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# Executive Summary

Six United Nations agencies, namely UNDP (lead agency), UNICEF, UNIDO, IOM, FAO, and WFP, in close cooperation with the Government of Armenia, have united their efforts to design and implement the joint project titled “Enhancing Human Security and Building Resilient Societies in Disadvantaged Communities of Armenia” (hereinafter referred to as “the “Project”) funded by United Nations Trust Fund for Human Security. The UNTFHS funded the project with USD 1,999,595.81. Other funding came from other UN Agencies and the GOA making the overall budget of the project USD 5,636,578.18. According to the Project yearly report, during the first year of implementation the Project gained an additional USD 380,000 under Output 3.3. The Project duration is 15 October 2018 to 14 October 2021.

**The Project’s goal is *to support Armenia’s efforts in achieving the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development by addressing the root causes of human insecurity for the vulnerable communities of Amasia, Alaverdi, Tumanyan and Berd in the Shirak, Lori and Tavush regions of Armenia.*** To achieve this goal, the six above-mentioned agencies have pooled their efforts towards fulfilling three main objectives:

***Objective 1:*** *To ensure early prevention and sustainability of interventions through identification of root causes of threats to human security and enhancing community resilience;*

***Objective 2:*** *To strengthen social protection and inclusion to improve human security in targeted communities;*

***Objective 3:****To address economic and food insecurities in the target communities through strengthened livelihoods, creation of sustainable economic opportunities and capacity building.*

**The project focuses on the most vulnerable and poorest areas of Tavush, Lori and Shirak.** Within these vulnerable regions, the Project focuses on the consolidated communities of ***Amasia, Tumanyan, Alaverdi and Berd*** to address the increase in vulnerabilities stemming from the consolidation process.

The project theory of change was developed based on the Human Security Approach which is rooted in the notion that threats to people’s survival, livelihood and dignity are seldom singular in nature. Most of the time several factors generate situations that are often complex and multidimensional. For example, economic insecurity related to unemployment and poverty may lead to labour emigration and decreased personal security due to a higher exposure to human trafficking and exploitation. Similarly, the reasons behind children’s frequent absence from school may be socio-economic or health related, or the reasons behind women being less engaged in business than men in a given region could be economic, cultural or educational. Hence, to protect the vital core of human lives, fundamental freedoms and fulfilment, the HSA utilizes a wide range of new opportunities to tackle such threats in an integrated manner by examining the linkages and interdependencies between risk informed development, human rights and overall security.

Another advantage of HSA as an operational tool for analysis, implementation and impact is that it is ***people-centred*** and ***comprehensive*** when analysing and addressing the root causes of the range of human insecurities. It is also ***coherent*** in designing interventions to avoid negative outcomes while benefiting from the multiplying effects of positive interventions. Moreover, the HSA can be flexibly ***contextualized*** to meet rapidly changing international, regional and domestic developments, putting ***emphasis on prevention, building resilience and sustainability*** rather than response mechanisms. Usually, projects adopting the HSA require diverse competencies, which generally can be attracted through intensive ***collaboration and partnership*** among a wide range of UN agencies as well as private and public sector representatives at regional and international levels. Thus, the Project adopted the HSA to enhance the operational effectiveness of the “Delivering as One” initiative using a multi-stakeholder partnership model to move beyond the single-agency style of programming. By collectively identifying the needs, vulnerabilities and capacities of people and communities, and by advancing solutions that are comprehensive and integrated, the Project places critical significance on assessing, planning and “Delivering as One.”

Human security identifies the complexity of the challenges and promotes integrated solutions that ensure greater coherence and stronger impact by identifying the concrete needs of populations under stress. It is through the Project’s implementation that the participating UN agencies as well as national implementing partners address economic, food, health, personal and environmental insecurities in Berd, Tumanyan, Alaverdi and Amasia.

The comprehensive community profiles formulated within the Project serve as a baseline for any further monitoring and evaluation activities within the project. Moreover, the indicators are closely aligned with SDG indicators in order to measure and monitor progress in the three target regions.

The Project logic and interventions are well aligned with the Sectoral Strategies of the GOA. The Project document was developed in line with the Government Programme 2017-2022, National Development Strategy (until 2025) and Disaster Risk Management National Strategy to explicitly link it to the SDGs and Sendai Framework 2015-2030 for DRR with the horizon of 2030, Action plan for implementation of the Migration strategy (2017-2021), strategy on the Protection of the Rights of the Child 2017-2021 and Work Plan 2012-2017, in which mitigation of disparities in development of Armenia’s regions was included as a priority. After the GOA changed in 2018, all project partners were reconfirmed, including at national and sub-national levels, through meetings. The newly selected Project board members were properly informed about the Project’s objectives and ongoing activities.

## METHODOLOGY

The evaluation follows the principles of the UN Evaluation Group’s norms and standards, particularly regarding independence, objectiveness, impartiality and inclusiveness, and is guided by the UN ethics guidance to ensure quality of evaluation, especially apropos conflict of interest, confidentiality of individual informants, sensitivity to beliefs, manners and customs, discrimination and gender equality to address issues among the vulnerable population.

The five core OECD/DAC evaluation criteria were used, namely ***the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability (to the extent possible) and impact (to the extent possible).*** Key evaluation questions were defined per the evaluation criteria, which are presented in the Annex 4 of this document.

A mixed method of data collection was applied in the evaluation by combining qualitative and quantitative components to ensure complementarity. The independent evaluator collected data from desk reviews and verified them using soft data from the field and interviews with key stakeholders and beneficiaries. The analysis was built by triangulating information collected from different stakeholders (project staff, project partners, stakeholders and beneficiaries) through different methods.

## CONCLUSIONS AND KEY FINDINGS

The key findings per the evaluation criteria are presented below.

Relevance

1. The Project’s components were designed in line with the national development priorities and remained in place after the change in the GOA in 2018 as a result of the “velvet revolution”.
2. After the change in government, the project partners at national and sub-national levels were reconfirmed and recommitted themselves to the Project’s objectives, outcomes as well as ongoing and planned interventions.
3. The Project components are relevant to the needs of beneficiaries and key stakeholders, although new needs might emerge due to the COVID-19 pandemic, and the approach of some project interventions might need to be reconsidered.
4. All of the defined target values of indicators at the activity level, as well as most of the defined output and objective level indicators, are quite specific, measurable, achievable and realistic. For each of the targets set for activity level indicators there are clearly defined timeframes for achievement. Some indicators, however, were formulated technically incorrectly, including their targets.
5. Gender and other relevant cross-cutting issues were properly mainstreamed into the Project’s design. Project interventions were properly informed by comprehensive assessments and consultation processes conducted during the project inception phase.

Effectiveness

1. The participation of key stakeholders and partners in the Project’s implementation is ensured through participatory design and implementation approaches of the Project’s interventions. These interventions were based on long consultation processes with key partners and stakeholders as well as HS Needs Assessment, Social Needs Assessment and DRR-related assessments carried out based on participatory approaches. The involvement of key partners, stakeholders and their groups in these processes ensured their ownership and dedication to the Project’s initiatives.
2. The Project’s interventions address the actual needs of the beneficiaries. Evidence of this fact is found when analysing all project components. For example, new employment opportunities in the communities/settlements with frequent labour migration have reduced the number of out-migrating persons. The high demand for preschool services established in remote communities also demonstrate that the intervention actually addressed the needs of target beneficiaries. It should be noted, however, that the interviews with potential beneficiaries (larger processing businesses) showed that due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the uncertainty and expected economic crises around the world may alter the needs of beneficiaries representing the private sector.
3. Some baseline and progress values of objective and output level indicators are not available in the project monitoring file. Therefore, in these cases, the Project’s progress had to be assessed based on activity level indicators within the scope of the evaluation, which could not allow revealing synergy effects of joint efforts of IAs.
4. According to the Project’s set-up, each IA manages its own activities with its own financial, monitoring and HR systems. The information on expenses related to project activities, progress values of activity level indicators and HR-related issues are not readily available for project management at every point in time. In this set-up, the management of the Project’s implementation, as one unit, may not be effective.
5. Within the evaluation period two major risks occurred that impacted the Project’s implementation: the change in government and the COVID-19 pandemic. While the transition was managed properly and the new government’s commitment to the project was confirmed, the pandemic may further delay the Project’s impact and there may be a need for an extension and revision of terms and approaches for certain interventions.

Efficiency

1. The Project’s goal, design and implementation approaches assume unprecedented cooperation among the UN agencies and creation of synergies among their respective programmes. Relevant stakeholders and partners also are actively involved in project design and implementation to ensure project efficiency.
2. The analysis of project expenses versus progress towards the targets reveals that overall, 57% of the envisaged budget for the evaluation period was spent (the project coordination costs are not considered in the analysis). Some of the activity level indicators were not reached, thus no data on the progress of outcome and objective level targets were available.
3. Despite the limitations and challenges related to evaluating the project efficiency, especially in terms of analysing the funds spent within the period versus planned budget and project progress, the evaluation revealed several issues that must be addressed by the Project to increase efficiency. These issues include the following:
   1. Overall, 57% of the envisaged budget for the evaluation period was spent (the project coordination costs are not considered in the analysis). Only 68% of the planned budget for Objective 1 for the evaluation period was spent. The budgets spent for Objectives 2 and 3 were 44% and 53%, respectively.
   2. The target value of indicator related to activity 1.2.6 was not achieved and the budget was not spent. The evaluation showed that the originally proposed partnership scheme did not materialize due to the COVID-19 pandemic and uncertainty among farmers as well as collateral-related issues while working with financial institutions, which make farmers hesitant to make investment decisions. Therefore, the initially designed scheme was enhanced with additional incentives to ensure no immediate costs and less risky investments for farmers.
   3. Data on the progress of outcome and objective level targets were not available. Therefore, the synergy effects of the joint projects were not revealed and reported.
4. The Project’s management and coordination set-up created challenges in terms of accessibility to necessary, timely and comprehensive data for efficient decision making at the project management level*.* Each IA has its own internal fund management and monitoring tools that are used to manage its own component within the Project. For efficient project management, however, information related to expenses as well as on progress and/or challenges related to all components should be made readily available for decision making.

Sustainability

1. Even though it is to early to measure sustainability at this stage of the Project’s implementation, the evaluation identified that the project interventions are being designed and implemented according to the pillars of sustainable development which are human, social, economic and environmental aspects of growth. The principles of DRR-informed development, human capacity building and social inclusion can be found in all project components.
2. The project never took any system function even on a temporary basis and never played a role of a service provider in the market. Instead, to ensure the sustainability of its interventions, the Project created capacities for the relevant stakeholders to ensure that the final target beneficiaries receive higher quality services from both state and private sector representatives. All relevant stakeholders were involved from the design phase to implementation, which ensured their ownership in the Project.

