used interviews from those stakeholders to inform project activities. Besides the students from educational institutions and active youth also will be involved into the project through tea meet-ups, roundtables etc. |
| LDPA | 1. Legislative Framework Analysis and Policy Recommendations: This will include the review of all existing local (laws, decrees, and executive orders) and international legislative frameworks that Azerbaijan has joined. Policy recommendations aimed at improvement of the legislative framework will be presented to the Government.   2. Publication & Distribution: Guide to Your Social Rights; Booklets on social rights, Constitutional and legal provisions, protection mechanisms for the vulnerable groups. The booklets will reference the existing legislative framework on social rights and their protections.  3. Development & Roll-out of Online Training Program: LDPA will develop several online-training modules on human rights, social and economic rights for citizens, NGO and civil activists, media, and local government officials, offering broad understanding of social rights, in-depth knowledge on the key principles, international mechanisms, and mechanisms to promote those rights in practice.  4. Regional Workshops “Social Rights in the Regions: Key Challenges & Improvement Opportunities”: One-day workshops with the participation of key stakeholders, exploring the current state of implementation and protection of social rights, generating multi-stakeholder view of ways of solving upcoming challenges. “Current State of Social Rights in Azerbaijan” report will be generated.  5. Training of Trainers on Social Rights & Mechanisms for their Protection: Two-day ToT will be organized for representatives of local NGOs, initiative groups and community based organizations, as well as volunteers; training materials will be developed as part of Activity 3.  6. Capacity Building Seminars for Local & National Stakeholders on Social Rights Protection: 13 seminars on social rights and their legal protection mechanisms will be held in target regions and Baku. The key target groups for participation will be vulnerable groups, and other key stakeholders, including local government representatives and civil society leaders. We expected approximately 300 people will be participate in the seminars. LDPA will invite representatives from the relevant executive government agencies (e.g., Ministry of Labor and Social Protection, State Social Protection fund) to speak about the procedures and processes within their institutions for implementing the social rights, as well as the Courts to speak about their courts and the procedures for the appeal process. 7. Facebook Page: “Know & Protect Your Rights”: With information on social and economic rights, promote legal defense activities offered, and encourage horizontal discussion among citizens. 8. E-library on social rights &their legal protection: Online resource with related literature, built-in templates (e.g., complaint forms, request forms, government forms) and best practices. We also plan to have built-in templates that could be used by citizens to send inquiries and complaints; All publications prepared within this action will be placed on this e-library and be accessible to public. It will also have a Q&A section, through which anyone can submit a question and get an answer and explanation within 48 hours.  9. Legal Support and Defense Centers: Established in 4 target cities to provide free legal advice and support to people from vulnerable groups. Each regional center will have a legal consultant, while the center in Baku will have 3 consultants; the centers will operate Hot Lines answering any calls on social rights. Support would include the interpretation of laws and other documents, instructions on application for restoration of rights, preparation of applications, and legal defense in the courts. | LDPA methods of implementation of the proposed actions include the following:  Methodological priority 1: Actions in partnerships and networks to strengthen common approaches and agendas; LDPA will involve three partner organizations in implementation of the activities in their own regions, and will be partly engaged in the implementation of activities in the neighboring regions. All outputs of the project will be achieved with active participation and engagement of the partner organizations. Certain outputs within the project seek to strengthen and formulate common approaches and agenda for LDPA, its co-applicants and associate organizations, as well as other regional and national organizations. We will make sure to engage local government authorities, and civil society representatives as much as possible.  Methodological Priority 2: Capacity building activities for other NGOs working in the same field. The proposed action includes various capacity building activities, and the activities are two-fold, i.e., they not only provide co-applicants and associate organizations with knowledge, skills and tools on the field of civic awareness raising, protection of rights and legal defense, but also allows them to participate in providing some of the activities directly and also lead the implementation of some key activities (for example, regional awareness campaigns). Moreover, the project outputs will serve as a capacity building activity for many individual practitioners and experts.   Methodological priority 3: Gender sensitive, inclusion of both men and women stakeholders and that all gender equality issues relevant to the project are systematically incorporated in its methodology.  We target to ensure the participation of these vulnerable groups in all activities. All LDPA job announcements will include statement about LDPA’s being an equal opportunity employer. Gender analysis approach will be applied in the implementation of several activities.   Methodological priority 4: Innovative and creative approaches and those that build upon existing and past initiatives and best practices LDPA will implement the proposed action by applying innovative and creative approaches. We will document lessons learned from multiple stakeholders from three regions and Baku, striving to create synergies and achieve consolidated outcomes (via multi-stakeholder discussions and conclusions captured in report) and making it available to all interested stakeholder as a tool.  Methodological priority 5: Building on Previous Actions LDPA has about 10 years of experience in rights protection and legal support to various groups of citizens. LDPA implemented 23 projects on legal aids, more than 12,000 people benefited, and 2500 applications to state bodies and more than 350 applications have been submitted to the courts. In 2006-2013, LDPA implemented "Legal support to individual human rights cases and complaints”. LDPA has conducted 187 capacity building workshops and seminars on human rights awareness, organized 50 round-table workshops. In terms of legal support LDPA has served 1200 election participants, compiled 310 appeals and complaints to election commissions, prepared and sent 87 complaints to courts, and defended 42 complainants in the Courts of Appeal and Courts of Cassation. |
| LGA | Activity 1: Elaborating the promotional materials and purchasing equipment for project activities (supporting activity) The applicant will elaborate the promotional materials to be used during the project:  - 50 T-shirts;  - 50 project folders;  - 50 USB sticks; - 50 personalized cloth bags; - 4 roll-ups  Activity 2: Selection of 8 NGO representatives to be trained (Component 1- Capacity building of national network of experts on social service development based on the principles of participation, PPP and local ownership)  In order to achieve objective 1 and build a network of experts able to provide capacity building for CSO and local government based on the principles of participation, PPP and local ownership, it is necessary that we carefully select these experts. An open call will be launched for interested people to apply.   The following criteria for selection from the targeted regions will be respected: at least 2 years’ experience in training, preferably in working with local groups and local authorities; member of an NGO from regional and/ or national level having capacity building for organisations as part of its mission and have at least one initiative in the field of working with disadvantaged youth/ children and social services; Interest, commitment and availability to engage in a long capacity building process, and integrate learning outcomes in his/ her organisation’ activities.   Activity 3: Organising 3 trainings for the 8 selected NGO representatives (Component 1- Capacity building of national network of experts on social service development based on the principles of participation, PPP and local ownership)  The newly selected experts will go through a capacity building component consisting of 3 trainings on topics relevant for their future work with the local communities. The training agendas will be designed and adapted to training needs and expectations of participants that will be collected through initial evaluation forms elaborated by the trainers and sent to participants to fill in before the training delivery period.  Based on organisational expertise of the Applicant, the responsibility for the training delivery will be shared as follows: 1. One 3-day ToT on strategic participatory planning, project management, facilitation and conflict management; 2. One 2-day ToT on innovative techniques for social service creation and provision, with respect of Good Quality standards with focus on children and youth and their families. 3. One 2-day ToT on lobby and advocacy towards respecting children and youth rights and towards needs for further development of inclusive and adequate social services provision and towards fostering PPPs development.   The two expert trainers who will deliver these trainings will be selected by LGA. They will develop the training agenda and materials.  Activity 4: Selection of 4 municipalities from the 2 selected regions, 2 municipalities/region (Component 3- Capacity building for local cross-sectorial initiative groups) The selection will be done by the applicant, based on a careful examination of motivation, interest, and need of the local stakeholders. The examination will be done through field visits and meetings with representatives of local authorities, CSOs (NGOs and community groups) from the 2 targeted regions. Each initiative group will have at least 10 members that will give their consent to get involved in the upcoming project activities.  Activity 5: Training for members of the local cross-sectorial initiative groups (Component 2- Capacity building for local cross-sectorial initiative groups) The members of the cross-sectorial working groups will be trained by the 8 expert trainers on the following topics: facilitation and conflict management, project management, lobby and advocacy, quality social service provision.  2 3-day workshops will be organised in each community, aimed at building the capacity of local initiative groups to further be able to support the implementation of the local strategic plans through providing them with the skills and knowledge to conduct effective meetings, to elaborate and implement projects, advocate for resources and PPP together with supporting the rights of children and youth and design quality social services, in accordance with the national and international standards.  Activity 6: Participatory planning at the municipality level (Component 3- Participatory planning for development of social services and piloting of social services) The 8 national/local experts, based on the competencies gained through the trainings, will be conducting the process of elaborating the strategic plans for the improving social service provision at local level. They will be divided into teams of 2 people to work with each selected municipality, thus ensuring 8 processes of participatory planning. The workshops will be supported by at least 1 Town Hall meeting/region.  One of main duties of the municipalities to render social services for disadvantaged youth and children. Taking into consideration less resource of municipalities, active participation in these kinds of activities is not observed. Municipalities expressed their interests in working in this direction during the meetings conducted before development of project proposal. As they do not have any plan or paper to systematically approach the issue, development of strategy on rendering social services in the municipalities were agreed. To promote implementation of the plan, elaboration of social service pilot project in the framework of the poroject will create good base further continuation of the work started by the municipalities in the local level.   Activity 7: Development of social service pilot projects (Component 3- Participatory planning for development of social services and piloting of social services) During this activity, the cross-sectorial initiative groups will be supported in development and implementation phase of short term projects for piloting the development and provision of a specific social service for children and youth and their families that can be provided at least on the short term. The project ideas will result from the elaborated strategies for development of social services that have been elaborated during the participatory planning processes and represent the solutions identified in accordance to the carefully understood needs and challenges of the target groups from the 4 municipalities.  Activity 8: Development of training manual (Component 4- Valorization of elaborated methodology and results) 1 training manual is developed LGA. The manual will contain training methodology and instruments on the 3 topics of the ToTs, workshops for the local cross-sectorial initiative groups, the participatory planning process and description of the whole capacity building intervention included in the action.  Activity 9: Piloting social service projects (Component 3- Participatory planning for development of social services and piloting of social services) 4 social services initiatives/programs will be piloted in 4 communities, 1 program/ community, with financial support- 3000 Euro/ program. No sub-granting will be involved, the Applicant will organise purchase, procurement of relevant goods and materials needed for pilot project implementation.  The piloted projects will be aimed at strengthening PPP and can target the establishment of community-based informational and support services in the four target regions (one per region) to facilitate access to social services of families to meet their basic needs, such as informational, legal and consultative support and access to: medical/health care services; education/schooling/kindergarten/day care services; youth programs/tutoring/mentoring; services for disabled people; clothing assistance (it may include clothing, bag, copybook, book and other needs for schools); temporary housing/shelter; food assistance to provide food to families and children in need.   Activity 10: Elaboration of paper on benefits and challenges of participatory local planning for quality social service development and provision (Component 4- Valorisation of elaborated methodology and results) The paper will aim at further promoting the benefits of such a process together with the challenges encountered and recommendations for future similar interventions.  The paper will be presented in the final meeting to international, national and regional stakeholders in order to ensure relevant follow-up initiatives. | Methods of work area chosen in view of being effective and productive, and in respect of already agreed 3 leading principles to be implemented within this project action, such as participation, PPP, and local ownership on the final outcomes.  Participation is viewed both as principle and practice in every development process. Within context of this project action, we perceive Participation as principle and practice which will ensure active involvement of all partners, representatives of the targeted groups, Local and Central government institutions in the decision making process and design of local strategies for social services development. Thus we will facilitate the involvement of all interested parties in the process of designing, deciding and planning ways of action that are in accordance to their needs, capacity and availability.   The 4 cross-sectorial groups created in the 4 municipalities from the 2 selected regions will go through a facilitated participatory planning process and they will develop 4 local strategies for the development of inclusive social services. The strategies will be elaborated for a minimum 2 year- period will include ideas for projects/ programs and public policies aimed at creating and improving social service delivery. Civil society representatives will be included from the very beginning in the process and will work together with representatives of local government and other initiative groups, thus ensuring their contribution to the elaboration of public policies and effective monitoring for the future elaboration and implementation of such policies.   A PPP we perceive as extension of the basic principle of partnership in the process of local community development, and also as good practice for collaborative arrangements for social service delivery between the public authorities and “private” sector organisations– NGO’s, social entrepreneurs and others, based on the principle of appropriate allocation of resources, rewards and risks identification. Implementation of this principle within the project action will secure sustainability of the final outcomes and in successful implementation of local strategies for social services development in the preliminary selected regions in Azerbaijan.   The training for trainers in Azerbaijan will be designed as off the job, interactive, tailored to the identified needs with experienced trainers and specialists in community development processes and in direct community services provision. The training for trainers will consist of both theoretical and practical parts, incorporated with many simulation processes, small group works, discussions and other interactive methods, in order to secure transfer of knowledge and know-how and thus securing further development of skills and competences that will enable Azeri trainers to provide direct training and facilitation to CSO’s and other local groups within the process of implementation of the project action.   The trainings will also be supported by publications, such as the training manual that will process the methodology and content from the training courses and modules so as to be used by the local trainers/NGOs, municipalities and trainees can later refer to these materials when they have questions about the topic that they were trained.   One of the key elements that will be taken into consideration in the project regarding providing pilot community based social services is their individualisation to meet the needs of every child, youth and /or family. The staff and /or volunteers of the pilot social services will be supported through counselling, mentorship or additional training, so to be table to identify needs, to outline individual plan for intervention steps for support, as well as its implementation while the service provision. |