*Impact*

1. The Project’s progress towards SDGs is clear and visible. The interventions aimed at risk-informed and resilient community development for overcoming poverty, providing access to quality, inclusive and safe education and social services and ensuring gender equality have already started to show measurable results.
2. The Project’s impact, however, may be diminished due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The postponement of certain project activities and reconsideration of terms for support may not bring about the expected changes within the Project’s given timeframe. On the other hand, the forecasted economic crises may result in worsening macro level indicators (e.g. indicators related to poverty and migration may increase), which will create a false notion of weak project impact.

*Cross-cutting topics*

1. Based on the recommendations of the international gender expert, who has developed the Report on Gender Analysis within the framework of the Project, gender was mainstreamed into the project document in order to ensure gender-responsive interventions. Most of the interventions are designed to benefit women, children and socially vulnerable groups. Nevertheless, it is important to note that to date, the IAs are implementing very few recommendations derived from the conducted Gender Analysis even though the interventions defined in the Project’s document were revised to incorporate them.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

*The recommendations derived from this mid-term evaluation are for the Project team. The recommendations related to the* ***programmatic/strategic*** *levels are the following:*

**R1.** Some of the Project’s objective and output level indicators need to be reformulated to be technically correct, clear and understandable for all stakeholders. The Project team may choose to attach an explanation document to the defined indicators. All missing baseline data should be inserted.

**R2.** The agencies should look for more synergies among project components at the implementation stage as more practical cooperation opportunities may arise in the field. By doing so the agencies shall utilize the local impetus of the community focal points more effectively.

**R3.** The IAs may need to discuss practical implementation challenges for the recommendations made by the international gender expert to understand why these recommendations are not being implemented to date, despite the fact that they were incorporated into the project document and relevant interventions were defined based on those recommendations. The IAs should also come up with a solution to address those challenges.

*At the operational level the recommendations derived from this mid-term evaluation are the following:*

**R4.** Aside from the regular Inter-Agency Coordination Committee and Project board meetings, additional managerial tools should be introduced to increase the Project’s effectiveness, e.g. frequently updated databases on expenses and monitoring. The Project should assign or hire responsible staff that will regularly maintain such databases for project management and decision making.

**R5.** The Project can consider applying for a no-cost extension based on the revised work plan and reconsidered interventions with beneficiaries, increased investments from private sector representatives including farmers and processors and additional capacity building events.

**R6.** The beneficiary needs may need to be reassessed as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, and intervention implementation approaches related to private sector development may need to be reconsidered accordingly.

**R7.** The project needs to carry out further analysis of underspending and delays at the activity level to ensure that the issues are addressed in a timely manner.

**R8.** The Project’s monitoring database should allow that reports on synergy effects be reflected in the objective and output level indicators. The IAs should jointly report the progress values of these indicators periodically.

**R9.** The project should have a sound monitoring system which will show the Project’s real impact. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic by the end of the Project the macro level indicators will show negative trends, e.g. increased poverty and migration levels in the target communities, decreased household income and food consumption and so forth. A budget can be allocated for developing a monitoring system, if necessary.

# Chapter I Background, Object and Methodology

## Introduction

The United Nations in Armenia in partnership with six agencies, including **UNDP** (lead agency), **UNICEF, UNIDO, IOM, FAO** and **WFP,** and in close cooperation with the GOAGOA, is implementing a joint project titled “*Enhancing Human Security and Building a Resilient Society in the Disadvantaged Communities of Armenia*” (hereinafter referred to as the “Project”) funded by the United Nations Trust Fund for Human Security. The UNTFHS has funded the project with **USD 1,999,595.81.** Additional contributions were made by **UNDP** (USD **2,376,531.00), UNICEF (USD 494,951.37), WFP (USD 15,500) and the GOA (USD 750,000).**

**The Project’s goal is *to support Armenia’s efforts in achieving the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development by addressing the root causes of human insecurity for the vulnerable communities of Amasia, Alaverdi, Tumanyan and Berd in the Shirak, Lori and Tavush regions of Armenia.*** The aims of the Project are 1) to ensure early prevention and sustainability of interventions by identifying the root causes of threats to human security and enhancing community resilience; 2) to strengthen social protection and inclusion to improve human security in the targeted communities; and 3) to address economic and food insecurities in the target communities by strengthening livelihoods, creating sustainable economic opportunities and capacity building.

The HSA within the project addresses individual rights, good governance, access to safe and inclusive education and health care. It ensures that opportunities and choices are fulfilled at maximum potential and are aimed at reducing poverty, achieving economic growth and community resilience as well as promoting an understanding of human security in terms of the risks faced by individuals and groups at grass-roots level.

The Project’s duration is from 15 October 2018 to 14 October 2021.

The overall objective of the mid-term evaluation assignment was to assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency as well as impact and sustainability of the interventions under the Project. Given that this is a mid-term evaluation, impact and sustainability were considered to the extent possible.

The geographical coverage of the evaluation included the consolidated communities of Tumanyan, Alaverdi, Berd and Amasia, including their settlements. Considering the three-year duration of the project, the mid-term evaluation was conducted for the period of October 2018 to 31 March 2020 (a period of 18 months according to the Project Document).

The evaluation was conducted through a combination of qualitative and quantitative data collection and analysis tools. Aside from the desk review, data was collected through interviews conducted with around 70 stakeholders, beneficiaries, key informants and Project experts representing all project components and all target communities.

This evaluation report documents the results of collected data analysis, key findings, conclusions and the derived recommendations.

## Background and context of the project

**The project focuses on the most vulnerable and poorest areas of Tavush, Lori and Shirak regions.**

Shirak has yet to recover from the 1988 earthquake. Tavush borders Azerbaijan and communities near the border are exposed to ceasefire violations. The poverty rate in Lori is higher than the country average. Shirak tops the list of the country’s poorest regions with 45.3% of the region’s population living below the poverty line, while poverty growth is 1.5 times faster in Tavush. Meanwhile, the increase in extreme poverty is highest in Shirak (3.9%) and Lori (2.8%). In addition, the emigration rates from Shirak and Lori are the highest in the country at 18.5% and 16.2%, respectively[[1]](#footnote-1) (Armenia Poverty Profile 2008-2015).

Within these vulnerable regions, the Project focuses on the consolidated communities of ***Amasia, Tumanyan, Alaverdi and Berd***. These communities were formed as a result of the Government’s ongoing decentralization reforms. The Project is of real strategic importance to the targeted communities. It is helping to address the temporary increase in vulnerabilities stemming from community consolidation and decentralization and enhancing the performance of the local self-government bodies, improving the quality of local public services and encouraging public participation as well as transparency and accountability of local authorities in the long run. All these benefits create sound bases for the sustainable development of the target communities. The Project also aims to contribute to the improved quality of local public services and the creation of economic opportunities to assist the most vulnerable people in the targeted communities.

The target community in ***Tavush*** is ***Berd***. The population of Berd is 27,624 (<https://www.armstat.am/file/article/marz_2017_34.pdf>). The community is located along the border with Azerbaijan. The community includes the settlements of ***Aygepar, Artsvaberd, Mosesgegh, Chinchin, Tsaghkavan, Nerkin Karmiraghbyur, Norashen, Choratan, Chinari, Varagavan, Aygedzor, Itsakar, Navur, Paravakar, Verin Karmiraghbyur and Tavush.*** *Berd serves as the community’s administrative centre.*

The target communities in ***Lori*** are ***Tumanyan and Alaverdi***. The population of Alаverdi is 17,086 and Tumanyan has a population of 4,317 (<http://www.armstat.am/file/article/marz_2017_29.pdf>). The ***Tumanyan*** community includes the settlements of ***Tumanyan***, ***Atan, Ahnidzor, Lorut, Marts, Shamut and Karinj***, while ***Alaverdi*** includes the settlements of ***Aqori, Tsaghkashat, Kachachkut, Haghpat and Jiliza***.

The target community in Shirak is ***Amasia,*** which has a population of 5,648 (<https://www.armstat.am/file/article/marz_2017_31.pdf>). The Amasia community includes the settlements of ***Aregnadem, Bandivan, Byurakn, Gtashen, Kakhmut, Hovtun, Meghrashat, Voghji and Jradzor***. *Amasia**serves as the community’s administrative centre.*

## Object of the Evaluation

**The Project’s goal is *to support Armenia’s efforts in achieving the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development by addressing the root causes of human insecurity for the vulnerable communities of Amasia, Alaverdi, Tumanyan and Berd in the Shirak, Lori and Tavush regions of Armenia.*** To achieve this goal, the six above-mentioned agencies have pooled their efforts towards fulfilling three main objectives and relevant outputs as well as the envisaged activities, which are presented in the Table 1 below. The table also presents the Objective and Output level indicators based on which the evaluation should be carried out.

***Table 1. Project Logical Framework and Indicators***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Project Logic*** | **Indicators** | **Baseline** | **Target** | **Progress As of 31 March, 2020** | **Notes** |
| ***Objective 1:*** *To ensure early prevention and sustainability of interventions through identification of root causes of threats to human security and enhancing community resilience.* | # of communities where HS approach is integrated into community development planning. | *0* | *3* | The integration process ***in progress*** in 4 consolidated communities (Amasia, Alaverdi, Berd and Tumanyan). |  |
| # of recommendations for risk-informed community development implemented by communities. | *0* | *At least 50% of the recommendations implemented by the communities* | The recommendations of the LLRM and GIS based multi-risk assessments and community DRM Plans were provided to the Community administrations in March, 2020 | Due to Covid-19 state emergency, the official adoption of these recommendations was postponed to August |
| ***Output 1.1:*** *Localized, people-centered and comprehensive situation analysis were conducted.* | *# of communities where HS situation analysis were held.* | *0* | *3* (Amasia, Berd, Alaverdi) | *4 (Amasia, Berd, Alaverdi, Tumanyan)* |  |
| # of local community members engaged in HS situation analysis. | *0* | *1000* | 3738 |  |
| ***Output 1.2:*** *Disaster risk reduction mechanisms are established and capacities enhanced in target communities to reduce disaster-related losses with special focus on children and schools. Early Warning Systems in communities were installed through technical upgrade, improved coordination and mechanisms.* | *# of innovative DRR mechanisms operational within Regional and National Crisis Management Centers* | *0* | *3* | *3* |  |
| *# of schools with school safety plans* | *0* | *52* | *30* |  |
| ***Objective 2:*** *To Strengthen social protection and inclusion to improve human security in targeted communities.* | *% increase in coverage by basic social services of the most vulnerable families and children* | *0* | *20% increase* | *Baseline is not available to date, therefore the progress of % increase cannot be measured* | It is suggested to rephrase the indicator  "# of most vulnerable families and children benefitting from improved social services" |
| ***Output 2.1:*** *Cross-sectorial cooperation among social service providers is increased to better identify and respond to the human security needs of vulnerable communities and families.* | *# of implemented protocols on cooperation* | *0* | *3* | *1* | *1 MoU signed with Alaverdi municipality and Lori regional administration on cross-sectorial cooperation.* |
| ***Output 2.2:*** Members of vulnerable households are empowered to increase knowledge and access to social services. | *# of vulnerable children and women that benefit from social projects* | *80 children; 9 women* | *500 children, 50 women* | *a. 260 children (132 boys, 128 girls) - from Amasia and Alaverdi preschools, 40 women - teachers of preschool services and kindergartens in Amasia and Alaverdi* |  |
| *# of children that benefitted from interventions provided by trained social service providers* | *0 (2017)* | *200* | *b. 122 children in Alaverdi KG and 31 children in Amasia KG - benefitting from inclusive services (rehabilitation etc.)* |  |
| ***Objective 3.*** *To address the economic and food insecurity in the target communities through strengthened livelihoods, creation of sustainable economic opportunities and capacity building.* | *% of income raise among the most vulnerable target groups of the project* | *AMD 40,867 maximum monthly income of the poor population* | *20% increase* | Early to measure |  |
| *% of decrease of food insecurity levels within the targeted population* | *Food Consumption Score (FCS) - baseline value to be determined* | *60% decrease* | Early to measure |  |
| *% of beneficiary farmers' capacities strengthened on good practices* | *0* | *30%* | Not measured |  |
| ***Output 3.1.*** Income-generation opportunities are created for the most vulnerable groups through sustainable and modern agricultural and non-agricultural activities. | *% of women benefiting from economic opportunities* | *0* | *50%* | 20% | Data is available only from IOM and FAO for this indicator.  74m 29f (IOM)  25m 15f (IOM)  77m 1f (FAO) |
| *% of returning migrants benefiting from economic opportunities* | *0* | *30%* | Not measured |  |
| ***Output 3.2*** Environmentally resilient agricultural and non-agricultural practices are introduced to reduce the impact of environmental risks on economic and food security. | *% of RE in overall energy mix used by the industries in the target regions;* | ***0*** | ***10%*** | Early to measure |  |
| *# of trainings organized on good practices* | ***0*** | ***30*** | Not Measured |  |
| ***Output 3.3:*** Productive safety net to the school feeding programme is established in the targeted communities to decrease food insecurity and malnutrition**.** | *% increase of locally procured food for the implementation of School Feeding Programme* | ***40%*** | ***100%*** | Early to measure |  |

## Purpose, Objectives and Scope of the Evaluation

The overall objective of the mid-term evaluation assignment is to assess ***the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency*** as well as ***impact and sustainability*** of interventions under the “Enhancing Human Security and Building a Resilient Society in the Disadvantaged Communities of Armenia” project.

Given that this is a mid-term evaluation, impact and sustainability are considered to the extent possible.

The geographical coverage of the evaluation includes the consolidated communities of ***Tumanyan, Alaverdi, Berd and Amasia*** together with their settlements. Considering the three-year duration of the Project (15 October 2018 to 14 October 2021), the mid-term evaluation will be conducted for the period of October 2018 to 31 March 2020 (a period of 18 months according to the Project Document).

The mid-term evaluation is to inform the six Implementing Agencies (hereinafter IAs) of the Project, Project Board members and donors on the progress, successes, opportunities and challenges as well as necessary modifications to ensure that the envisaged objectives and outputs are achieved, especially in light of the COVID-19 pandemic.

The evaluation was carried out in close cooperation with representatives from the IAs based on the results framework and joint work-plan. The project documents were reviewed, in-depth interviews were conducted and discussions were held with main stakeholders, members of the beneficiary groups and selected communities. The findings of the mid-term evaluation will be communicated to the implementing partners and the donor organization, UNTFHS.

The specific objectives are:

1. To assess the progress towards the stated project objectives and outputs, considering the period covered by the evaluation;
2. To determine the overall efficiency in the utilization of resources in achieving results;
3. To assess the appropriateness of the design of the Project and the implementation arrangements, including but not limited to the modality, organizational structure and coordination mechanisms set up to support the Project;
4. To assess the sustainability of results and provide recommendations for sustaining the benefits of the Project and how to improve sustainability in future initiatives;
5. To assess whether initiatives have contributed to or have created prerequisites for sustainability;
6. To review the effectiveness of the gender mainstreaming strategy and inclusion of the most vulnerable groups (principle of Leaving No One Behind), assess steps undertaken to ensure the active and equal participation of women, men, boys and girls within the Project and suggest required steps to be taken in the future to improve women participation;
7. To identify best practices and lessons learned which can be replicated.

The core criteria to be considered in this evaluation are the following:

* **Relevance:** The extent to which the Project’s intended outputs and outcomes are consistent with national and local policies and priorities and the needs of intended beneficiaries.
* **Effectiveness:** The extent to which the intended results were achieved and whether opportunities created were equally accessible to both women and men.
* **Efficiency:** How economic resources or inputs (e.g. funds, expertise and time) were converted to results.
* **Sustainability:** The extent to which benefits of the Project will continue after external development assistance has withdrawn. This includes evaluating the extent to which relevant social, economic, political, institutional and other conditions are present and, based on that assessment, making projections about the national capacity to maintain, manage and ensure developmental results in the future.
* **Impact:** Changes in human development and people’s well-being that are brought about by development initiatives, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.

## Evaluation Methodology

The evaluation follows the principles of the UN Evaluation Group’s norms and standards, particularly regarding independence, objectiveness, impartiality and inclusiveness, and is guided by the UN ethics guidance to ensure quality of evaluation, especially apropos conflict of interest, confidentiality of individual informants, sensitivity to beliefs, manners and customs, discrimination and gender equality to address issues among the vulnerable population.

The evaluation looks at the five core OECD/DAC evaluation criteria, namely ***the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability (to the extent possible) and impact (to the extent possible).***  For this purpose, key evaluation questions are defined per the evaluation criteria, presented in Annex 4 of this document. The evaluation is to analyse the progress of the Project towards its objective and output level targets. The evaluation methodology detailed in Annex 4 also presents the objective and output level indicators with their relevant baseline and progress values (per the data is available in the monitoring data of the project) as the bases of this mid-term evaluation.

The evaluation utilizes a mixed method of data collection by combining qualitative and quantitative components to ensure complementarity. An independent evaluator collected data from desk review and verified it against soft data from the field as well as interviews with key stakeholders and beneficiaries. The analysis is built on triangulating information collected from different stakeholders (project staff, project partners, stakeholders and beneficiaries) through methods including secondary data and documentation review and primary data. The collected data from various sources was carefully examined and synthesized in an objective manner. In cases where contradictory information was obtained from different stakeholders the data was re-examined to reveal the reasons for the discrepancies, including gender-based differences.

The data collection methods included a desk review of project monitoring files, project documents and reports and other relevant documents (the full list of the reviewed documents is included in Annex 2), in-depth Interviews with key informants, external experts and project staff including management (the full list of interviewees is included in Annex 3) and case studies.

Due to restriction measures in place as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, in-person interviews were not possible. Therefore, data was obtained through **online means and by telephone**.

Each data source has its strengths and limitations. For this reason, various data collection methods were used and/or different data sources were triangulated to answer the Key Evaluation Questions. A mixed-method approach was used to improve the credibility of the findings and illustrate the key evaluation criteria of the Project.

The collected data was analysed in order to summarize them and look for patterns. Because most of the information collected within the scope of this evaluation was **qualitative and textual data**, ***content analysis*** was carried out to transform unstructured textual content into manageable data relevant to the evaluation questions. ***Thematic coding*** was conducted to identify passages of spoken text that were linked by common theme or idea. Clear and coherent ***narratives*** were constructed related to changes occurring in communities, direct or indirect beneficiaries or other stakeholders.

Most of the numeric data was obtained from the provided project-related documents including human security baseline analysis, the project monitoring framework and budget implementation report. Another source of numeric data collection were records of service providers. ***Exploratory techniques,*** which involve taking a ‘first look’ at a data set and summarizing its main characteristics through the use of visual methods, were used to analyse the data.

The information collected through interviews were verified or corroborated using the triangulation method.

Considering that this is a mid-term evaluation and most of the activities and interventions during the evaluation period were still in their infancy, while carrying out the ***sampling of stakeholders*** and beneficiaries for data collection there were three main considerations: *1) contacting beneficiaries who have already felt a tangible impact from the project interventions, 2) contacting beneficiaries and stakeholders who can narrate typical cases* and *3) contacting stakeholders and experts who are best informed on project components and interventions.*

Based on these three considerations, **purposive sampling** was the main option for recruiting beneficiaries and stakeholders for interviews. This sampling was used to study information-rich cases from a given population to make analytical inferences about the population. In rare cases where it was impossible to contact a beneficiary from the purposive sampling method, ***convenience sampling*** was used to interview another beneficiary from the same list. In general, convenience sampling considers individuals who are readily available for an interview and volunteer for the interview/focus group. However, this sampling option was avoided in all possible cases. Different ways of sampling introduce different types of bias when assessing the results of the Project. Therefore, where possible, in the data analysis this bias was addressed through triangulation.

When carrying out the beneficiary and stakeholder mapping and sampling for this Project, comprehensive lists of beneficiaries and stakeholders organized per activity, outcomes and objectives with gender disaggregated data were not available. Therefore, all Project experts were asked to provide lists of beneficiaries for the activities which were implemented during the evaluation period. The experts were asked to suggest the names of beneficiaries and stakeholders per activity and output who are mostly informed about project interventions. When suggesting interviewees, the Project experts considered the following:

* Beneficiaries from various target communities should be included in the list of interviewees;
* Women and men beneficiaries should have equal opportunities to be interviewed;
* Beneficiaries who can present typical cases;
* Beneficiaries who have already felt some tangible impact from the Project’s results or can provide an informed forecast for the anticipated results;
* All key stakeholders from the public and private sector who can provide information to support the evaluation process based on the defined criteria.