| Mingachevir Parents Organization | Development of data community: six informal “meetups” of data enthusiasts with at least 60 participants in order to promote data culture to a mix of journalists, CSO activists, public officials, IT developers ensuring convergence between these groups for the future development of data tools; creation of online hub to store datasets mined in the course of the project, data visualizations, reports developed, training manuals and courses. Data community meetups will be based on the principle of grassroots canvassing of communities. The regular meetups of data enthusiasts, including one-on-one conversations and group gatherings, offer an informal setting built on mutual trust and the transfer of control to local actors. Building on the underlying assumption - that communities are the best judges of how their lives and livelihoods can be improved and, if provided with adequate resources and information, they can organize themselves to provide for their immediate needs. In meetups, we will also seek out possible successful leaders and potential trainers in the community which can lead/train community after this phase of project is over. In Azerbaijan, we will also use the Belarusian comprehensive experience in working with governmental agencies in a closed country such as Belarus, gradually persuading them to join social innovation and open data movements and release data under open licenses to the public. Training at home and abroad for more active members: two days of introductory and two days of advanced data journalism workshops for 15 participants from media, CSOs, students, state officials in Azerbaijan; in-house consultations for four organizations keen on developing their first data based projects, advising those on methodology of such projects, on data collection, processing, visualization and programming into tools to improve life of communities; ten participants attend Prague 5-day open data course with visits to Czech media/CSOs using data (two participants will stay on in Prague for an additional two weeks to learn more in-depth methods at NGOs or media using data extensively); Point conference in Bosnia for 5 persons and intern at data-driven CSOs in Western Balkans for 3 persons. Introductory workshop will start direct interaction with beneficiaries on their data skills capacity building. The two-day workshop is intended to be an introduction to data journalism and will provide students with skills in finding and interpreting data and the statistical tools to do basic evaluation of data. Advanced workshop will build on the knowledge from the previous workshop and focus more on getting stories from data, asking for data and obtaining, cleaning and delivering data. Special focus will go towards visualizing data and engaging people around the data. Individual consultations will seek to build on these workshops providing consulting tailored to target organizations. The participation of Azerbaijanis in the Point conference will allow them to hear how their counterparts in the Western Balkans have worked to build up their respective communities and see the presentation of inspiring success stories. Following the conference, the conference attendees will stay on in Bosnia and spend a month with ZastoNe, a leader in spreading open data concepts and tech for transparency initiatives in the Western Balkans, to learn about open government and data-driven initiatives used to empower civil society and vulnerable groups in the Balkans, for potential replication of approaches in AZ, Resource development: creation 2 e-learning courses on data journalism and data visualization, 2 localized data visualization tools, translated Data Journalism Handbook. Rationale: Azerbaijanis get access to world-level data knowledge in their native language, and a knowledge base available to all organizations not taking part in project/after the project is over, thus disseminating data knowledge as wide as possible. | Project employs the following methods to attain declared objectives: - meetups, bringing together representatives of media, NGOs, local activists, volunteers, representatives of vulnerable communities and members of wider public, state officials, IT and design professionals – in order to attain necessary cohesion between these groups whose joint expertise is necessary in order to promote wider use of open data and develop data tools required to provide more transparency, exert more pressure on state officials to activate dialogue on activation of rights of vulnerable groups.  - intro and advanced data workshops – in order to provide an entry point into why open data is important and how data based tools may be used to attain transparency and improve standing of vulnerable communities. - Individual consultations for organizations – in order to provide targeted advice to organizations most able and ready to deliver in terms of opening more data and developing data based tools for transparency and inclusion, which (tools and cases) may later be used to showcase progress and motivate other organizations. - International trainings in Prague, POINT conference – to receive input from international trainers from Belarus, Poland, Czech Republic, Ukraine, and other EU countries which have attained sizable successes in use of open data for empowerment of versatile communities - Fellowship – to be able to receive hands on training through participation in actual data projects development which experience may later be used in building data projects back in AZ. - Distance learning courses and localization of tools and manuals – to create a body of knowledge in Azeri to enable access of other organizations in all country to valuable info on open data for inclusion and empowerment, thus guaranteeing project sustainability.  Events inside the country will be organized in Mingachevir and in Baku in order to involve both capital city and regional groups in above-mentioned communities, to activate data development on both regional and central level, and to empower regional communities which situation is worse than that in the capital city.  We seek to involve both activists, journalists, NGO people and state officials to activate discussion on which exactly open data projects may be useful to enable vulnerable communities, improve public services and bring more transparency thus fostering fruitful dialogue. Participation of IT developers and designers is important to train other participants basic on open data tools development and use - especially given that IT community is very much detached from other target groups as of now, a situation typical also in other countries before open data promotion started. Presence of IT and design professionals may also empower development of further social projects in direct cooperation between media, NGOS, state agencies, and IT community. |
| ULUCHAY | Result 1: Established mechanism that provides better legal assistance, mentor programs, vocational training, and business training to prisoners • Legal Aid The first group of activities of this Action will be the provision and advocating of legal aid and mentor support for prisoners in Sheki Prison. Hired lawyer (up to 50 days) and consultants of Ministry of Justice will meet the legal needs of prisoners in and out of prison for property, parental rights, social aid, and writing of legal documents to relevant authorities.  • Psychological Mentor Assistance Psychological rehabilitation of prisoners will be provided by the psycho-social mentor of the Action. The mentor with the service contract working at least 60 full days will support the psychological rehabilitation of prisoners in Sheki Prison.  • Vocational training  Uluchay in cooperation with MoJ Regional Division will supply one empty class with the relevant equipment for locksmith vocational education. At the same time, Uluchay and Sheki Prison will select one vocational trainer among prisoners, who is specialized in selected vocational field. He will receive small amount of funding from the Action’s budget to his bank account or to the account within the prison for their provided lessons at the vocational classes. • Business training  Uluchay’s business trainers will work directly with 150 selected prisoners, who will be released within 6-10 months. The selection process will be based on the willingness of prisoners. Participants of activity will be educated into following topics: business leadership, business start-up, business management & development, accounting, marketing, sales, business-plan writing. The training program consists of seven main topics 10 working days long, considering the fact that the duration of each session will be three hours’ maximum. • Technical and Grant Support Total of 9000 EUR will be available for the technical assistance to start-up businesses. The maximum amount for one business idea is 900 EUR. It is expected that at least 10 business ideas will benefit from this support, but this number of supported business ideas can be higher due the less request of funding by other participants. • Business Mentoring and counseling After the technical assistance, Uluchay’s business advisors will be working with the grant winners to support and ensure their sustainability. At least three times per months they will visit each grant winner and provide their business related recommendations and counseling. Result 2: Developed capacity and skills of regional and national CSOs, MoJ Divisions, Penitentiary Service and local authorities Uluchay, CESD and Regional Division of MoJ will provide three capacity building trainings to CSOs and local authorities on promoting and understanding that the prisoners do have human and economic value and it is the responsibility of officials to provide the prisoners an environment that will respect human rights. The CSOs will increase their capacity in promoting justice and rule of law. As well, the proposed action will present innovative solutions and roles of CSOs dealing with democratization process in Azerbaijan. Totally 30 people will participate in these trainings. Uluchay and Regional Division of MoJ will also provide three capacity building training sessions to 100 officials of Sheki Prison in order to increase their knowledge on 1) human rights of prisoners and conventions related to them, 2) working with the prisoners: interpersonal relations, and 3) how to support the rehabilitation and reintegration processes of prisoners. Result 3: Increasing awareness amongst the general public on this issue, provided solutions and the role of stakeholders in it Uluchay will organize awareness raising sessions which will cover the ex-prisoners’ employment problems and what kind of support they need in order to be fully integrated into the society and role of entrepreneurs in supporting of ex-prisoners.  Uluchay will develop awareness raising publications in A4 booklet format with the information about the Action and activities, problems of prisoners, importance on support the rehabilitation and reintegration processes of prisoners and ex-prisoners, as well as what the CSOs, public, mass-media and government should do in order to decrease the social stigma on prisoners. The booklets will be disseminated within the organized events, among CSOs, governmental authorities, mass-media and entrepreneurs. Totally 750 copies of booklet will be printed within this Action. | The strategy of the Action is to support the establishment of long-term interaction between CSOs and authorities on promoting and solving the rehabilitation and reintegration problems of ex-prisoners into the society, as well as cooperating in issues related to the justice and rule of law. Through the example of cooperation between Uluchay, CESD and MoJ Regional Division, the Action will promote this cooperation among other authorities and CSOs. Uluchay and MoJ have proposed several mechanisms, which were developed based on the consultations with stakeholders, including the local government representatives and ex-prisoners. This proposed action will build upon all accumulated experience, networks and knowledge of both Uluchay and Ministry of Justice in this sector. The Action will use the following methods: using the best practices and lessons learned; synergy with the EU Programmes specifically Justice Support Reform Programme – Azerbaijan (2009-2014), replication of the action by other state authorities and CSOs and their interaction, as well as principles of sustainability and addressing cross-cutting issues such as minorities and disabled persons. As a result of Justice Support Reform Programme – Azerbaijan (2009-2014) provided by EU to the Government of Azerbaijan (GoA) to reform the juridical system in line with the European Standards (in line with the ENP Action Plan Priority 2 and 3 and Council of Europe Standards), the GoA established 10 Regional Justice Divisions (RJD). One of these Divisions (Regional Division of MoJ in Sheki-Zagatala region) is an associate partner of the Action, and is interested in supporting prisoners and their future lives after release. At the same time, the EU brochure on the Justice Reform Support Program - Azerbaijan related to the results of budget supports in EaP countries established primary and vocational courses for prisoners. Uluchay will synergize with this program and provide additional equipment to two vocational classes in newly established Sheki Prison for better education and involvement of more prisoners in vocational education.  The cooperation with both Ministry of Justice and Penitentiary Service will need new approaches and methodologies in order to achieve the main and specific objectives of the Action. The main methodology will be the direct involvement of experts of MoJ to the Action, which will be working along the experts of Uluchay within the Sheki Prison, as well as in capacity building activities of governmental authorities and prison officers. Through their involvement Uluchay will also achieve the higher representation of all stakeholders and target groups in the Action and also to achieve the effective and sustainable results. |
| WARD | Objective 1/Step1/Activity 1: Building infrastructure resource   Months: 1-5 months  Location: Baku and Ismayilly Target group: 8 experts of Gender School (with due support of international experts and   consultants), 10 GFPs in main Ministries and State Committees,   10 HR managers/senior supervisors in main Ministries and State   Committees, 7 decision-makers from National Parliament & SCFWCA  Description: The activity is oriented at the establishment of the Gender School – a unique capacity-building infrastructure with gender-oriented profiled team. Gender School will provide the in-depth training on gender concepts with the view of gender as interdisciplinary perspective in all major fields (from global to micro levels). The Gender School will cover the gender-sensitive education, healthcare, business, media, politics, etc. The alumni of Gender School will be enabled to mainstream gender into their areas of professional engagements and personal commitments. The added-value of the activity will be contribution to the elimination of re-emerged negative phenomena like gender-based discrimination and violence. Within the project framework the Gender School will work towards the advancement of NWM, the two main focuses of the UN CEDAW Committee for Azerbaijan, and will be outsourced for a durable stock of knowledge, strong mechanism and experience on gender mainstreaming. The activity supposes the following sub-activities:   1.1. Establishing the Gender School - transforming Gender Expert Group of WARD (established in 2010) to Gender School and recruiting additional thematic gender experts (totally up to 8 ppl) to Gender School (based on bilateral meetings, interview-based selection and testing of experts); 1.2. Conducting 1 Focus Group meeting with 35 people from all target groups to be held prior to the planning meeting of Gender School experts. The FG meeting is important for identifying the specific challenges that the GFPs and HR supervisors face for fulfilling their gender-sensitive tasks in the institution and for collecting their views on the perspectives for improvement of GFP system and NWM. The views expressed on the FG meeting will be used as the baseline for further planning meetings and action plans adopted. 1.3. Holding 3 orientation and planning meetings with experts of Gender School to form the concept of strengthening GFP machinery, assessing the needs of Gender School experts for further capacity-building, setting up the strategy and action plans for Gender School;  1.4. Conducting 4-day international training for Gender School Experts (as TOT) on concepts of gender architecture, NWM and gender mainstreaming in Ismayilly (to ensure the full participation of experts); 1.5. Setting up the visibility and publicity plan for the Gender School and the “CEDAW in Action” project  Outputs: Gender School established; 8 experts of Gender School capacitated; GFP machinery framework identified; visibility materials (project banner, booklet, promo materials) produced.  Interrelations:  The Activity will be the basis for Activities 2 as well as steps No 3,4,5 to be implemented beyond this project.   Objective 2/Step2/Activity 2: Building documentation resource   Months: 6-18 Location: Baku Target group: 8 experts of Gender School (with due support of international experts and   consultants), 10 GFPs in main Ministries and State Committees,   10 HR managers/senior supervisors in main Ministries and State   Committees, 7 decision-makers from National Parliament & SCFWCA  Description: In Azerbaijan there has never been elaborated any information baseline or publication for GFPs for reference, neither there have ever been produced the orientation guidelines for HR managers/senior supervisors to recruit GFPs in accordance to their working roles and modalities. The production of the 8 (eight) publications will be an important information and knowledge reference for everyone in the NWM as well as key representatives of 6 focus groups of the Action. For identifying the content of publications it is planned to have 5 planning meetings with the experts to work over the publications. The activity supposes the following sub-activities:  2.1. Preparation and publication of the Resource Pack on CEDAW (3 publications) with the following tentative content: 2.1.1. Handbook on basic concepts on gender equality and women’s rights (overall gender sensitization, gender mainstreaming tools and mechanisms); 2.1.2. Handbook on international human rights mechanisms (overview of international human rights mechanisms, UN Human Rights System and CEDAW, significance of CEDAW, state obligations); 2.1.3. Guidelines for various stakeholders to work with CEDAW (sector-by-sector interventions possibilities and advocacy mechanisms).  2.2. Preparation and publication of the Resource Pack for GFPs (4 publications) for GFPs with the following tentative content:  2.2.1.Toolkit for GFPs (qualifications, role, scope of tasks and responsibilities, work modalities, understanding gender architecture in the agency system, information access, capacity-building/knowledge development plan, structural locations, linkages with internal and external structures, NWM, networking values)  2.2.2. Gender Equality Guidelines for GFPs (gender concepts, gender-related guiding principles and documents; gender mainstreaming principles, strategies, tools, criteria, indicators, checklist; enhancement of achieved gender parity; gender-neutral language concept and tools, gender glossary). 2.2.3. Operation Manual for GFP (key policy documents, initial decisions after appointment, personal action plan, analysis framework, assessment tools, gender-mainstreaming/integration plan, communication strategy & plan, advocacy strategy & plan, monitoring & evaluation, gender analysis framework, development of tools and indicators)  2.2.4. Handbook on International Human Rights Mechanisms and GFPs’ work with them, namely with CEDAW convention (purpose, reporting skills, outputs/deliverables of reporting, conducting evaluations)   2.3. Preparation and publication of the handbook for HR managers/senior supervisors (1 publication) with the following tentative content:  2.3.1. The Handbook for HR managers/senior supervisors (gender sensitization, guiding principles for understanding GFP position, allocating time and resources, TOR elaboration, selection process and staff selection system, appointment & initial power, space for GFP's knowledge development, information access, analysis framework, gender-mainstreaming, networking; communication strategy & plan, monitoring & evaluation).   