Additionally, the Project experts were asked to make sure that the beneficiaries on the interview list represented all targeted communities. Another consideration was to make sure that men and women had equal opportunities to be heard during this evaluation.

The beneficiary mapping according to the Project Logic and Evaluation Matrix is presented in Table 2 in Annex 4 of this document.

Evaluation tools and interview guides are presented in Annex 5 of this document.

For the purpose of this evaluation 68 interviews were conducted. Of all the interviewees 30 were women and 38 were men. The interviewees included 45 project beneficiaries, 11 Experts and 12 public sector representatives.

## Major Limitations

There were several limitations to the evaluation process related to data availability, beneficiary and stakeholder mapping and sampling and field-based data collection. The limitations and corresponding mitigation measures taken are described below.

Proper beneficiary and stakeholder mapping was to be carried out before writing the inception report for the Project. While the report was being complied, comprehensive beneficiary and stakeholder lists organized by activity, outcomes and objectives with gender-disaggregated data were not made available. Therefore, all Project experts were asked to provide lists of beneficiaries for activities implemented during the evaluation period as well as the names of beneficiaries and stakeholders who were informed about the Project’s interventions. Project experts were also asked to make sure that the beneficiaries on the suggestion list for interviews were from all targeted communities. Furthermore, men and women had to be given equal opportunities to be heard during this evaluation.

This evaluation was conducted during ***the COVID-19 outbreak in the country,*** thus face-to-face interviews were not possible and observations within the scope of this evaluation could not be conducted. The interviews were conducted mainly by phone while meetings for focus groups and group interviews were done using Zoom, a video conferencing software application. During the interviews and meetings zoom, it was difficult to receive detailed answers to the questions. Therefore, in most cases the evaluator repeated the questions or asked for permission to call back if more information was needed. Later a decision was made with the approval of Project experts to interview each beneficiary individually.

Another limitation related to the generic formulation of some of the activities. The implementation of these activities assumes a series of interventions with different beneficiaries or various stakeholders during different times. This information related to what intervention was planned and what was implemented during the evaluation period became available only after interviewing Project experts and could not be verified with a desk review as the project work plan was not detailed down during implementation phase. This situation limited the transparency in the process of evaluation.

Additionally, baseline and progress values were not available for some of the Project objective and output level indicators. It is crucial to note that these targets can only be met through the joint efforts of IAs, and objective and output level indicators need to be analysed to reveal the synergy effect of these joint efforts. The availability of relevant progress value of indicators could present a better picture for evaluation criteria. Due to the fact that the IAs are using parallel funding for most interventions and indicators in some cases are defined based on each IA’s programme, the achievements attributed to the Project were difficult or impossible to identify. To mitigate this limitation, the evaluation looked at the activities carried out within the provided budget by UNTFHS as well as activity level indicators to forecast the possibility of achieving the objective and output level targets.

Another limitation had to do with budget revision. The budget for Activity 2.2.2 under Objective 2 was transferred from Year 1 to Year 2. However, there was no such demand, the respective IA did not divide the budget per quarters. Hence, there is no reference/information on the planned budget for the evaluation period for this activity. The analysis was conducted based on the initial budget amount for this activity. This fact also distorts the overall picture of the budget expenditures at Objective and Project levels since expenditures including budget revisions might be higher. To mitigate this limitation, the evaluator did not consider this activity when studying the Project’s efficiency (budget implementation vs. project progress). However, this limitation’s impact on the analysis of the overall budget and progress could not be determined.

To mitigate the abovementioned limitations, the evaluator also interviewed Project experts and stakeholders in order to reveal the logical sequence of the interventions within the activities. Project experts were asked to identify the interventions carried out with the budget provided by UNHSTF that contributed to the Project’s progress. Additionally, IAs were asked to provide the expenses incurred from the UNHSTF budget for the interventions completed before the evaluation.

Many interventions were in their infancy stage at the time the evaluation was being conducted, which was an obvious challenge when evaluating sustainability and impact. Sustainability is an ex-post measure, and ideally, it should be measured at least two to three years after completion of a particular project. For most interventions the impact was also impossible to identify during the evaluation.

Therefore, this mid-term evaluation studied the existing preconditions in order to forecast sustainability and impact.

The limitations of the information collection tools and instruments used, as well as the weakness in the sampling methodology used for stakeholder mapping, is described in the relevant sections of this report. To ensure that there is sufficient basis to make the conclusions, the analysis was built on data collected from different stakeholders using triangulation.

## Ethical Considerations, Human Rights and Gender

The evaluation follows the principles of the UN Evaluation Group’s norms and standards, particularly regarding independence, objectiveness, impartiality and inclusiveness, and is guided by the UN ethics guidance to ensure quality of evaluation, especially apropos conflict of interest, confidentiality of individual informants, sensitivity to beliefs, manners and customs, discrimination and gender equality to address issues among the vulnerable population.

The evaluation was guided by the principles of equity, justice, gender equality and respect for diversity. Based on a concrete examples the evaluation assessed the extent to which the Project has addressed the issues of social and gender inclusion, equality and empowerment; contributed to strengthening the application of these principles to various development efforts; and incorporated the UN commitment to rights-based approaches and gender mainstreaming in the initiative’s design.

The evaluation also took into consideration the recommendations of the international gender expert in the “Report on Gender Analysis Within the Framework of the Project”. In particular, gender disaggregated data was requested from the project team. This data was used to conduct beneficiary mapping and ensure that both men and women were interviewed and heard. Wherever relevant and possible the evaluation looked at the impact of the Project on women.

The independent evaluator closely followed the United Nations Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation in selecting interviewees, in interacting with them and in respecting their personal and institutional rights[[2]](#footnote-2). The evaluator also ensured each respondent’s privacy and confidentiality. They were assured that no attributions would be made to them against their will, and they were given the right to withdraw from the interview process at any time. The evaluator explained the reasons and objectives of the evaluation as well as the scope of the interview questions. They were chosen to ensure a fair representation of views and a balanced perspective. The experts’ opinions on issues related to their fields of expertise were cited with permission. In rare instances where potentially vulnerable groups were involved (e.g. persons with disabilities), the evaluator complied with ethical standards while interacting with them.

The independent evaluator also considered the United Nations Human Rights Based Approach, which provides the vision of what the initiatives should strive to achieve, namely to secure the freedom and dignity of all people, as well as the set of tools and essential references for human rights standards. The Participation, Accountability, Non-Discrimination and Equality, Empowerment and Legality (PANEL) principles were also respected, which are the following:

* ***P****articipation*– everyone is entitled to active participation in decision-making processes which affect the enjoyment of their rights.
* ***A****ccountability*– duty-bearers are held accountable for failing to fulfil their obligations towards rights-holders. There should be effective remedies in place when human rights breaches occur.
* ***N****on-discrimination and equality*—all individuals are entitled to their rights without discrimination of any kind. All types of discrimination should be prohibited, prevented and eliminated.
* ***E****mpowerment*  – everyone is entitled to claim and exercise their rights. Individuals and communities need to understand their rights and participate in the development of policies which affect their lives.
* ***L****egality* – approaches should be in line with the legal rights set out in domestic and international laws.

The evaluator is fully independent and was unaware of any conflicts of interest. During the evaluation, the independent evaluator followed the principles of impartiality, credibility and accountability.

# Chapter II Analysis and Findings

## Relevance

This chapter looks at the extent to which the intended outputs and outcomes of the project are consistent with national and local policies and priorities and the needs of intended beneficiaries.

1. ***The Project’s components were designed in line with national development priorities which remained in place even after the change in the Government of Armenia as a result of “velvet revolution” in 2018.***

**The Project’s goal is *to support Armenia’s efforts in achieving the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development by addressing the root causes of human insecurity for the vulnerable communities of Amasia, Alaverdi, Tumanyan and Berd in the Shirak, Lori and Tavush regions of Armenia.*** To achieve the Project’s goal, six UN IAs pooled their efforts to fulfil the three main objectives and relevant outputs. Based on the HSA, the agencies have unified their diverse competencies in addressing various threats to survival, livelihood and dignities of populations in the Amasia, Alaverdi, Tumanyan and Berd communities of the Shirak, Lori and Tavush regions of Armenia. The logic of the Project interventions derives from the community consolidation reforms in Armenia, with existing and inter-related vulnerabilities and deepening exposure. Hence, the Project interventions were jointly developed and are being conducted in close partnership with the ***Ministry of Emergency Situations***, ***Ministry of Territorial Administration and Infrastructure, Ministry of Education, Science, Culture and Sport, Ministry of Economy, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs,*** other state agencies (State Employment Agency, State Migration Service, etc.) and targeted consolidated communities to strengthen the community resilience, economic development and social protection system, to protect the poor and vulnerable from poverty, deprivation and hunger, to reduce inequalities, to integrate disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation measures into community development cycle and to build effective and accountable institutions capable of ensuring social justice and promoting inclusive sustainable development.

The Project’s logic and interventions are well aligned with the Sectoral Strategies of the GOA. The Project document was developed in line with the Government Programme 2017-2022, National Development Strategy (until 2025) and Disaster Risk Management National Strategy to explicitly link it to the SDGs and Sendai Framework 2015-2030 for DRR with the horizon of 2030, Action plan for implementation of the Migration strategy (2017-2021) and strategy on the Protection of the Rights of the Child 2017-2021.

After the change in government the project faced uncertainty with regard to reform processes in the country. All project partners were reconfirmed including at national and sub-national levels. The newly selected board members of the Project were informed about the Project’s objectives and outcomes as well as ongoing and planned interventions. As a result, the new project partners have recommitted themselves to the project. An MoU was signed with the Lori regional administration and the Alaverdi municipality on DRR, education and social protection programming.

The newly approved Government Programme 2019-2023 did not imply any need for revising the Project’s components and interventions since its strategy and approaches were fully in line with the new government’s approaches. Below are examples of new government approaches defined in the programme that are completely in line with the Project’s components.

* Point 4.2 states the importance of the introduction of a system of integrated social services which will raise the level of effectiveness of management of the social protection system and improve the quality of social services, which will be ensured in line with capacity building of personnel. A competitive environment will be shaped, alternative models of financing will be introduced and various and integrated social services will be promoted by private organizations.
* According to point 4.4 one of the goals of the education sector is to provide preschool education within all communities, raising enrolment of children above the age of three to 70% by 2020.
* According to point 5.10 the government intends to improve the agricultural sector by increasing food safety levels, introducing modern technologies, increasing export volumes, and boosting incomes of all entities in the entire agricultural value chain, including small household economies, rural cooperatives, processing facilities and exporters.
* Under point 6.1 the implementation of waste removal and recycling programmes in cooperation with international structures is envisaged.
* Point 6.2 calls for up to 10% of energy consumption from renewable energy sources.
* According to point 6.7 the main objective of the Government’s migration policy is to ensure the free and safe movement of people while ensuring Armenia’s national security.
* From the economic development perspective, the government underlines the importance of directing the economic and human potential of migrant workers, including returning migrants, to the development of the country.

Thus the Project remained in line with the national development priorities of the country and its met objectives will largely contribute to the achievement of national development goals.

1. ***The Project’s components are relevant to the needs of beneficiaries and key stakeholders, although new needs might emerge due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the approach of some interventions may need to be reconsidered.***

The HSA was carried out based on the gender and child sensitive LLRM tool to reveal the community vulnerabilities and capacities for risk informed community planning. This ensures that the assessment conducted during the inception phase of the Project covers all aspects of HSA. Based on the adapted tool a human security needs assessment was conducted in Alaverdi, Berd and Amasia. A science-based multi risk assessment was conducted in the same three communities. In Tumanyan, the previously conducted LLRM assessment results were updated within the evaluation period. These assessments help ensure the development of the target communities and provide the basis for designing project interventions and assessing the baseline values of some of the Project Objective and output level indicators.

The evaluation interviews showed that the communities are working towards integrating the recommendations derived from the assessments in their five-year development plans, which will be formalized following the planned community public hearings on the human security needs assessment results for all target communities. Within the evaluation period the science-based multi risk assessment results and reports were ready, while the human security needs assessment report was not finalized.

The human security needs assessment process started before any of the Project’s interventions begun. However, the human security assessment tool could not be completed before the start of other activities of the Project to serve as a basis for the design of each and every intervention. The design and preparation of many interventions was finalized after long consultative processes with relevant stakeholders and information sharing were completed. In addition, social needs assessments were conducted in the target communities of Shirak and Lori during the evaluation period. Safety assessments were made for each of the 52 schools in the target communities and structural and non-structural safety issues for the schools were identified. The data collected through these assessments and the experience of the relevant IAs contributed to the design of the Project interventions.

The beneficiary needs are identified within the human security needs assessments and will be communicated to the local key stakeholders as well as current and potential beneficiaries and will be validated through public hearings. Whenever necessary, the identified human security needs can be reconsidered before their integration into the community development plans.

Regarding to the results of the science based multi risk assessments, the interviews with the experts showed that they remain unchanged or almost unchanged during at least the first five years after its completion, and if even there are changes, usually they are so small that does not impact the main issues revealed by the assessment.

During the evaluation interviews it became clear that the beneficiaries would have new needs due to the COVID-19 pandemic in the country. In particular, the lack of preparedness to meet the health safety challenges in the communities, especially in schools and various organizations, was reported by the stakeholders. The experts were highlighting the need to integrate this issue in the assessment tools. The interviews with the project beneficiaries, especially for the economic development component, revealed that economic decline is expected and their plans for expansion may be difficult to implement. Very few beneficiaries saw economic opportunities in the current situation with the pandemic.

1. **All of the defined target values of indicators at the activity level as well as most of the defined output and objective level indicators are specific, measurable, achievable and realistic. For each of the targets set for the activity level indicators there are clearly defined timeframes for achievement. Some indicators however were formulated incorrectly, including their targets.**

The observation showed that all of the activity level indicators as well as most of the output and objective level indicators defined are quite specific, easily measurable and can realistically be achieved within the planned timeframe (not considering the current situation with COVID-19).

For some of the indicators baseline values need to be inserted into the monitoring files in order to be able to measure progress. Some other indicators were formulated incorrectly, including their targets.

The points listed below should be considered for output level indicators.

For output 3.1, “Income-generation opportunities are created for the most vulnerable groups through sustainable and modern agricultural and non-agricultural activities”, there are two indicators defined as follows:

1. percentage of women benefiting from economic opportunities
2. percentage of returning migrants benefiting from economic opportunities

The formulation of this indicator does not specify whether it is the percentage of women ***in the target*** communities that is envisioned to benefit from economic opportunities or the percentage of women Project beneficiaries that is anticipated to benefit from economic opportunities.

This indicator needs to be reformulated or else the implementing IAs should attach a brief explanation of the indicators in the monitoring file to ensure common understanding on targets.

As for the indicator “percentage of returning migrants benefiting from economic opportunities”, it is better to calculate the “number of returning migrants benefiting from economic opportunities” given that the Project’s interventions related to business opportunities are not high enough to have an impact on the statistical data of the regions. Additionally, it might also be hard to attribute the change in percentage in this indicator to the Project as other projects or state support also might have an impact in the given timeframe. Another concern is that this data may not be updated at the time of Project’s final evaluation. If the indicator will not be changed, then the baseline value should be added as of the Project’s start date so that the percentage increase can be calculated.

Output 3.3: “Productive safety net to the school feeding programme is established in the targeted communities to decrease food insecurity and malnutrition”. One indicator is defined for this output:

1. percentage increases of locally procured food for the implementation of School Feeding Programme.

The target for this indicator is set to be 100% from the baseline of 40% by the end of the Project. This target seems to be unachievable, as the indicator as formulated implies that within the set timeframe the local producers should provide 100% of the food consumed at schools for children. The actual target however is set only on the consumption of legumes that should be provided to schools by local producers as the relevant IA supports the development of the Legume Value Chain in the target communities.

This indicator also needs to be reformulated or else the relevant IA may choose to attach a short explanation in the monitoring file for the purposes of clarity and common understanding.

Another important consideration related to the indicators is the following:

The only indicator “percentage of implemented protocols on cooperation” defined for Output 2.1. “Cross-sectorial cooperation among social service providers is increased to better identify and respond to the human security needs of vulnerable communities and families”, does not reflect the impact of Activity 2.1.2, “Enhance capacity of the State Employment Agency to outreach to local communities and reduce human insecurity of Armenian labour migrants, reduce exposure to labour trafficking and exploitation”.

The activity level indicator “percentage of Labour migrants outreached” can be defined as an output level indicator. At the activity level the indicators can be defined as “percentage of trainings conducted for relevant stakeholders” and/or “percentage of tools developed for better outreach”.

1. ***Gender and other relevant cross-cutting issues were properly mainstreamed into the project design. The Project’s interventions are properly informed by the comprehensive assessments and consultation processes conducted within the Project’s inception phase.***

An international gender expert conducted gender analysis within the framework of the project, and many recommendations for addressing the revealed gender-related issues in the targeted communities were made. Based on the recommendations, gender was mainstreamed into the project document to ensure gender-responsive interventions. Additionally, issues related to gender and other cross-cutting topics such as environment, governance and human rights were identified in the inception phase of the Project for the target communities within the human security needs assessment, science-based multi risk assessment and social needs assessment. The results of various assessments and consultations with relevant partners and stakeholders were used as a basis to design the interventions. Moreover, the recommendations delivered based on those assessments are to be integrated into the five-year development plans of the target communities.

## Effectiveness

This section looks atthe extent to which the intended results have been achieved and whether opportunities created by the Project were equally accessible for women and men.

1. ***Participation of key stakeholders and partners in the Project’s implementation is ensured through the participatory design and implementation approaches of the interventions.***

The Project’s interventions are designed in a way to encourage and ensure the participation of key partners and stakeholders.

The conducted assessments within the scope of ***Objective 1*** were based on various participatory and scientific methodologies. The interviews with relevant stakeholders and Project experts revealed that the participatory approaches ensured the ownership of key stakeholders in the Project’s results, while scientific approaches added to the credibility of the assessment results. The interventions were designed based on participatory assessments and long consultation processes with key stakeholders. This ensured their participation in the Project’s implementation. One example of this participatory approach during the Project’s implementation stage is the development of School DRR and Emergency Response plans by the trained school staff within the scope of the project. To ensure the quality of these plans the Regional Rescue Services were involved in coaching and ensuring the quality of the developed plans. Another example is the development of the website [www.imigrant.am](http://www.imigrant.am) and assessments conducted in the target communities that revealed the various reasons for migration, which fell within ***Objective 2*** in cooperation with the State Employment Agency. This initiative will help in the design of future projects to be implemented by the State Employment Agency in order to help prevent migration or contribute to the integration of returning migrants into the local workforce. Within ***Objective 3*** the establishment of a waste management solution in cooperation with the Municipality of Alaverdi is in the works.

1. ***The Project interventions address actual needs of beneficiaries. Evidence of this fact is found when analysing all project components. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the uncertainty and expected economic crises in the world and the country may alter the needs of beneficiaries representing the private sector.***

Even at this early stage of project implementation, the interviewed beneficiaries have reported that the Project has addressed their various social and economic needs in ways they never could do themselves, not only because of the lack of access to financial resources but also due to being uninformed about their own rights or existing opportunities.

Proof that beneficiary needs are actually being met can be found in ***Objective 1*** of the Project. The carried-out participatory and science-based assessments for the communities and schools serve as a basis for developing community and school DRM and emergency response plans. According to the interview results, the quality of the developed DRM plans of the communities and schools are incomparably high.

Within ***Objective 2*** of the Project, preschool education was established for the first time in two of the most remote settlements of the target communities. Preschool education was previously unavailable in these settlements due to the lack of funds and human resources.

Within ***Outcome 3***, the provision of machines for harvesting legumes to the established cooperative led to the tripling of the number of men and women farmers from these remote settlements willing to cultivate legumes on their land and join the cooperative. This is further proof of effective intervention in terms of addressing the exact needs of farmers in the target communities within the value chain. Interviews with the beneficiaries and project stakeholders also revealed cases of prevented migration from the target communities due to the new economic opportunities created based on the value chain approach defined in ***Objective 3***. Within this same objective, the project has supported the establishment of demo winter wheat farms and vineyards. Even though the involved farmers have yet to collect the harvest, they reported that the demonstrated agro-technologies have a visible positive impact on their fields and orchards in terms of quantity and quality of yield. They will continue using these technologies and advise other farmers from the settlements to do the same.

For some beneficiaries the support and cooperation terms might need to be reconsidered due to the COVID-19 pandemic. For example, the Project was considering a public-private partnership model to support farmers in installing hail suppression nets. Due to the declared state of emergency and severe border restrictions in the country, decreased consumption and sales and the lack of cash currently available for farmers and agro producers, this model, which assumes cash investments on their end, might not work. Because of the uncertainty and expected economic crisis in the country the consumption and investment decisions of the target beneficiaries representing the private sector are expected to change. The same applies to the pre-selected beneficiary processors, which are comparatively large businesses. These beneficiaries predict sales crises due to the lack of export opportunities which will interrupt cash flow. Therefore they will rely on their savings for their immediate business needs, including the purchase of supplies for processing, rather than on capital investment for expansion.