Outputs: 300 copies of high quality and user friendly 8 (completely new, i.e. never developed in Azerbaijan) comprehensive publications produced in printed form and CD version for easy use and multiple usage; experts of Gender School capacitated to work further on these topics  Interrelations:  The Activity will be based on findings from Activity 1; will serve as the basis for steps No 3,4,5 to be implemented beyond this project.   Note: Launch and final conferences of this project will be conducted in line and within the overall UNDP project “Enabling civil society to play a greater role in advancing socio-economic rights of vulnerable populations”. Therefore, neither costs, nor timeline for these activities are inserted into the project document. | The project has the comprehensive approach based on 5 ‘building’ steps methodology to ensure sustainable functionality of a) targeted civil Society Representatives Network, b) established Gender School, c) strengthened NWM in Azerbaijan, which is a pre-requisite for setting fertile field for gender equality and good governance in Azerbaijan. The entire 5 ‘building’ steps methodology includes the following steps:   STEP 1. BUILDING INFRASTRUCTURE RESOURCE – establishing the Gender School and enhancing the Gender School capacity (national gender experts and consultants) on working with GFP system (this project) and other stakeholders (other projects).   STEP 2. BUILDING DOCUMENTATION RESOURCE – elaborating the information baseline and producing comprehensive publications.  STEP 3. BUILDING SKILLS – strengthening the in-depth capacities of 6 focus groups in the areas of gender equality, NWM operation, international human rights mechanism (including CEDAW), communication, reporting, advocacy, decision-making skills as well as networking and cooperation.  STEP 4. BUILDING MECHANISM – developing national strategy plan, action plan, communication plan for GFPs to integrate gender-sensitive issues at all levels; creating the consultation and reporting systems, setting up the systematic tracking, follow-up and management mechanism.   STEP 5. BUILDING PARTNERSHIP – creating the network of national GFPs to ensure exchange and cooperation, holding peer consultation, sharing best practice, networking, using electronic communication; building links with other gender mainstreaming stakeholders, making joint actions inside the GFP network and also between the GFPs and other stakeholders.  During this project 2 of 5 ‘building’ steps will be established/implemented that will be the founding baseline for implementing the remaining steps No 3, 4, 5 during furthers actions. WARD is in process of raising funds for further steps (3, 4, 5) to be able to continue the project and implement the 5 ‘building’ steps methodology completely. |
| Democracy Monitor | Activity 1.1: Baseline study and needs assessment report based on baseline study. A baseline study will be conducted to look into CSO’s needs to improve women’s representation, participation and, more importantly, their access to basic services rural areas of Azerbaijan. It will also help identify the current bottlenecks or challenges that rural men and women are facing in their everyday access to public services. This desk-research will provide a different perspective into the current situation by looking into local governance policy, capacity and institutional arrangements to identify gaps that prevent women from fighting gaining equitable access to economic resources and public services. A combined mapping and rapid organisational development needs assessment of key women CSOs and CBOs, including those based in rural areas through 2 focus groups and meetings will be carried out. In addition, the review will analyse gender issues at three levels: 1. Micro-level, focusing on individuals, households and local communities. 2. Intermediate level, focusing on institutions and services and 3. Macro-level, focusing on national policies and plans, the economy and social issues. Activity 2.1. Pub. of Manual on Women Empowerment Training Themes A Gender-Responsive Approach to Empowerment is the core value of women empowerment task. A gender-responsive approach recognizes the importance of understanding and addressing the informal and formal gendered rules and institutional arrangements that influence women’s and men’s ability to experience empowerment. These rules include informal social norms about the value, roles, responsibilities, and power relations of women and men based on gender. . The manual will provide recommendations to CSOs and the other selected target groups for training workshops in the relevant areas, examples of documents and templates to be used by CSOs and other target groups in their work practice. These manuals will be distributed to target CSOs, active female groups interested in establishing association, increasing their participation in own communities, regional resources centers and libraries, university students and community development groups. Activity 3.1. Training workshops for women leaders Rural women and women from vulnerable groups lack necessary knowledge and skills on equality concept and institutionalised participation, local ownership in communities and self-confidence. To achieve the Action’s specific objectives there is a need to build and improve capacity for rural and vulnerable women. In an attempt to the action will bring in empowerment and gender focus to socio-economic development in Azerbaijan, 2 capacity-building workshops will be organized in, Ganja and Lenkaran, two-day capacity-building workshops for 15 selected rural women leaders. 1 (one) (in Lenkaran) will be on international equality and human rights law; national legal and policy frameworks on discrimination; documentation and advocacy techniques; and 1 (one) (in Ganja) on business cycle management; networking and communication; effective use of ICT technologies; media resources and state institutions etc. Activity 3.2. Training for NGOs, media and youth 1 x 2 days long training on equality in Baku- Training of the selected Azerbaijani CSOs, media and youth groups in the use of equality law and best practice and in the application of equality law in documentation, litigation and advocacy will have an immediate positive impact in helping to meet the identified need for improved knowledge of this area, thereby increasing the capacity of these organisations to combat discrimination using a full range of techniques. It will also address the need to ensure a good basic knowledge of modern equality law among all those involved in the action going forward. DM will select a team of 2 trainers, one from ERT and one an expert on the Azerbaijani legal system as it relates to human rights. The trainers will be tasked to design, develop and deliver one two-day long training workshop. 1 x 2 days long training in Sheki - Based on the pre-Action analysis the Action implementers identified that the CSOs, media representatives and youth groups need knowledge and skills building in the areas of good governance, advocacy, women empowerment from gender prospective. It is important to build CSOs capacity in this area to improve policy and institutional framework for women socio-economic empowerment. In that regard the CSOs, media and youth groups need extensive knowledge and skills in the area: Ø Effective networking and advocacy; Research for policy; How to track & monitor the government policies with an emphasis on spending the budget resources in line with goals of gender empowerment; CBOs’ management systems, strategic planning, resource mobilisation and financial management. In each of the capacity-building training, 20-25 participants will attend. 1 (one) Capacity-building training will be held in Baku and the other 1(one) in the region. The local trainer expert will be identified by DM.  Activity3.3. Training workshop for journalists There is a need to increased awareness about the challenges of gender prospective approach in the service delivery framework, right to equality and non-discrimination, organizing successful advocacy work for improved gender agenda and economic and social rights of women. One of the best ways of doing it is well developed media publications by investigative journalists with improved capacity. This activity component aims at improving capacity of journalists in reporting and journalist investigations DM in consultation with the experts will identify a group of 10 journalists both, local and national, and arrange a training workshop in Baku on (i) overall investigative journalism for better news-reporting skills and (ii) pro-gender reporting from empowerment perspective, i.e. gender challenges in the current service delivery framework. Activity 3.4. Regional Workshop for Stakeholders Consensus amongst stakeholders will be built up through a Multi-stakeholder Consultative Process through the engagement of private sector, civil society and successful women leaders to gain their support for policy recommendations and reforms to institutionalize gender responsive practices in institutions. In that regard the Regional Workshops for Stakeholders will be a tremendous extensive contribution to inter-stakeholder cooperation on advocacy for policy and institutional framework improvement on rural women empowerment. They will take place with the participation of state, non-state organizations and businesses in Baku and Ganja – 2 in total.   Activity 3.5. National Conference  A consensus amongst stakeholders will be built up through a Multi-stakeholder Consultative Process through the engagement of private sector, civil society and successful women leaders to gain their support for policy recommendations and reforms to institutionalize gender responsive practices in institutions. In that regard the National Conference which will involve wide range of stakeholders will be an extensive contribution to inter-stakeholder cooperation on developing legal and policy recommendations, advocacy for legal, policy and institutional framework improvement on rural women empowerment.  The one day long conference will take place at the end of the 2nd year, the project findings and the results will be discussed. Women Empowerment Index methodology will be presented and debated and new consolidated legal, advocacy and policy recommendations will be developed as an outcome. It will involve the target groups’ members, multi-stakeholders including government, local media, NGO representatives, gender and development experts, international community representatives and the other relevant actors etc.   Activity 4.1. Media Publication by Investigative Journalists After training of journalists on the gender-sensitive reporting, 4 journalist investigations will be published by the selected journalists in the respective media outlets about case studies of rural women empowerment, participation challenges and discrimination cases.  This component will act as case studies and aim at increased awareness of the society at large and the target groups on the situation on the ground and visions for improvement by the interviewed experts.   Activity 5.1. Talk Shows on Online TV  Raising public awareness on gender equality in business and social life. A total of 4 debates on online TV will be organized. Guest speakers will be involved from Baku and the regions. They will include different range of issues of gender equality and socio-economic life of women  Activity 6.1. Developing Women Empowerment Index International organizations focus on gender equality as a major priority in development interventions due to the direct impact gender-sensitive policies have on economic development, higher education achievement, and better quality of life within a country or region. There is an increasing need for effective techniques to measure progress of such interventions and maintain gender equality as a main concern in international development. Thus, the Women Empowerment Index to be designed will fill the existing gap of gender statistics in the country. This Index will identify, evaluate, and recommend gender-sensitive indicators across five dimensions: economic contribution, education, governance, health, and media.  Activity 6.2. Developing Policy Briefs Two Policy briefs will be written and disseminated among target audience – state bodies, businesses, international donor organizations, about the potential scenarios on improving the gender picture of particular regions. It will touch upon the development challenges in the remote regions from gender prospective for  1. Reducing the gap between rural women and men in access to productive resources and services;  2. Ensuring that women and men have the ability to influence programme and policy decision-making and building institutional responsiveness and accountability (voice); and 3. Ensuring that rural women and men can take up economic opportunities to improve their individual and household wellbeing.  Activity 7.1. Website and Facebook page development A general website and Facebook page will be created for the Action. There will also be created a “Women entrepreneurship”, legal aid/consultation, women empowerment, gender equality section for FAQs and forums. DM will allocate special space on its website titled as “women entrepreneurship” where it will post all the results and analyses regarding women empowerment.   Activity 8.1. Establishment of Women Social Network The Network’s objective will be to create a venue for cooperation among CSOs in combating all forms of discrimination and rural women empowerment. The Network’s membership will be drawn from across civil society, including representatives of those working on behalf of particular vulnerable groups or on particular grounds of discrimination, human rights, gender and women empowerment organisations and others with a stake in equality issues; observer organisations - including government representatives, academic institutions and international organisations such as UNDP and OHCHR – will also be invited to attend meetings. Two large Network Meetings will be carried out within the Action.   Activity 9.1 Study tours (2 days long) Meetings at the selected business institutions, organizations, state bodies, civil society and with women leaders in businesses who will talk about success stories of women participation. It will also give a rural women leaders, entrepreneurs to get a new channel and networking for advocacy for positive changes on empowerment at the grassroots level. It will inspire future relationships between the women from the regions and capital city, which women in the regions lack today and desperately need. Such visits will enable women participants from the regions to develop direct dialogue with their experienced peers and get to know different realities and experiences, which they can replicate in their own cases. The study tours will also reinforce collaboration between women NGOs and successful women, who will promote and take part in the activities of NGOs. The Study Tour will also enable participating organizations to identify the best practices of women empowerment in the light of today’s challenges in the society. | To accomplish the main objectives of this project, Democracy Monitor and its experts team – will use various methods in the fields of capacity building, research, fact finding, public awareness, advocacy and support to capacity for legal and policy framework improvement. The selection of these implementation methods is based on 1) the extensive research of similar projects in the field in European and neighboring countries; 2) mini-surveys conducted among selected CSOs and citizens in target regions and 3) previous experience of Democracy Monitor and the project’s experts team in the field of civil society development and human rights.   To achieve the goal and objectives of the project, Democracy Monitor will use the following methods:   Research/Analysis: Democracy Monitor will conduct desk research, surveys and focus group discussions to identify problems;   Training: Democracy Monitor will conduct training courses starting from awareness-raising workshops to specialized and focused technical training courses for CSO representatives, journalists and rural and vulnerable women leaders. To ensure that training courses are effective, Democracy Monitor will use interactive participatory methods such as brainstorming, group work and case studies in the trainings.   Technical Assistance: The project team will provide consulting and other technical assistance to women NGOs, community members and initiative groups in organizational development, proposal development and fundraising. Democracy Monitor will provide individual consulting services to target groups on legal matters, advocacy and development issues.   Publications and Electronic Resources: Democracy Monitor will develop different manuals, awareness raising materials to reinforce knowledge and skills received through training and technical assistance. In addition, Democracy Monitor will develop online resources on a project website and facebook page to provide citizens with resources on gender equality, women rights, soci-economic empowerment and women development.   TV Shows: Democracy Monitor will use one national TV and one online TV as a main method to reach citizens, as many in remote regions do not have access to print media and have a rare access to internet or cannot attend activities organized by Democracy Monitor and/or other organizations a traditional TV will also be used. This method will also provide an opportunity for target groups to call and talk with CSO experts on problems they face in exercising their right to social-economical rights.   Newer communication technologies and social media (Internet, Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, Googlegroups) will play a central role in activities involving target groups. Project accounts will be established on Facebook and Twitter and channels with YouTube with the aim of sharing views about issues addressed. Choosing new technology and social media as tools will lower the threshold for young people to participate in discussions by giving them the feeling of moving on their own arena and talking their own language. This will also give them a feeling of being an integral part of the process and dialogue for youth and women participation in improving the situation. New communication and networking channels will also provide for a solid infrastructure for regional and international cooperation, self-organization, reflections and advocacy. Networking activities will tie the partners closer together and enhance their sense of being part of an organized, meaningful and focused community that can see and accomplish common challenges together. They will also garner wider support for the accomplishment of the project goal, multiply the results achieved and inspire professionalism, seriousness, determination and legitimacy to all stakeholders. Proposed methods are interconnected and reinforce each other. Democracy Monitor and its experts will organize project activities both at the national and regional/local level. Democracy Monitor will carry out not only group activities such as trainings, roundtables, but also undertake individual work with each target CSO and individuals. |

Annex 9. Suggested revision of EQs stipulated in the TOR

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **ToR EQs** | **Revision** | **Comment** |
| ·        Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions.  Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document. | EQ 2 Design of the Project | Items in this EQ will be presented as indicators |
| ·        Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results.  Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design? | EQ 1. Relevance of the project | Item on lessons learned will be included as indicator in EQ 2 |
| ·        Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country (or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects)? | EQ 1. Relevance of the project | Sub questions will be addressed within indicators |
| ·        Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes? | EQ 2 Design of the Project | Items in this EQ will be presented as indicators |
| ·        If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement. |  | Recommendation section |
| **Results Framework/Logical Framework Matrix:** |  |  |
| ·        Undertake a critical analysis of the project’s logframe indicators and targets, assess how “SMART” the end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound). | EQ 2 Design of the Project | Items in this EQ will be presented as indicators |
| ·        Are the project’s objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame? | EQ 2 Design of the Project | Items in this EQ will be presented as indicators |
| ·        Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, employment suggestions, human rights, improved governance etc...) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis. | EQ 4 Effectiveness  Also, in recommendation section |  |
| ·        Verify whether the broader development aspects of the project are being monitored effectively.  Develop and recommend SMART ‘development’ indicators. | EQ 5. Monitoring and recommendation | Indicators |
| **i.                 Progress Towards Results** |  |  |
| Analysis of Progress towards Outcomes: | EQ 7 Effectiveness |  |
| ·        Review the Logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix and colour code progress in a “traffic light system” based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as “Not on target to be achieved” (red). | EQ 7 Effectiveness |  |
| **Table. Progress towards Results Matrix (Achievement of outcomes against End-of-project Targets)** |  |  |
| |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Project Strategy** | **Indicator****[[1]](https://jobs.undp.org/cj_view_job.cfm?cur_job_id=76853" \l "_ftn1)** | **Baseline Level****[[2]](https://jobs.undp.org/cj_view_job.cfm?cur_job_id=76853" \l "_ftn2)** | **End-of-project Target** | **Achievement Rating****[[3]](https://jobs.undp.org/cj_view_job.cfm?cur_job_id=76853" \l "_ftn3)** | **Justification for Rating** | | **Outcome 1:** | Indicator 1: |  |  |  |  | | Indicator 2: |  |  | | **Outcome 2:** | Indicator 3: |  |  |  |  | | Indicator 4: |  |  | | **Outcome 3:** | Indicator 5: |  |  |  |  | | Indicator 6: |  |  | |  | **Will be added as Annex to the report** |
| In addition to the analysis of progress towards outcomes: |  |  |
| ·        Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project. | EQ 7 Effectiveness | Subsection on drivers/hindering factors |
| ·        By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits. |  | Recommendations |
| **ii.               Project Implementation and Adaptive Management** |  |  |
| Management Arrangements: |  |  |
| ·        Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document.  Have changes been made and are they effective?  Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear?  Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner?  Recommend areas for improvement. | EQ 3 Efficiency, EQ 4 Partnerships |  |
| ·        Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement. | EQ 4 Partnerships |  |
| ·        Review the quality of support provided by the Project Beneficiary and recommend areas for improvement. | EQ 4 Partnerships + recommendations |  |
| Work Planning: |  |  |
| ·        Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved. | EQ 3 Efficiency |  |
| ·        Are work-planning processes results-based?  If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results? | EQ 3 Efficiency + recommendations |  |
| ·        Examine the use of the project’s results framework/Logframe as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start. | EQ 2 Design (Indicator 2.1) |  |
| **Finance and co-finance:** |  |  |
| ·        Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions. | EQ 3 Efficiency |  |
| ·        Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions. | EQ 3 Efficiency |  |
| ·        Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds? | EQ 3 Efficiency |  |
| ·        Informed by the co-financing monitoring table to be filled out, provide commentary on co-financing: is co-financing being used strategically to help the objectives of the project? Is the Project Team meeting with all co-financing partners regularly in order to align financing priorities and annual work plans? | EQ 3 Efficiency |  |
| Project-level Monitoring and Evaluation Systems: |  |  |
| ·        Review the monitoring tools currently being used:  Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems?  Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive? | EQ 5 Monitoring |  |
| ·        Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and evaluation budget.  Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? Are these resources being allocated effectively? | EQ 5 Monitoring |  |
| **Stakeholder Engagement:** |  |  |
| ·        Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders? | EQ 4 Partnerships |  |
| ·        Participation and country-driven processes: Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project?  Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation? | EQ 8 Impact and Sustainability |  |
| ·        Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives? | EQ 7 Effectiveness |  |
| **Reporting:** |  |  |
| ·        Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board. | EQ 3 Efficiency |  |
| ·        Assess how well the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfil reporting requirements. | EQ 3 Efficiency |  |
| ·        Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners. | EQ 3 Efficiency |  |
| **Communications:** |  |  |
| ·        Review internal project communication with stakeholders: Is communication regular and effective? Are there key stakeholders left out of communication? Are there feedback mechanisms when communication is received? Does this communication with stakeholders contribute to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and investment in the sustainability of project results? | EQ 6 Communication |  |
| ·        Review external project communication: Are proper means of communication established or being established to express the project progress and intended impact to the public (is there a web presence, for example? Or did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns?) | EQ 6 Communication |  |
| ·        For reporting purposes, write one half-page paragraph that summarizes the project’s progress towards results in terms of contribution to sustainable development benefits, as well as global environmental benefits. |  | Will be added as an annex to the Main report |