1. ***Most of the baseline and progress values of objective and output level indicators are not available in the project monitoring file. Therefore, the Project’s progress had to be assessed based on the activity level indicators within the scope of the evaluation. As a result the synergy effects of the joint efforts of IAs on the target communities could not be revealed.***

The progress values of output and objective level indicators were not in the Project’s monitoring database for the period of evaluation. Therefore, the Project’s progress was assessed based on the activity level indicators, which in turn helped forecast progress made toward the Project’s output and objective level targets. Although the targets are defined appropriately and the relevant IAs are continually monitoring their own activities, the monitoring data is not being combined into the Project monitoring file periodically in order to effectively inform project management about existing issues. The monitoring file was updated for the purposes of developing the Project’s first annual report. For the purposes of this evaluation, each of the IAs had to update the monitoring file for their respective activities.

While this set-up may allow each IA to report against the activity level targets quite well, it cannot ensure effective reporting on the Project’s output and objective level targets. It is crucial to note that these targets can be met only through the joint efforts of the IAs. ***The availability of relevant progress values of indicators could present a better picture of overall effectiveness.*** Therefore, the status of objective and output level targets should be made available periodically so that Project management can quickly identify issues that may arise during project implementation and prevent future complications.

1. ***According to the Project’s set-up, each IA manages its own activities with its own financial, monitoring and HR systems. The information on expenses related to project activities, progress values of activity level indicators and HR-related issues are not readily available for project management at every point in time. In this set-up, the management of the project implementation, as one unit, cannot be effective.***

The project management and implementation set-up are quite liberal. The IAs are responsible for the full management of the project components and finances that they are required to implement. On one hand this is the proper set-up of a joint project that has adopted the HSA where the IAs must pool their joint efforts and come together as one to address human security needs identified in the consolidated communities. However, within the project logic, while the IAs must contribute their expertise in this or that field, none of them can technically have a supervising role. With this set-up, *each IA manages its own project activity with its own financial, monitoring and HR systems*, while the Project as a whole is managed through project coordination meetings and project board meetings, during which the IAs share information on implementation and discuss cooperation. For the first progress report, the Project team developed a common results framework and reporting templates. These templates were used for the first annual report. However, unfortunately none of the forms are being updated periodically to inform about Project decision-making processes. Thus, the Project as a whole cannot be efficiently managed. *Additional project management tools for regular board meetings and regular cooperation meetings should be introduced, such as a frequently updated databases for project expenses and project monitoring. The Project could appoint dedicated staff responsible for updating those files so that they can be readily available for project management decision-making at any time.*

1. **Within the evaluation period two major risks occurred thereby impacting project implementation: the change in government and the COVID-19 pandemic. While the change in government was managed properly, the pandemic may further delay the Project’s impact and create a need for extension and revision of terms and approaches for certain interventions.**

Within the first 18 months of the Project’s implementation two major developments in Armenia have challenged the smooth implementation process of the Project:

1. The change in the structure of government as well as uncertainty regarding reform processes underway.
2. The COVID-19 pandemic which challenged all aspects of the Project from daily organization and implementation responsibilities to the priorities of the beneficiaries.

The Project was not impacted by the change of government. All project partners at national and local levels were reconfirmed through meetings. The newly selected Project board members were properly informed about the Project objectives and ongoing activities. The strategic directions and approaches in the new Government Programme did not contradict the Project’s adopted strategies and approaches.

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic Project staff and management have started to work from home. All the coordination meetings are held online using Zoom, a video conferencing software application. Some Project experts conduct monitoring activities using online tools. Project activities that require the physical presence of many stakeholders and beneficiaries in one closed space were postponed. These interventions included public hearings, validation of developed manuals in partnership with relevant stakeholders, capacity building, experience exchange and trainings and so forth. Project management has therefore initiated a revision of the work plan for 2020.

## Efficiency

1. ***The Project’s goal, design and implementation approaches assume unprecedented cooperation among the UN agencies and creation of synergies among their respective programmes. Relevant stakeholders and partners also are actively involved in the Project’s design and implementation to ensure efficiency.***

Six IAs have pooled their expertise in various aspects of human security to address issues in the target consolidated communities. The Project’s interventions are designed in a way to complement each other and ensure multiplied impact as a result of the cooperation between IAs. The direct involvement of the six IAs in the Project also ensures unprecedented synergies between the Project and the programmes of the IAs. One example is the cooperation between IOM, UNIDO and UNDP in the promotion of herbal tea production in Tavush and the support for collective farmer’s groups in Shirak as well as fruit and cheese value chains within **Objective 3**. Other examples include the cooperation between UNDP and UNICEF to support the implementation of comprehensive school safety measures in all the schools and preschools of the target communities and the cooperation between UNDP, UNICEF and UNIDO to support women in benefitting from economic opportunities created in the communities where preschool services were established within the scope of the Project.

Additional opportunities for cooperation and synergies related to the Project’s components can still be discussed by the IAs. For example, FAO or IOM and UNDP can discuss cooperation for promoting the use of anti-hail nets among the demo vineyards and orchards or the fruit producers and not necessarily among the current beneficiaries. The respective IAs can inform farmers about opportunities during their capacity building initiatives.

All IAs have actively involved key partners and stakeholders in the design and implementation of the project activities, which is key in ensuring synergies and avoiding overlaps between similar initiatives. For example, within ***Objective 2,*** Project experts under the lead of MLSA have developed guidelines for social workers for early identification, prevention and response to human security social needs. After the completion of this initiative, the guideline will be institutionalized as part of MLSA training and assessment packages for the benefit of all communities throughout the country ultimately. Within ***Objective 1***, the Project is considering a public-private partnership model for promoting the use of anti-hails nets among farmers. UNDP has developed a scheme to establish multi-party private-public partnerships to help farmers, wine and brandy factories, food processing companies and community administrations in Tavush to invest in agricultural disaster risk reduction for resilient, risk informed and sustainable development. Within this scheme UNDP will provide grants to qualified farmers to minimize the socio-economic impact of COVID-19, by covering 50% of the cost of anti-hail nets for vineries and orchards. DRRNP will organize relevant trainings on agricultural risk reduction and will install the anti-hail nets at a fixed service charge. The remaining 50% of the cost can be covered with government subsidized 2% loans from banks for qualified farmers or be financed by interested wine, brandy and food processing factories, provided that the supported farmers will reimburse that cost with agricultural products at agreed-upon quality and price. This way, the farmers will receive the anti-hail nets at no immediate expense and will cover the remaining 50% of the cost during a period of three to five years (the agreement with the factories would be made in advance). By the end of the evaluation period, the negotiations between all parties were already underway.

This partnership will allow the Project to address the needs of a greater number of farmers and ensure beneficiary ownership in the Project, rather than in case of investing the envisaged budget for the intervention as a direct grant to the farmers.

Within ***Objective 1,*** the results of the School Seismic Assessment have been incorporated into the HSA and contributed to the identification process of local-level risk and beneficiary needs.

Within ***Objective 2,*** the website [www.imigrant.am](http://www.imigrant.am), developed by the Project in cooperation with the SEA, reveals the current migration situation in the target communities in order for the Project, the implementing agency and SEA to develop targeted interventions. Involving SEA as a partner in this initiative will ensure the sustainability of this intervention. The cooperation between SEA, LG and the Project will ensure periodic updates to the database. The SEA will make sure that in time additional communities will be covered and the projects designed by SEA and other state or international agencies dealing with ensuring safe migration are better informed.

1. ***Despite the limitations and challenges related to evaluating efficiency, especially in terms of analysing the funds spent within the period versus planned budget and project progress, the evaluation revealed several issues that need to be addressed by the Project to increase its efficiency.***

The cost-efficiency of the Project is hard to assess within the scope of this evaluation. While this evaluation had to look at project implementation within the scope of the funds received from the UNTFHS, the target values set for the Project indicators for some Project components were set after considering the availability of parallel funding and the activities to be implemented with the funding. The targets set for these indicators are quite ambitious. For other components the target values of indicators were set only after considering the activities to be implemented within the scope of UNTFHS funding and their contributions to output and objective level indicators. In addition, the progress values of the output and objective level indicators were not available for the evaluation period.

For the purpose of this evaluation, the IAs were asked to share information on the planned budget and expenses carried out within the evaluation period with the funding allocated by UNTFHS together with the progress values of activity level indicators. Even though at the activity level the planning of targets was also based on a multiple principle, showing and proving attribution was not difficult.

Analysis at the activity level facilitates analysis of expenses versus achievements within the evaluation period. The data provided by the IAs is presented in Annex 6 of this report. According to this data only 68% of the planned budget for *Objective 1* for the evaluation period was spent. For *Objective 2*[[3]](#footnote-3) and *Objective 3*, the relevant percentages are 44% and 53%, respectively.

Within ***Objective 1*** there are cases of both underspending and overspending. The analysis also revealed that in some cases this could be a reason for concern and consideration. For example, the target for Activity 1.2.1 (“Enhance Early Warning Systems in communities through technical upgrade, improved coordination and mechanisms”) was reached. Even though the component budget for the evaluation period was overspent, the expenses did not exceed the planned budget for the component. The target value of the indicator related to Activity 1.2.6 (“Establish Public-Private Partnership (PPP) with local business community to invest in DRR”) was not achieved and funds budgeted for it were not spent. The evaluation showed that due to the country’s economic crises and uncertainty caused by the COVID-19 pandemic farmers are hesitant to make investment decisions. Therefore, the initially designed scheme has been re-discussed with all stakeholders to ensure no immediate cost and less risky investments for farmers. Due to the declared state of emergency, this intervention has seen some delay.

Most of the underspending for ***Objective 2*** for the evaluation period was due to various activities. For example, only 43% of the planned budget allocated for ***Activity 2.1.2.*** “Enhance capacity of the State Employment Agency to outreach to local communities and reduce human insecurity of Armenian labour migrants, reduce exposure to labour trafficking and exploitation” was spent. Due to restructuring in the Government and redistribution of portfolios, the government partner responsible for labour migration information management and support was yet to be appointed. When conducting their community mapping exercise, SEA and its administrative branches were trained on methodology for further data collection on labour migration patterns in communities. The relevant Government decree was in circulation among responsible government authorities.