Annex 10: Description of project planned action

### Summary of the action

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Project Title | Enabling civil society to play a greater role in promoting socio-economic rights of vulnerable populations |
| Duration | 24 months |
| Budget | 1,994,981 EUR |
| Objectives of the project | **Overall objective:** To advance socio-economic rights of vulnerable populations (particularly women, Persons with disability (PWD), children and young people, imprisoned persons) in Azerbaijan  **Specific Objective:** To support civil society initiatives at national and local level in Azerbaijan aimed at promoting and advancing rights of vulnerable groups through addressing social inclusion, socio-economic, non-discrimination and equality needs of vulnerable groups, particularly women, PWD, children and young people, imprisoned persons. |
| Expected Result 1. | Capacity of targeted civil society organisations increased to utilize human-rights based approach in advancing the social inclusion, equality and socio-economic rights of the vulnerable groups; |
| Expected Result 2. | Social inclusion and socio-economic rights of vulnerable groups advanced at the local level |
| Expected Result 3. | Issues of non-discrimination and equality promoted through active engagement of civil society in community development and social inclusion |
| Implementing Agency | UNDP |
| Project Partners | Constitution Research Fund  Center for Economic and Social Development (CESD)  Eurasia Partnership Foundation  Initiative for the Sake of Development  Internews;  Local Governance Assistance (LGA);  WARD,  Law and Development Public Organisation;  Human Rights Centre (HRCA),  Uluchay;  Mingachevir Parent's Association;  Democracy Monitor |

### Background

Azerbaijan has a relatively developed legislative base in terms of protecting socio-economic rights of vulnerable groups. For example, the Constitution of the Republic of Azerbaijan guarantees its citizens gender equality and freedom from all kinds of discrimination in all spheres of life. National legislation stipulates equal rights of men and women to engage in all types of economic and social activity, inherit, own and sell property, receive bank loans and travel in and out of the country. Since Independence, Azerbaijan ratified all major international agreements on human rights – e.g. the Convention on Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW) in 1995; the Convention on the Right of the People with Disabilities in 2009.

However, in Azerbaijan there is a gap between legislative acts and their enforcement. For example, the UN’s alternative report to CEDAW Convention (2014) points out to a number of challenges faced by women that prevent full implementation of women’s rights. In terms of people with disabilities there are some gaps in existing legislation that should be harmonized with the Convention. The non-exhaustive list of examples of these gaps includes the need to incorporate specific prohibition of disability-based discrimination; recognition of gender equality of women and girls with disability in the legislation; modification of physical environment.

Azerbaijan has also made spectacular achievements in terms of reducing poverty rate (from almost 50% to 5% in a decade) and unemployment (5% for the general population. However, low unemployment rate masks special vulnerabilities in some segments of the population such as youth and women[[15]](#footnote-15). Young people aged 15-24 have the highest unemployment rate of 13.5% against 5% in the general population[[16]](#footnote-16). Azerbaijani women still have higher unemployment rates and higher shares in informal employment than men and are disproportionately concentrated in sectors that pay the lowest wages such as agriculture, education, health care and social work. People with disabilities have also not fully benefited from economic growth. Seventy-four per cent of people with disabilities out of 750 surveyed[[17]](#footnote-17) are unemployed and face obstacles to economic participation. There are also numerous examples where vulnerable people are excluded from the active participation in the economic and social life as well as cannot participate in decision-making at the community level.

Hence, there is an urgent need to translate the successful growth into augmented opportunities for equitable socio-economic participation and inclusiveness. To complement the government efforts in this direction, this Project will support civil society organizations to provide legal and social services to the various groups of vulnerable populations, raise awareness on human rights, advocate for inclusiveness and non-discrimination. The non-exhaustive list of specific target groups for this action includes women, people and children with disabilities, prisoners etc.

**3.1 Project components and activities**

The results of the project are focused on the development of a vibrant civil society advocating for and working on social inclusion and advancing rights of vulnerable groups. To achieve this, UNDP partners with 12 CSOs, each of which has experience and track record in working for and with vulnerable groups. Throughout the project duration, each of the 12 CSOs will implement different initiatives aiming to promote and protect the rights of vulnerable groups, with the overall support from UNDP.

The project will thus be structured in the following components and corresponding activities:

**Component 1:** Organisational Development Support to the Project partners

**Component 2:** Support to viable models for advancing social inclusion and socio-economic rights of vulnerable groups

**Component 3:** Non-discrimination and equality framework promotion.

**Component 1: Organisational Development Support to the Implementing partners**

During the preparatory work for the project, all partner CSOs had a chance to define their capacity development needs in their respective proposals. The needs outlined in the proposal and in bilateral meetings with an external consultant included: a) needs for thematic knowledge building (in areas of thematic focus of each CSO, knowledge on human rights based approach and international conventions and standards in human rights protection); b) management and organisational development capacity building; and c) knowledge and tools to better promote and advocate rights of their constituencies and final beneficiaries. Mentioned types of support were expert assistance for organisational development and management; enabling CSOs to participate in international and national events and thematic trainings and expert assistance for increasing PR skills and approaches. Under Component 1, the Project will respond to these needs in order to support partner organisations in their own organisational development towards functional, strong organisations with sustainable structures and networks capable to deliver quality Rights’ Based programmes. To implement activities within this component, UNDP will utilise its internal and outsourced expertise (consultants and trainers), while support to CSO partner representatives in educational and other thematic events will be used to cover their justified financial costs accrued. Below are detailed activities designed to support the partner CSOs during the project.

**Activities:**

**Activity 1.1** Develop and conduct detailed Capacity Development Needs Assessment (*Implementation responsibility:* *UNDP*)

**Activity 1.2.** Capacity building for utilisation of human rights based approach (*Implementation responsibility:* *UNDP*)

**Activity 1.3** Develop and implement Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) and quality assurance systems (*Implementation responsibility:* *UNDP*)

**Activity 1.4.** Develop and implement PR/communication strategy (*Implementation responsibility: UNDP*)

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Activity 1.1. Develop and conduct detailed Capacity Development Needs Assessment**

As mentioned above, CSO partners had a chance to outline their capacity building needs in the Section 13 of the Proposal template (See Annex 4). However, despite repeated clarifications in bilateral meetings and comments to proposals by Consultant, CSOs could not identify in detail exact areas and types of activities where support is needed and would be beneficial. Most CSOs presented ways in which they would address needs of their target groups instead of needs they would have for their organizational development. Still, final proposals present the account of thematic and organizational needs of organisations that could be tackled by the project. Some indicative topics for support have been identified by CSO partners in their proposals. The topics already identified as requiring further development are: rights-based approach and anti- discrimination; use of social networks and other Internet channels for dissemination of info and promotion of human rights; tailor made trainings on thematic areas linked to penitentiary, and other new methodologies in community work. Also raised is a need to have the opportunity to attend international and national thematic events and trainings on topics of their specific interest. In the area of organisational development and management, organisations raised issues of M&E, reporting, revising and improving organisational and governance structures and management, as well as PR. These areas are hereby presented as specific activities within the Component 1. Nevertheless, in order to ensure concrete activities are planned and implemented, UNDP team will conduct Capacity Building Needs Assessment to ensure concrete activities are singled out and adequately planned. The Needs Assessment will be conducted via individual questionnaires and bilateral meetings between UNDP and partners to set up the organizational development plans. The Capacity Building Needs assessment will be carried out from October through December 2016. As a result of the capacity needs assessment, it is expected to identify: i) specific topics for the trainings/ad hoc assistance for the CSO partners; ii) training schedule; iii) training participants; 4) indication on training providers.

**Activity 1.2 Capacity Building for utilisation of human rights based approach**

*Implementation responsibility: UNDP*

In this programmatic area, partner organisations will continually be supported to deliver their programmes in a quality and sustainable manner, based on human rights. This will be achieved by providing trainings and educational courses according to the specific needs of each organisation. As concrete lists of events were not provided by CSO partners, UNDP will work with CSO partners individually to provide ad-hoc assistance to events/educational activities that are deemed relevant and useful for improvement of CSO partner’s overall capacities and profiling. UNDP will also support analysis and development of individual methodological approaches by partner CSOs and wherever applicable in partnership with organisations professionalising in respective thematic areas (e.g. partnering with the Penal Reform International on issues relating to penitentiary).

**Activity 1.3 Develop and implement M&E and quality assurance systems**

*Implementation responsibility: UNDP*

UNDP will provide mentoring, coaching and training to key management staff of the 12 CSOs in order to support their implementation capacities. Trainings will be organised according to the needs identified through capacity development needs assessment and will be on topics such as: project management, organisational and structural issues (e.g. internal organisational procedures, principles, approaches, monitoring and evaluation, quality assurance systems in management and programmes, etc. Alongside the development of programmatic capacity UNDP will also focus support to the finance, accounting and administrative policies and practices for the partner CSOs.

The UNDP team, its programme and financial staff, will further provide support through backstopping and mentoring to each CSO on improving the financial and reporting management systems in line with UNDP and EU procedures. UNDP will be jointly working with partner organisations in setting up and implementing a Monitoring and Evaluation system comprising a number of separate elements, including indicator definition, frequency of data collection and analysis, disaggregation of indicator data, sources of information, etc. UNDP and the partner CSOs will ensure quality M&E system is designed to track all areas of work within individual CSO project activities. The tracking of implementation of this system will largely be based on indicators agreed and presented in CSO proposals. This system will serve to track and monitor progress and provide routines for reflection and adaptation.

**Activity 1.4. Develop and implement PR/communication strategy**

*Implementation responsibility: UNDP, Constitution Research Fund; CESD; Eurasia Partnership Foundation; Initiative for the Sake of Development; Internews; LGA; WARD; Law and Development Public Organisation; HRCA; Uluchay; Mingachevir Parent's Association; and Democracy Monitor.*

All 12 partner CSOs recognise that their public profile could be raised and benefit the CSO and their constituency. The CSO partners will, in partnership with UNDP, develop their own Communication strategies for the initiatives they will implement under this project, that will highlight the strength and value of their products and serve to brand the organisations locally. These strategies will also include advocacy and promotional activities to be implemented within the framework of their respective projects.

**Component 2: Support to viable models for advancing social inclusion and socio-economic rights of vulnerable groups**

Under Component 2, interventions at local and regional levels will aim at developing models for advancement of social inclusion and socio-economic rights of vulnerable groups,particularly women, PWD, children and young people, and imprisoned persons, in partnership with government stakeholders and other CSOs. The Project will work on improving the knowledge and awareness on related subjects concerning work and inclusion of vulnerable groups, and will support targeted communities and their local authorities to provide quality public services to achieve sustainable social development. It is expected that interventions implemented within this component will have direct contribution to improvement of the quality of life as well as empowerment of most vulnerable women, men and children. Below are activities to be implemented within this Component, while detailed account of individual CSO partner activities and methodologies are presented in Annex 3 of the Inception Report.

**Activities:**

**Activity 2.1** Increasing Capacities of state and non-state actors for provision of legal and social services to PWDs *(Implementation responsibility: Constitution Research Fund)*

**Activity 2.2** Increasing Capacity of CSOs in the field of Juvenile Delinquency prevention, early detection and intervention (*Implementation responsibility: Initiative for the Sake of Development)*

**Activity 2.3** Preparation and delivery of prison monitoring services (*Implementing partner: HRC)*

**Activity 2.4** Protecting and promoting economic and social rights of prisoners for their rehabilitation and reintegration of into society. (*Implementation responsibility: Uluchay, CESD)*

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Activity 2.1 Increasing Capacities of state and non-state actors for provision of legal and social services to PWDs**

*Implementation responsibility: Constitution Research Fund*

Activities will contribute to social protection of PWD/CWD in 6 districts of Sheki-Zakatala regions and in Baku through addressing legal and social protection issues at district and national levels and promoting an equitable, open and democratic society. This activity will be led by local partner organisation, Constitution Research Fund (CRF). The organisation will work with 20 local and regionally active CSOs on provision of para-legal assistance and advocacy for PWD; and up to 30 social workers, 60 representatives of duty bearers, 100 school teachers and 50 health personnel as well as the Ombudsman’s Office on raising their capacities and education on rights of PWDs stemming from the National Action Programme 2013-2018 on Rights of PWDs. CRF will work with social workers and lawyers on raising their knowledge and skills to work directly on education and provision of legal aid to 300 PWDs and their family members on the rights of PWDs, legislation, Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD), existing services/resources, etc. Finally, CRF and social workers will carry out 100 follow-up visits to families and individual persons with disabilities to monitor the implementation of decisions made after legal services are provided. The work with PWDs will be followed up and promoted through public events and campaigns and through media, which will also serve to promote the rights and protection mechanisms, directly contributing to Expected result 3 of this action.