Activity 3.1.3 from *Objective 3*, “Support building human and physical capacities among new businesses from vulnerable communities and families including women and returning migrants, to implement the business models developed, as well as provide access to loan funds”, assumed that support for producers and interventions related to the processing companies within the same value chains would start in parallel. While the progress of indicators related to the works of producers are registered and the budget was spent accordingly, the interventions within the selected value chains were delayed and the budgets were underspent within the evaluation period. The pandemic situation may further complicate matters with this intervention.

Overall 57% of the planned budget for the evaluation period was spent (the project coordination costs are not considered in the analysis). Some of activity level indicators were not reached, and data on the progress of outcome and objective level targets were not available.

Based on the analysis of the data provided by the IAs coupled with the data collected from relevant stakeholders through interviews, it appears that the chances of the pandemic having a negative impact on the Project’s progress are quite high. As a result, the terms of cooperation and support for the private sector beneficiaries may need to be revised, and some activities (and their expected impact) will be delayed. Therefore, it is recommended that the Project team apply for a no-cost extension of activities once the work plan is revised.

1. ***The Project coordination set-up creates challenges in terms of accessibility to necessary, timely and comprehensive data for efficient decision-making processes at project management and coordination levels.***

The Project’s Steering Committee meetings are being conducted periodically, and coordination meetings among the technical staff members also are being conducted on a weekly basis. Before the pandemic joint field visits were being conducted on a regular basis and IAs are readily cooperating to accomplish common goals.

The Project coordination set-up, however, does create certain challenges in ensuring efficient project implementation. For example, unlike other development projects where there is one finance manager responsible for reporting all expenses and a monitoring expert that collects and analyses data on all project components, in the Project all of these functions are split between the experts representing their respective IAs. According to the project document the project manager is appointed by the lead agency but has no typical managerial functions and responsibilities for the project as a whole or for specific components.

Decentralization of project management functions cannot be considered efficient unless alternative management tools can be implemented. For example, a shared file used to keep track of project expenses could be shared and updated monthly by the financial managers from all IAs. Monitoring databases could also be shared and updated. This way more informed decision-making and quicker response times can be accomplished for unexpected challenges during the Project’s implementation.

Additionally, the Project work plan needs to be more detailed for all IAs and relevant stakeholders so that the particulars of all activities for the target communities can be easily understood. Also, a cooperation framework can be reconsidered that would track additional opportunities for creating synergies between the project components and the programmes initiated by IAs while the activities are being implemented.

## Sustainability

This part of the report looks at the preconditions created for the sustainability of the Project’s benefit streams. In other words, the evaluation has assessed to what extent benefits will continue after the Project’s lifespan.

Sustainability typically can be measured two to three years after the end of a project. This evaluation looked at the preconditions created within the Project to ensure the sustainability of interventions. Overall the Project has made good efforts and created sound preconditions for sustainability.

1. **Even though the sustainability is early to measure at this stage of the Project’s implementation, the evaluation has deduced that the interventions are being designed and implemented with a strong emphasis on the pillars of sustainable development, which are human, social, economic and environmental aspects of growth. The principles of DRR informed development, human capacity building and social inclusion can be found in all project components.**
2. **The Project never took on any system functions, even temporarily. This means that the Project had never played a role of a service provider in the market. Instead, for ensuring the sustainability of its interventions, it strengthened the capacities of relevant stakeholders to guarantee that the final target beneficiaries receive services with higher quality both from the state and private sector stakeholders. All the relevant stakeholders were involved from the design phase to implementation, which ensured their ownership in the Project’s initiatives.**

It can be stated with confidence that the Project’s key stakeholders and partners have full ownership of the interventions and they will most likely continue delivering the stream of benefits for the target groups. The interview results also have revealed that even though the preconditions for sustainability are there, some interventions may need follow up to ensure sustainable impact.

Within ***Objective 1*** of the Project, the recommendations of the human security needs assessment based on the LLRM tool will be incorporated into the five-year development plans of the target communities after the public hearings scheduled in August 2020. Interviews with the mayors of the communities revealed that the recommendations will be incorporated by December 2020, when the development plans will be revised. According to the interviewed LLRM experts, however, the incorporation process will need coaching from the Project side to ensure that for each of the incorporated recommendations the community sets realistic implementation deadlines and can clearly define sources of funding.

According to the interviewed key stakeholders and experts, the human security needs assessment is quite comprehensive. The Project however needs to ensure that it reflects the key findings of all other assessments conducted within the scope of various components of the project, such as social needs assessment, or the assessment conducted to determine migration trends.

The results of the GIS-based multi risk assessment can be incorporated into the development plans of the communities. Some of the identified issues will be addressed during the coming years. Even though the results of such a comprehensive and science-based assessment will probably not change, especially in the communities, for a more sustainable impact, a comprehensive database will need to be updated periodically by a GIS specialist since the communities lack human resources and capacities to do that. To address this issue, the project is discussing the possible involvement of the State Cadastre Committee. Per a government decision in 2018 an integrated cadastre database will be created, and all other state agencies will be provided logins and passwords in order to access the data. Incorporating all these data in one portal will ensure that there are no overlaps or inconsistencies in the database. The State Cadastre Committee is interested in the database created based on the GIS-based multi risk assessment. The State Cadastre Committee will eventually decide whether the agency will update and manage the database or else outsource that work to a private company. However, since the head of the State Cadastre Committee resigned during the negotiation phase, the Project needs to renegotiate and reconfirm the commitment of this state agency with the new head.

To address the findings and recommendations within the school seismic safety assessments and utilize the capacity building activities carried out by the Project for school administration and teaching staff, the active participation of school staff members in all DRM related issues for schools is required. The current DRM guidelines heavily rely on participatory approaches and encourage schools to engage all school stakeholders in the process, while previously only DRM focal points were responsible for school contingency plans and their implementation. Despite these changes and project interventions to enhance school capacities school proactivity remains low. For the intended sustainable impact, the project and relevant partners, including MES and regional rescue services, need to further coach the schools in developing proper DRR and emergency response plans. The regional and national level education and emergency authorities need to monitor the schools more closely and frequently. The draft law on DRM and Population Protection, which is currently being considered by the government, foresees the DRM to be an integral part of broader school development planning processes. If adopted, the enforcement of this law will help encourage relevant school staff members and authorities.

The schools need to be better monitored by the regional and national level education and emergency authorities, which are now simply providing additional capacity development.   
Government reforms should ensure that the School DRM is an integral part of the broader school development planning processes. The relevant ministries embedded in the draft Law on DRM and Population Protection are currently discussing this matter.

Within ***Objective 2*** the Project managed to find sustainable funding solutions for creating preschools in the most remote settlements of the target communities. The suggested model is in line with the government’s approaches and can serve as a good example for other regions and communities to follow.

Within the same objective a manual on early identification and prevention was drafted jointly with MOLSA as part of social needs assessment of families, which is still pending validation with social workers. The manual is in line with the priority approaches of the government, and the preconditions for this intervention’s sustainability are present.

Within ***Objective 3***, the economic opportunities to be created in the field are based on the value chain approach. The project carefully selects partners from the private sector with proven success records and profound growth plans that can become a driving force for the development of the whole chain. With their growth economic opportunities can be created for other smaller private actors along the value chain. The Project does not impose support conditions upon private sector operators which may put an unnecessary load on businesses (e.g. contractual agreements stipulating that legume producer cooperatives only supply local schools). Rather, the Project creates all the preconditions for the intended targets to be reached, thereby ensuring the sustainability of the achievements. Another example is the opportunities being created for women and vulnerable groups. The Project promotes value chains in which women can be involved in any capacity. For instance the Project provides support for a herb and tea production value chain, where the co-founder and financial manager is a woman and the majority of work force is comprised of women. Another example is the intended support for a wool factory in Amasia, which can create jobs for women and as a result spur preschool education opportunities for their own children and the community as a whole.

## Impact

This part of the report will examine how the Project has brought about change in human development and people’s well-being during the 18 month-long evaluation period.

1. ***The Project’s progress towards SDGs is visible. The interventions related to overcoming poverty, providing access to quality education and social services and promoting gender equality have already started to show measurable results.***

It is too early to measure the Project’s impact on sustainability. The objective output level targets in most cases are not being measured yet. While the cooperation between the IAs will have a multiplied impact on the target communities, the anticipated results are not yet identifiable since all project components not are being implemented in parallel or are not at the same stage of implementation. For example, within ***Objective 3****,* the producer groups that were supported within the Project to create economic opportunities in the communities with heavy migration trends have created jobs for farmers. But since the interventions with the processors are now slightly delayed, the larger intended impact is not visible yet.

Within the same objective, even the created cooperative of legume producers has yet to harvest their first yield, therefore the economic impact on their families cannot be measured at this stage. The target of the Project connected with this component was to ensure legume supplies for local schools to feed children. This impact also cannot be identified at this stage. Since the Project addressed the main constraints for the local producers within the legume value chain, especially in the production stage, the local women and men farmers have already applied to join the cooperative. Because of this, replication of practices can already be identified.

The demonstrated agro-technologies within the same objective of the project already register good results when assessing the conditions of the fields and vineyards. However, it is too early to measure economic impact or replication.

The interviews conducted with Project experts and relevant stakeholders revealed that the social impact intended to be reached through the ***Objective 2*** interventions related to enhancing quality of services provided by social workers may be delayed. Many of the activities and follow-up actions that need to be conducted by the relevant stakeholders (validation of the manual, training of social workers, etc.) are postponed indefinitely, although Project experts were seeking alternative solutions. However, the methodological guide is being developed with the support of the project, therefore, the relevant stakeholders are reporting on the technical upgrades of their capacities, which in turn create preconditions for future enhanced quality of social services.

Likewise, because the preschool services and kindergartens that were created or renovated in the remote areas operated for just a couple of months until the COVID-19 pandemic hit the country, the intended economic or social impact in those communities cannot be identified.

The impact of the human security needs assessments conducted within ***Objective 1*** will be measured with indicators that show the extent of their integration into the five-year community development plans. Chances are that this impact will be visible by the end of 2020. The real economic and social impact of this intervention, however, will be visible only after the communities address their identified issues.

As previously noted, some progress has already been made toward SDG 1, 2 and 5 in terms of creating economic opportunities, including for women. Other progress has been seen towards SDG 4 in terms of new learning opportunities in the remote communities for children and possibilities for new jobs and sustainable economic growth (SDG 8) and the integration of disaster risk reduction into the community development cycle (SDG 11, 13).