**Activity 2.2 Increasing Capacity of CSOs in the field of Juvenile Delinquency prevention, early detection and intervention**

*Implementation responsibility: Initiative for the Sake of Development*

The Activity 2.2 contributes directly to the implementation of the Juvenile Justice Reform, by creating mechanisms for prevention of juvenile delinquency, through increased attention to the emotional, behavioural and autism spectrum disorders of children and adolescents within the operation of the pilot Family and Child Care Centre (FCCC) to be opened in Baku – Narimanov District. The approach to working on prevention of juvenile delinquency is based on the principle of identifying individuals and environments at risk for delinquent activity before the behaviour has occurred and then either removing risk factors or strengthening resistance to the risk factors through support the development of the child’s personality, abilities, and potential. Establishment of FCCC with well-trained team members will ensure early detection and preventive interventions to troubled families. FCC centre will be duplication of the Georgian model, which served effectively and was undertaken by the Ministry of Education and Science of Georgia and continues its’ effective functioning till now. Georgian experience will be presented to the project network of governmental and non-governmental bodies, to use as additional evidence to be used in the advocacy process.

The family-directed psychosocial care Centre is the community-based service that will provide the high-risk families and juveniles with preventive intervention both at centre and in community/families. This service has the advantage that young people are not taken from their trusted environments. FCC team members will represent different professions - psychologists, social workers, nurse, and medical doctor. This multidisciplinary team will provide both at-centre/day care and outreach services. FCCC’s services’ will include Day-care, In-home intervention (via mobile teams), Care Coordination, Psychosocial assessment (Family and Child and Adolescent Functional Assessment), Parents’ aide (e.g. training parents in family management techniques), Supervision.

The work within this activity will also include establishment of the referral system for effective coordination of various agencies and structures, including policlinics, schools and kindergartens, social agencies, mental health institutions (psycho-neurological dispensary), police stations, CSOs, etc. Advocacy and promotion will be underlying endeavour in order to raise awareness and ensure buy-in for continuity of care.

This activity will be implemented in close cooperation with the local community and address the most exposed, at-risk groups/families, aiming at setting up the equal and effective care and preventive programs for and with them.

**Activity 2.3 Preparation and delivery of prison monitoring services**

*Implementing partner: HRC*

The opportunity of public control over the prisons was included in law in 2000. However, only in2006, the Public Committee (PC) under the Minister of Justice was established. The PC includes 11 experts representing Baku-based non-governmental organizations (NGO), including the Project CSO Partner, HRCA. Other NGOs can participate in the process of monitoring of prisons and correction of convicts under the supervision of the PC. However, this measure is challenged by two factors: lack of capacity of CSOs from regions to monitor prisons thus preventing them from participation in the process of public control as well as lack of possibility for PC to monitor regularly prisons in remote areas. The Activity 2.3 is designed to address these two challenges through building of new capacities of local CSOs to monitor the prison institutions subordinated to the Ministry of Justice of Azerbaijan. Local CSO partner in charge for this Activity will identify and train up to 30-40 prospective members of the prison monitoring groups in Ganja and Sheki among the local activists of civil society, covering all aspects of the monitoring of prisons. The training activities will include also the study visits to the prisons and the learning of monitoring work of PC and National Prevention Group and fellowship at the HRCA offices in Baku and Ganja, in cooperation with the PC, National NGO Forum, regional offices of the Human Rights Commissioner (Ombudsman). Trained CSO activists will then perform regular monitoring of about 15-20 prisons in Baku, Salyan, Ganja and Sheki, with reports to the Ministry of Justice, mass media and international organizations. During monitoring visits, lawyers of each monitoring groups will work with the prisoners and provide them the legal consultations related to the convictions and detention. The reports and media articles about prison conditions and actual problems will be issued, with a goal to promote the prison reforms. For the purpose of education, the Project will produce a manual for prison monitors and its annex, a compilation of basic legal norms on prisons (about 500 copies). The publications will be used during the trainings and distributed among the NGOs, mass media and prison libraries in various regions of the country (e.g. in Nakhchivan).

**Activity 2.4** **Protecting and promoting economic and social rights of prisoners for their rehabilitation and reintegration of into society.**

*Implementation responsibility: Uluchay, CESD*

This Activity is responding to recognised challenge of recidivism in Sheki-Zagatala region of Azerbaijan, as well as the reintegration and rehabilitation problems of ex-prisoners into the society. Project partners and the Ministry of Justice believe that the best way to interrupt a negative cycle would be to better prepare prisoners for their releases and to support them as they readjust to freedom. Hence, within this activity, the Project, through partner CSO Uluchay, will concentrate on solving psychological problems and employment of ex-prisoners through psychological mentoring and supporting ex-prisoners’ own business initiatives. Simultaneously, issues of weak capacity, coordination and cooperation between government and civil society sector for improvement of rehabilitation and reintegration processes of ex-prisoners into the society will be addressed through trainings, exchanges and networking among sectors. Finally, legal problems of prisoners in and out of the prison will be covered through the legal aid support, whole problems related to the social stigma on ex-prisoners will be addressed through awareness raising sessions and publications. An awareness raising campaign will be realized that details the training, struggle, transition, and progress former inmates make as they leave prison and become productive citizens.

**Component 3:** **Non-discrimination and equality framework promotion**

Communication to government and wider audience on non-discrimination and equality by CSO advocates was acknowledged as one of the critical elements that need further investment, as efficient communication and public awareness are crucial for the success in ensuring full social inclusion and equality. The Project will work on designing and implementing communication and advocacy strategies to ensure awareness raising and understanding of non-discrimination and equality framework to the potential stakeholders, beneficiaries and concerned authorities, especially the most vulnerable and affected communities and groups of population. One of the most important aspects covered by the Project advocacy and awareness raising efforts will be the rights and opportunities for the vulnerable groups targeted by this action, particularly women and children.

**Activities:**

**Activity 3.1** Build partnership with national and local government and advocate for and promote the issues of non-discrimination and equality (including advocacy campaign, inputs into policy-making; advocacy for participatory policy processes) (*Implementation responsibility: UNDP, partners)*

**Activity 3.2** Develop networking and partnerships with and between CSOs working on the issues of non-discrimination and equality (including information sharing and planning meetings) (*Implementation responsibility: UNDP, partners)*

**Activity 3.3** Build Infrastructure and Documentation Resource for Civil Society and National Women’s Machinery (*Implementation responsibility: WARD)*

**Activity 3.4** Enhance Technical and practical civil society capacity to improve the legal, institutional and policy framework for socio-economic empowerment of women in remote areas (*Implementation responsibility: Democracy Monitor)*

**------------------------------**

**Activity 3.1 Build partnership with national and local government and advocate for and promote the issues of non-discrimination and equality (including advocacy campaign, inputs into policy-making; advocacy for participatory policy processes)**

*Implementation responsibility: UNDP, Constitution Research Fund; CESD; Eurasia Partnership Foundation; Initiative for the Sake of Development; Internews; LGA; WARD; Law and Development Public Organisation; HRCA; Uluchay; Mingachevir Parent's Association; and Democracy Monitor*

Project CSO partners across the country will interact with or enter into partnerships with government at local, regional and national levels to promote the issues of non-discrimination and equality. Partner CSOs will provide trainings to local and regional authorities to support the development of participatory policy processes; will engage in advocacy and lobbying for the issues of non-discrimination and equality; as well as directly provide input into policies and State Programmes through offering viable models assessed, developed or tested within the project.

To ensure ongoing exchange of experiences and presentation of results, UNDP and partners will support the implementation of a local, regional and national level advocacy and policy conferences, seminars and trainings discussing issues of non-discrimination and equality. Such events will seek to engage a variety of partners, state and CSO, to explore forms of active social inclusion, non-discrimination and equality; to share best practice and lessons learnt in community work, etc. The events, wherever applicable will also engage representatives of vulnerable groups. Evaluation of the events, knowledge development of participants and subsequent changes in policy processes (measured by follow up contact through CSO partners) will be used to demonstrate the development impact of such initiatives.

This activity will target also raising profile of CSOs in society, while advocacy will aim to ensure that more local authorities provide support to measures, initiatives and models of social inclusion, non-discrimination and equality. This type of activity is vital for the organisations in Azerbaijan, as it will secure not only financial sustainability but also recognition in the wider society.

Use of social media and internet in citizen mobilisation and advocacy will be also instrumental towards building a data community to empower CSOs to promote accountability and better governance and to empower local communities. Work on this will be organised by Project Partner Mingachevir Parents Organization through six “meetups” of data enthusiasts in order to promote data culture to a mix of journalists, CSO activists, public officials, IT developers ensuring convergence between these groups for the future development of data tools; and creation of online hub to store datasets mined in the course of the Project, data visualizations, reports developed, training manuals and courses. This community which will be made of representatives of all target groups will further disseminate open data handling knowledge resulting in development of more data tools, projects, reports, services benefitting whole range of communities inside Azerbaijan. The critical mass of activists will be trained at home and abroad and networking among data enthusiasts will be supported towards development of data tools for the benefit of local communities.

**Activity 3.2 Develop networking and partnerships with and between CSOs working on the issues of non-discrimination and equality (including information sharing and planning meetings)**

*Implementation responsibility: UNDP, Constitution Research Fund; CESD; Eurasia Partnership Foundation; Initiative for the Sake of Development; Internews; LGA; WARD; Law and Development Public Organisation; HRCA; Uluchay; Mingachevir Parent's Association; and Democracy Monitor.*

The value of improved networking among partner CSOs, but also between partner CSOs and other CSO actors in the country was identified by the proposals and is recognised as having a strong function for quality assurance of the work of the CSOs and more successful advocacy. Partner CSOs will have the opportunity to meet and exchange experience and coordinate work, through Project coordination events and bi-lateral exchanges. Project coordination meetings will be organised at least twice per year. Bilateral or multilateral exchanges, meetings, and coordination will be organised whenever deemed relevant and important for advancement of Project’s intervention.

**Activity 3.3** **Build Infrastructure and Documentation Resource for Civil Society and National Women’s Machinery**

*Implementation responsibility: WARD*

The activity responds to the recommendations of the CEDAW review of Azerbaijan from March 2015 to strengthen operation of Gender Focal Point (GFP) through education and skill development interventions. Within this Activity, the Project, through CSO WARD, will work with eight (8) independent gender experts, 10 GFPs from 10 ministries and state committees, 10 human resource managers and supervisors as well as 7 decision-makers from National Parliament & State Committee on designing and establishment of a unique capacity-building infrastructure with gender-oriented profiled team in the form of a Gender School, which will provide in-depth training on gender concepts with the view of gender as interdisciplinary perspective in all major fields (from global to micro levels). Gender School will be a ‘non-formal education’ setting, formed of gender experts and mixed profiled (relevant fields) experts for integrating gender aspects in GFP system work within this activity, and mainstreaming gender into all fields, in future projects. Direct work with GFPs and HR managers/senior supervisors will contribute to increased knowledge and skills but also improved groups’ perspectives on the needs for improvement of GFP system and for upgrading recruitment standards to ensure that gender balances and GFP-related functions are institutionalized in the personnel as well as human resource units.

**Activity 3.4** **Enhance technical and practical civil society capacity to improve the legal, institutional and policy framework for socio-economic empowerment of women in remote areas**

*Implementation responsibility: Democracy Monitor*

Following up on the recommendations of CEDAW Review 2015, the Project will tackle specifically the issues of women empowerment and prevention of discrimination through use of various methods in the fields of capacity building, research, fact finding, public awareness, advocacy and support to capacity for legal and policy framework improvement. The project will include training courses starting from awareness-raising workshops to specialized and focused technical training courses for CSO representatives, journalists and rural and vulnerable women leaders combined with technical assistance to women CSOs, community members and initiative groups in organizational development, proposal development and fundraising. To raise awareness of wider public, tools such as new communication technologies and social media (Internet, Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, Googlegroups), TV shows will be used, together with continuous work with journalists and media. In addition, develop online resources will be developed to provide citizens with resources on gender equality, women rights, socio-economic empowerment and women development. Networking activities will tie the partners closer together and enhance their sense of being part of an organized, meaningful and focused community that can see and accomplish common challenges together. They will also garner wider support for the accomplishment of the Project goal, multiply the results achieved and inspire professionalism, seriousness, determination and legitimacy to all stakeholders.

## 3.2 TARGET GROUPS AND BENEFICIARIES

### 3.2.1 Target groups per component

**Component 1. Organisational Development Support to the Implementing partners.** The Project will work closely with the partner CSOs and will regularly support their organisational development, in particular Project management and monitoring and evaluation of the Project implementation. The learning opportunities will be enhanced by thematic trainings on M&E, project management, organisational and structural issues (e.g. internal organisational procedures, principles, approaches, etc.) or trainings on human-rights based approach in advancing the social inclusion, equality and socio-economic rights of the vulnerable groups.

**Component 2. Support to viable models for advancing social inclusion and socio-economic rights of vulnerable groups.**

The Project will work with local service providers and professionals, local governments, other CSOs and representatives of vulnerable groups across the country, with particular focus on Baku and its neighbouring communities, Ganja, Samux, Sheki, Narimanov districts. The target groups per Activity will include the following:

**Activity 2.1 Increasing Capacities of state and non-state actors for provision of legal and social services to PWDs**

* 60 Duty Bearers (DB) from local government
* 300 Persons and children with Disability
* 20 lawyers
* 30 social workers
* 100 healthcare service providers
* 100 school personnel
* 20 CSOs

**Activity 2.2 Increasing Capacity of CSOs in the field of Juvenile Delinquency prevention, early detection and intervention**

* 9 Professionals offering preventive intervention
* 15 psychologists and mental health specialists
* 30 representatives of general practitioners, family nurses, teachers, juvenile inspectors/police officers, social workers
* Children and youth with emotional, conduct and autistic spectrum disorders (ASD)

**Activity 2.3 Preparation and delivery of prison monitoring services**

* 30 to 40 activists of the civil society (NGO activists, journalists and lawyers) in Baku, Ganja and Sheki cities

**Activity 2.4 Protecting and promoting economic and social rights of prisoners for their rehabilitation and reintegration of into society.**

* 600 prisoners in Sheki Prison
* 100 Sheki Prison Employees
* 20 CSOs
* At least 20 Political decision makers from government, parliament and relevant local agencies

The project will also work on supporting exchanges between communities/institutions, with the aim to extend and share best practices, lessons learnt and models of social inclusion and advancing socio-economic rights of vulnerable groups.

**Component 3: Non-discrimination and equality framework promotion**

The Project’s strong focus will be on sharing good practices and advocating for non-discrimination, equality and rights of vulnerable groups. Therefore, the main targets of activities within this component will be other civil society organisations and decision makers (local authorities, ExComs, government institutions both at regional and national levels) as well as all other relevant stakeholders and wider public. The Component three will target particularly Baku, Ganja, Sheki, Guba; Mingechevir, Sumgayit and Shirvan. The breakdown of target groups per activity is as follows:

**Activity 3.1. Build partnership with national and local government and advocate for and promote the issues of non-discrimination and equality.**

* Local authorities in Baku, Ganja, Sheki, Guba; Mingechevir, Sumgayit and Shirvan
* Representatives of local and national authorities (e.g. EXCOMs, executive administration, state committees, municipalities, state universities)
* At least 200 disadvantaged youth and children and their families from 2 regions

**Activity 3.2 Develop networking and partnerships with and between CSOs working on the issues of non-discrimination and equality**

* Local and regional civil society organizations (including but not limited to Ganja Regional Women’s Center, “Bridge to the Future” Youth Public Union, “NGO Resource Center” Public Union, “Young Friend” Youth Public Union, “Permanent Development” Public Union etc
* NGO Resource Centres in Guba, Mingechevir and Shirvan regions
* Journalists and media representatives and activists

**Activity 3.3 Build Infrastructure and Documentation Resource for Civil Society and National Women’s Machinery**

* Gender Focal Points from main Ministries and State Committees
* Human resource managers/senior supervisors from main Ministries and State Committees
* Decision-makers from Parliament & SCFWCA

**Activity 3.4 Enhance Technical and practical civil society capacity to improve the legal, institutional and policy framework for socio-economic empowerment of women in remote areas**

* 20 young women leaders in ten regions across Azerbaijan as follows: Barda, Fuzili, Astara, Lenkaran, Sheki, Zagatala, Balaken, Khacmaz, Sirvan and Ganja.
* CSOs, new media institutions and youth organizations

### 3.2.2. End beneficiaries of the Project as a whole

The section 3.21 above elaborated on direct target groups of interventions within the three components. The Project interventions and results achieved in working with target groups are expected to provide benefits to general population of Azerbaijan, and particularly vulnerable groups, including women, PWD, children and young people, imprisoned persons. Specifically, it is expected that improved legal and social services to PWDs will reach out to families and individuals, PWDs in the targeted regions. It is expected that app. 135 families and juveniles from the targeted district as well as about 200 representatives of CSOs trained or included directly will benefit from results achieved through activity 2.2. Final beneficiaries of activities focusing on protecting and promoting economic and social rights of prisoners for their rehabilitation and reintegration of into society will be the prisoners in the penitentiary institutions in Baku and surrounding regions (about 15.000 persons), Salyan region (550), Ganja city (530) and in Sheki city (900 people). It is expected that the activity will provide benefit for about 450-500 women. Finally, activities for support to women empowerment will open the space for women to benefit from the improved conditions for social and economic empowerment, particularly young women in rural regions.

**4. Implementation arrangements**

The following options were considered for the implementation of the project:

1. Provision of grants to CSO project partners
2. Conclusion of service agreements with CSO project partners
3. Direct implementation by UNDP

During the Inception Phase, consultations were held CSO partners as to the preferred modality of operation. All CSO partners advised their preference for option 3. The selection of option 3 is based on the fact that the current legal and political landscape in the country is not conducive to the normal operation of non-governmental organizations and calls for special measures to enable civic society participation in the development work. Amendments made to the NGO-related legislation imply a complicated procedure for registration of the grant both by the grant recipient and the donor, giving the relevant authorities very broad discretion to decide whether to register or deny grant or service contract. Therefore, the modality for implementing the project will channel financial support to the 12 partner CSOs through contracts signed directly by UNDP and supporting the implementation of all activities outlined in the Section 3 of the Description of Action by the 12 project partners, instead of provision of sub-grants to CSOs (as originally reflected in the Action budget).

Direct implementation is a modality whereby UNDP will directly procure all goods and services and other inputs required for the implementation of CSO partner activities. Following its operational policies and procedures, UNDP will enter into contractual arrangements with individuals and legal entities that will deliver inputs required for the implementation of the CSO partner activities including but not limited to provision of trainings, publications, research, equipment, awareness raising, advisory services etc. Terms of References defining scope of work, specific deliverables and/or technical specifications will be agreed with CSO partners in advance to ensure that they fully match the expectations of the CSOs.

**4.1 Project Team**

During the inception phase, UNDP organised recruitment of Project Manager, and Project Assistant in line with UNDP rules and procedures, and identified Project premises. The Project team is fully operational as of 1 July 2016. The Project Manager will report to the Assistant Resident Representative at UNDP.

Given that the change of the implementation modality entails increased workload on the Project team in terms of procurement of goods and services, it is proposed to strengthen the Project Team with one full-time Project Assistant and a legal adviser on a retainer contract. This will not have implication of the budget component originally allocated for CSO partner activities. The increase of the budget will be absorbed by reducing the budget component allocated for capacity building.

UNDP office will provide direct support to the implementation of the project. In addition to the Programme Officer, the Financial Assistant will support the project by ensuring proper financial management, and Communication Manager will provide services in support of the project visibility. The cost of UNDP staff will not increase and the amount originally budgeted for the Programme Officer will be split among the above positions.

To support the Project Team, it is also proposed to recruit an expert for monitoring of the Project, mainly in Year 2 of the project implementation. Given that CSO partner activities are located in different parts of the country and many of them will occur at the same time, it will not be feasible for the Project Manager alone to monitor all activities in compliance with UNDP monitoring requirements.

**4.2 Reporting**

As per the contractual obligations between the UNDP and the EU, all Reports must be approved by the Contracting Authority as stipulated in the applicable General Conditions or superseding provisions. In line with this but also UNDP’s standards and procedures for reporting, the following reports will be submitted to the EUD in Azerbaijan and UNDP:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Nature/Content** | **Type** | **Reporting Period** | **Recipients** |
| Inception Report  Responsible: UNDP | The inception report contains an update of the context of Project in Azerbaijan, a detailed log frame, description of activities and management arrangements. In its elaboration, the Logical Framework Approach is followed linking the Project objectives to expected results and the activities needed in order to achieve the results. The inception report outlines the management structure of the Project clearly describing the responsibilities of the main players as well as the decision-making process and information flow between the Project participants. It will also cover the Project activities and progress made in the inception phase. Final version incorporates any comments of EUD. | At the end of the inception phase. | Submitted to:  EU Delegation |
| Quarterly reports Responsible: CSO Project partners (English) | The report will list in detail the activities undertaken in the reporting period and assess the progress towards achievement of Project objectives. This update will stress particularly the achievement of results. The report will be 4 pages maximum. | To be submitted by  the 5th day of every upcoming quarter | Submitted to: UNDP by Project partners  CC: EUD |
| Annual Progress Report  Responsible: CSO project partners | These reports will list more in detail the activities undertaken and assess the progress toward achievement of partner Project objectives. The update will stress particularly the achievement of results and identify also potential risks during the implementation period ahead. Update of the country situation will also be included, supported by case statistics. | To be submitted every 12 months not later than 30 days after the end of the reporting period in English. | Submitted to: UNDP  CC: EUD |
| Annual Progress Report (narrative and financial)  Responsible: UNDP | This report will provide analysis of activities undertaken and their contribution to the achievement of overall Project objectives. The update will stress particularly the achievement of results and identify also potential risks during the implementation period ahead. Update of the country situation will also be included. | To be submitted every 12 months not later than 60 days after the end of the reporting period in English. | Submitted to: EU Delegation as per the Article 3 of the General Conditions constituting Annex II of the contract between EU and UNDP. |
| Final report (narrative and financial)  Responsible: Project Partners | These reports will include an in-depth assessment of Project implementation results and the level of achievement of the objectives. | To be submitted not later than 30 days after finalization of partner Projects. | Submitted to: UNDP |
| External Evaluation report | This report will provide an assessment of the Project performance and results, in line with OECD DAC criteria and following evaluation standards of UNDP and EU. | To be submitted one month before the closing of the Project. | Submitted to: UNDP and EUD |
| Final Report (narrative and financial)  Responsible: UNDP | The final report should follow the inception report format and include an in-depth assessment of Project implementation results and the level of achievement of the objectives. The final report will be complemented by an evaluation of the impact of the Project aimed at identifying the impact and the achievements of the Project at the end of it. The Final Report and the Evaluation Report will contain lesson learnt and recommendations to be followed up by the beneficiary. The report will be finalised after incorporation of any comments from the EUD. | Not later than 6 months after the end of the Project implementation period. | Submitted to: EU Delegation as per the Article 3 of the General Conditions constituting Annex II of the contract between EU and UNDP. |

Quarterly reports will be considered approved and final if within 30 days of their submission to each party when there have been no comments or objections/recommendations for changes.

Financial reports shall be produced as integral part of the annual reports and at the end of the Project. Their structure shall be the same as that of the budget.

**4.3 Monitoring and Evaluation**

Project monitoring and evaluation will be based on periodic assessment of progress on delivery of specified Project results and towards achievement of Project objectives. The Project team will conduct regular monitoring of activities organized within the project and implemented. On site monitoring and meetings with partners will be organized as standard part of Project implementation and monitoring framework.

The Project will organise periodic meetings between EU, UNDP and CSO partners as space to discuss and check the progress in implementation of the action, and address any problems that may arise in implementation. These meetings will also be space to propose and adopt changes to the Project implementation arrangements wherever such changes are deemed feasible.

UNDP will commission an external evaluation of the Project three months prior to its scheduled end. The external evaluation will provide an assessment of the overall Project progress from its start until the end against the objectives and indicators of achievement, as well as its overall impact, by addressing i. a. the following points:

* Results and impact produced;
* Efficiency/effectiveness of implementation;
* Assumptions/influence of external factors;
* Sustainability potential;
* Relationship with other Projects/donor actions;
* Conclusions and implications for future Projects

1. **Visibility**

In accordance with the EU Visibility Guidelines, the Project will ensure the visibility of EU’s contribution at all stages of its activities. The EU logo and disclaimer that actions are carried out “with funding from the European Union” will be appropriately displayed and acknowledged during the activities, on printed materials and information sharing occasions (for details see *Communication Plan*). However, during the Inception Phase, some CSO partners raised a concern that some activities may be too sensitive and it would be advisable to keep them low –profile. Hence, UNDP would like to reserve the right to request waiver for visibility requirements on a case-by-case basis.

# 
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|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Suggested revised intervention** | | **Responsible Parties** | **Objectively verifiable indicators** | **Sources and means of verification** | **Assumptions** |
|
| **Overall Objective** | **To advance socio-economic rights of vulnerable populations (particularly women, PWD, children and young people, imprisoned persons) in Azerbaijan** | UNDP; CSO partners | **Indicator 1**. Number of targeted members of vulnerable groups (particularly women, PWD, children and young people, imprisoned persons) benefitting from improved social and economic policies and services | a) National statistics on vulnerable groups with sex-disaggregated data; b) Media reports, studies, assessments and other reports on advocacy and other related initiatives and interventions; c) monitoring reports on rights, non-discrimination and inclusions with recommendations | Socio-economic and political situation in Azerbaijan stable and conducive for advancement of partnerships between CSOs and government towards advancement of socio-economic rights of vulnerable groups |
| **Specific Objective 1** | **To support civil society initiatives at national and local level in Azerbaijan aimed at promoting and advancing rights of vulnerable groups through addressing social inclusion, socio-economic, non-discrimination and equality needs of vulnerable groups, particularly women, PWD, children and young people, imprisoned persons** | UNDP; CSO partners | **Indicator 1.** Number of relevant CSO initiatives claiming rights **Indicator 2.** Number of measures, platforms and models developed with engagement of right-holders and duty-bearers to promote respect and protection of rights of vulnerable groups | a) CSO partners' Reports b) Media reports, independent studies and assessments as well as relevant government reports on social services and other related initiatives and interventions; c) Monitoring reports on rights, non-discrimination and inclusions with recommendations | 1. Policymakers are interested in advancing social, and economic policies on the basis of solid evidence generated by the Project initiatives  2. There is a great advocacy and networking potential among CSO that needs further support and activation. 3. Rights advocates have strong motivation to enhance their evidence based advocacy skills; 4. Rights advocates establish effective partnership with relevant policymakers through their evidence based advocacy and other initiatives. |
|
|
| **Expected Result 1.** | **Capacity of targeted civil society organisations increased to utilize human-rights based approach in advancing the social inclusion, equality and socio-economic rights of the vulnerable groups;** | UNDP; CSO partners | **Indicator 1.1** Evidence of improved M&E capacities of CSO Project partners; **Indicator 1.2** Evidence of improved capacities of CSO partners to apply human-rights based approach **Indicator 1.3 E**vidence of CSOs becoming more effective in their communication/PR strategies towards donors, policy makers, media etc. | CSO progress reports; M&E frameworks | CSOs, particularly Project partners, willing and motivated to increase their skills and knowledge in different thematic areas of relevance for advancement of socio-economic rights of vulnerable groups; CSOs, particularly project partners, willing to increase their organisational capacities |
| **Expected Result 2.** | **Social inclusion and socio-economic rights of vulnerable groups, particularly women, PWD, children and young people, imprisoned persons, advanced at the local level** | UNDP; CSO partners | **Indicator 2.1.** Share of models, services and best practices generated by the Project for advancement of socio-economic rights of vulnerable groups that have been taken into consideration in relevant policies and legislation;  **Indicator 2.2** Number of final beneficiaries from targeted vulnerable groups, particularly women, PWD, children and young people, imprisoned persons benefitting from healthcare, social protection, legal aid and economic policies**;  Indicator 2.3** Number of Azeri CSOs with increased capacity to address rights and needs of targeted | a) Packages of recommendations submitted to relevant policymakers with an indication of those recommendations that have been taken into the consideration;  b) Media articles, external studies and other sources analysing status and rights of vulnerable groups;  c) Project and CSO partner reports | 1.Different needs and priorities of vulnerable groups (particularly women, PWD, children and young people, imprisoned persons) are reflected in relevant laws, services and policies;  2. The government prioritises social issues and is open and receptive to the recommendations and advocacy work in this area. |
| **Expected Result 3.** | **Issues of non-discrimination and equality promoted through active engagement of civil society in community development and social inclusion** | UNDP; CSO partners | **Indicator 3.1** Number andquality of comprehensive publications produced on issues of targeted vulnerable groups (particularly women, PWD, children and young people, imprisoned persons);  I**ndicator 3.2** Share of evidence-based policy recommendations elaborated by rights advocates for the improvement of the situation of vulnerable groups in the timeframe of the Project implementation;  **Indicator 3.3.** Number of CSOs with strengthened CSO networks and relations with local authorities | a) Actual evidence-based publications and policy recommendations elaborated by rights advocates that were submitted to the government in the timeframe of the Project implementation;  b) Evidence from the roundtables, forums and advocacy meetings conducted during the Project implementation;  c) Media articles, external studies and other sources analysing status and rights of vulnerable groups;  d) Project and CSO partner reports | 1. Policymakers are interested in social, and economic policies on the basis of solid evidence generated by the Project initiatives. 2. There is a great advocacy and networking potential among CSO that needs further support and activation. 3. Rights advocates have strong motivation to enhance their evidence based advocacy skills; 4. Rights advocates establish effective partnership with relevant policymakers through their evidence based advocacy and other initiatives. |
| **Activities for achievement of**  **ER 1.** | **Activity 1.1 Develop and conduct detailed Capacity Development Needs Assessment** *Activities: I*ndividual questionnaires and bilateral meetings between UNDP and partners to set up the organizational development plans. | UNDP |  |  |  |
| **Activity 1.2** **Capacity building for utilisation of human rights based approach**  *Activities*: Needs assessment and setting up the Capacity building plan; Trainings, workshops, exchanges, networking between partner organisations | UNDP |  |  |  |
| **Activity 1.3** **Develop and implement M&E and quality assurance systems** *Activities:* Establishment of M&E system for the project as a whole and individually for partner organisations; trainings and backstopping for use of M&E systems; | UNDP |  |  |  |
| **Activity 1.4 Develop and implement PR/communication strategy**  Activities:  Developing and running successful PR campaign. | UNDP, partners |  |  |  |
| **Activities for achievement of**  **ER 2.** | **Activity 2.1 Increasing Capacities of state and non-state actors for provision of legal and social services to PWDs**  *Activities:* Sensitisation of primary social/legal protection service providers, school teachers and health personnel on PWD rights and entitlements; education of PWDs and their family members on the rights of PWD; | Constitution Research Fund |  |  |  |
| **Activity 2.2 Increasing Capacity of CSOs in the field of Juvenile Delinquency prevention, early detection and intervention**  *Activities:* Establishment of CSO network on juvenile delinquency prevention; capacity building, advocacy activities; raising awareness of service providers on issues of juvenile delinquency | Initiative for the Sake of Development |  |  |  |
| **Activity 2.3 Preparation and delivery of prison monitoring services** *Activities:*  Capacity building for prison monitoring; research and analysis of relevant laws and context analysis; etc. | HRC |  |  |  |
| **Activity 2.4 Protecting and promoting economic and social rights of prisoners for their rehabilitation and reintegration of into society**.  *Activities*:  trainings; legal aid; entrepreneurship support, etc. | Uluchay, CESD |  |  |  |
| **Activities for achievement of**  **ER 3.** | **Activity 3.1** **Build partnership with national and local government and advocate for and promote the issues of non-discrimination and equality.**  *Activities:* Advocacy and establishment of relations with national and local government levels; provision of inputs in Local policy making; advocating for participatory policy processes; | UNDP, Constitution Research Fund; CESD; Eurasia Partnership Foundation; Initiative for the Sake of Development; Internews; LGA; WARD; Law and Development Public Organisation; HRCA; Uluchay; Mingachevir Parent's Association; and Democracy Monitor |  |  |  |
| **Activity 3.2** **Develop networking and partnerships with and between CSOs working on the issues of non-discrimination and equality**  *Activities:*  Information, planning meetings, support  to networking among CSOs towards stronger advocacy; | UNDP, Constitution Research Fund; CESD; Eurasia Partnership Foundation; Initiative for the Sake of Development; Internews; LGA; WARD; Law and Development Public Organisation; HRCA; Uluchay; Mingachevir Parent's Association; Democracy Monitor |  |  |  |
| **Activity 3.3** B**uild Infrastructure and Documentation Resource for Civil Society and National Women’s Machinery**  *Activities:*  capacity building, networking and knowledge sharing within the framework of the Gender School for GFPs, Human resource managers, gender experts and decision makers | WARD |  |  |  |
| **Activity 3.4**  **Enhance Technical and practical civil society capacity to improve the legal, institutional and policy framework for socio-economic empowerment of women in remote areas**  *Activities:* Research and studies, trainings for women leaders, NGOs, media, youth, and investigative Journalists | Democracy Monitor |  |  |  |

1. https://www.devex.com/news/from-ngo-to-social-business-why-and-how-84259 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/capacity-building/discussion-paper--innovations-in-monitoring---evaluating-results/), 05 Nov 2013. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Based on the following discussion paper: Anne E. Cullen, Chris L. S. Coryn, Jim Rugh: The Politics and Consequences of Including Stakeholders in International Development Evaluation (American Journal of Evaluation 2011) [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. See for example ILO Policy Guidelines for Results-based Evaluations: Principles, Rationale, Planning and Managing for Evaluations (2012) [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. UNDP Towards Decent Employment Through Accelerated Structural Reform, 2013 [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Data of the Ministry of Labour and Social Protection of Population [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. UNICEF, UNDP Situation Assessment: People with Disabilities in Azerbaijan, 2011 [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. https://www.devex.com/news/from-ngo-to-social-business-why-and-how-84259 [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/librarypage/capacity-building/discussion-paper--innovations-in-monitoring---evaluating-results/), 05 Nov 2013. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Populate with data from the Project Document [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Use the 6 point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU (See ToR Annex E below) [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. Engagement of the consultants should be done in line with guidelines for hiring consultants in the POPP: <https://popp.undp.org/SitePages/POPPRoot.aspx> [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. [www.undp.org/unegcodeofconduct](http://www.undp.org/unegcodeofconduct) [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. UNDP Towards Decent Employment Through Accelerated Structural Reform, 2013 [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. Data of the Ministry of Labour and Social Protection of Population [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. UNICEF, UNDP Situation Assessment: People with Disabilities in Azerbaijan, 2011 [↑](#footnote-ref-17)