1. ***The Project’s impact may be diminished due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Due to the postponement of certain project activities and the reconsideration of terms for support the Project may not bring about the expected change within the given timeframe. Furthermore, the forecasted economic crises may result in the worsening of macro level indicators (for example indicators related to poverty and migration may increase), which will create a false impression of weak impact.***

At this stage of the evaluation any serious threats that can jeopardize the Project’s direct impact are not identified. The COVID-19 pandemic, however, will most likely cause a delay in the intended impact of some of the Project’s components. It is also unclear whether the pandemic will result in the delay of project activities. Therefore the Project team should consider applying for a no-cost extension for the Project based on reconsidered implementation approaches for some activities. For instance capacity building can be conducted online with a video conferencing platform, terms of support for the private sector could be revised if necessary and the Project work plan can be re-evaluated.

As stated in the previous sections of this document, due to the pandemic the investment capacities and plans of the pre-selected beneficiary processors will most likely change and the Project team will need to revise the terms for support based on the discussions with potential beneficiaries. A similar problem may likely arise with the anti-hail nets for potential beneficiary farmers.

The Project also needs to strengthen its monitoring capacities in order to demonstrate how the Project helped mitigate the negative impact of the pandemic.

## Cross-cutting topics

1. **Based on recommendations gender was mainstreamed into the Project document in order to ensure gender-responsive interventions. Most Project interventions are designed to benefit women, children and socially vulnerable groups. Nevertheless, it is important to point out that to date, very few of the recommendations in the report are practically being implemented by the agencies, even though the interventions defined in the Project document were revised to incorporate them.**

An international gender expert that was contracted by the lead agency conducted gender analysis within the framework of the Project. A number of recommendations were made to address gender issues in the target communities. Based on the recommendations gender was mainstreamed into the Project document in order to ensure gender-responsive interventions.

An analysis of the Project’s practical interventions revealed that many of them are designed to benefit women, children, migrants and vulnerable groups. The IAs unified their efforts to ensure a multiplied positive impact on vulnerable groups in the target communities. While within one of the Project’s components preschool education became available for children in the six most vulnerable communities of the country, another Project component will contribute to the creation of economic opportunities for their own mothers. Another example is the creation of business and employment opportunities for returned migrants in the communities through the promotion of value chains. In many cases the Project chose to provide support to private sector organizations that are part of value chains, which may result in new jobs for women. One example of this is the herbal tea production business, the expansion of which may result in up to 70 seasonal employment opportunities for women. Other examples of creating economic opportunities for women include support for farmers in the legume value chain, where the provision of machinery for harvesting and cleaning legumes to the legume producers cooperative encouraged women in the communities to start cultivating their lands and apply to join the cooperative.

Equal participation from all the community members was highly encouraged within the scope of various interventions carried out by the Project.

In the selection of candidates wishing to participate in the Project interventions priority was given to the occupation of the candidate as well as the organization or community group that he or she represented. Nevertheless, out of 97 beneficiaries trained or supported within the scope of the demo farm projects only one of them is a woman. In some cases though, women were more active in participating and benefiting from the Project than men. The beneficiary list presented in Table 2 of Annex 6 of this report shows that out of 52 school directors/administrators trained on comprehensive school safety, including school disaster management, psychosocial support to children, first aid and DRR teaching and learning, 32 of them were female. Furthermore, out of 217 school deputy directors and teachers that received training 133 of them were female. Overall, according to the Project beneficiary matrix more than 50% of direct and indirect beneficiaries of the interventions carried out within the evaluation period are women.

Nevertheless, very few recommendations in the report are practically being implemented by the agencies, even though the interventions defined in the Project document were revised to incorporate them.

The Project does not have any gender related indicators at objective and output levels. Some indicators at the activity level require presenting information in a gender disaggregated manner, as adopted based on the recommendations by the gender expert. However, in most cases, the implementing agencies do not even present gender disaggregated data on the Project beneficiaries that could reveal participation levels of women. Gender disaggregated data was compiled in the beneficiary matrix and presented by each IA to the evaluator for review. However, since the beneficiary matrix and gender disaggregated data are not periodically updated by each IA, Project management cannot see the overall picture and properly address issues in a timely manner.

# Chapter III Conclusions and Recommendations

## 3.1 Conclusions and Lessons Learned

The evaluation looked at the extent to which the intended Project outputs and outcomes are consistent with national and local policies and priorities and the needs of intended beneficiaries.Project components were designed in line with the national development priorities and the needs of the beneficiaries in the target communities. After the change in the Government of Armenia as a result of the “velvet revolution” in 2018, the Project partners at national and sub-national level were reconfirmed and the new Project partners have recommitted themselves to the Project’s objectives and outcomes and have approved of the ongoing and planned interventions. However, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the needs of Project beneficiaries might alter slightly, or else new needs might emerge due to the expected economic crises.

Despite the fact that a few of the objective and output level indicators with their respective targets were technically incorrectly formulated, most of the project indicators are clearly defined and achievable. Gender and other relevant cross-cutting issues were properly mainstreamed into the Project’s design. Project interventions are properly informed about the comprehensive assessments and consultation processes conducted within the Project’s inception phase.

The evaluation also reflected on the extent to which the intended results have been achieved and whether opportunities created by the project were equally accessible for women and men ***(Effectiveness)***.

The participation of key stakeholders and partners in the Project’s implementation is ensured through the participatory design and implementation approaches of the Project interventions. These interventions were developed based on long consultative processes with key partners and stakeholders and after a human security needs assessment, social needs assessment and DRR related assessments were made. The involvement of key partners, stakeholders and their groups in these processes ensured their ownership and dedication to the Project’s initiatives.

The evidence that the Project interventions are addressing the actual needs of beneficiaries can be found when analysing all the Project components. It should be noted, however, that the interviews with the potential beneficiaries (larger processing businesses) showed that due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the uncertainty and expected economic crises around the world and in the country may alter the needs of beneficiaries representing the private sector.

To assess the extent to which the intended results have been achieved, the evaluation had to look at the baseline and progress values of objective and output level indicators. However, the monitoring system of the Project did not provide comprehensive information on the baseline and progress values of these indicators. Therefore, in such cases, the progress of the Project was assessed based on the activity level indicators within the scope of evaluation, which complicates the revelation of synergy effects of joint efforts from IAs.

Within the evaluation period two major risks occurred, thereby impacting project implementation: the change in government and the COVID-19 pandemic. While the change in government was managed properly, due to the pandemic the Project’s impact will be delayed, and therefore a need for an extension and revision of terms and approaches for certain designed interventions might arise.

The evaluation also studied the optimal use of project resources ***(Efficiency)***. The project goal, design and implementation approaches assume unprecedented cooperation among the UN agencies and the creation of synergies among their respective programmes. Relevant stakeholders and partners also are actively involved in the Project’s design and implementation in order to ensure project efficiency.

The analysis of Project expenses versus progress towards the targets reveals that overall, 57% of the envisaged budget for the evaluation period was spent (the Project’s coordination costs are not considered in the analysis). Some of the activity level indicators were not reached. Data on the progress of some outcome and objective level targets were not available due to various reasons.

The Project management and coordination set-up creates challenges in terms of accessibility of necessary, timely and comprehensive data for ***effective and efficient*** decision-making processes at the project management level*.* Each IA has its own internal fund management and monitoring tools to manage its own component within the Project. For efficient Project management, however, the information related to expenses as well as on progress and/or challenges related to all components should be readily and timely available for decision-making.

The extent to which the benefits will continue after the completion of a project ***(Sustainability)***, is usually measured several years after the project lifecycle. At this stage, however, this evaluation has studied whether preconditions of sustainability were created through the Project’s design or implementation approaches.

At this mid stage of implementation, the evaluation could already identify that the project interventions are being designed and implemented with strong emphasis on the pillars of sustainable development, which are human, social, economic and environmental aspects of growth. The principles of DRR informed development, human capacity building and social inclusion can be found in all project components. The Project never took on any system function even on a temporary basis, rather it created capacities for the relevant stakeholders to ensure that the final target beneficiaries receive higher quality services both from state or private sector representatives. All the relevant stakeholders were involved from the design phase to implementation, which ensured their ownership in the Project’s initiatives.

It was too early to measurethe ***Project’s impact,*** therefore the evaluation looked mostly on the likelihood of the intended results to be met.The evaluation showed that the Project’s progress towards SDGs is visible. The interventions aimed at risk informed and resilient community development, overcoming poverty, providing access to quality, inclusive and safe education and social services, gender equality have already started to show measurable results.

The evaluation also showed that the Project’s impact might be diminished due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The postponement of certain project activities and reconsideration of terms for support may not bring about the expected change in the given timeframe of the Project. Furthermore, the forecasted economic crises may result in the worsening of macro level indicators (e.g. indicators related to poverty and migration may increase), which will create a false impression of weak impact.

Finally, the evaluation showed that the Project had put sufficient efforts into mainstreaming the ***cross-cutting topics***in the project design.In particular, based on the recommendations of the international gender expert who developed the Report on Gender Analysis within the framework of the Project, gender was mainstreamed into the project document in order to ensure gender-responsive interventions. Most of the project interventions are designed to benefit women, children and socially vulnerable groups. Nevertheless, very few recommendations derived from the conducted Gender Analysis are practically being implemented by the agencies, even though the interventions defined in the Project document were revised to incorporate them.

*Of all the experiences and lessons learned by the Project team members from the implementation of various components, the ones listed below concern this Project as a whole:*

1. Despite all the implementation challenges of this Project which were mainly related to Project set-up, the Inter-agency coordination and cooperation within the UN family and with other stakeholders (including public and private sector representatives, other donor funded projects) brings synergies with positive and integrated results. Within this Project, considering the complex human insecurities and permanent demand for addressing challenges, the IAs were able to mobilize resources to improve people’s livelihoods.
2. The Project management and implementation set-up relies on the internal management tools, including financial management and monitoring tools, of each IA. Moreover, the data collected by each IA on the Project is being consolidated in one file for the purpose of yearly reporting. While through this approach each agency may effectively and efficiently manage its own component within the project, it limits the possibilities for the Project implementation and management team to come together as one in addressing Project-related issues. Additional coordination mechanisms and tools, however, will need to be introduced to make sure information for relevant decision-making is readily available for the project management and coordination team.

## 3.2. Recommendations

*The recommendations derived from this mid-term evaluation are directed to the Project team. The recommendations related to the* ***programmatic/ strategic*** *levels are the following:*

**R1.** Some of the Project’s objectives and output level indicators need to be reformulated to be technically correct, clear and understandable for all stakeholders. The Project team may choose to attach an explanation file to the defined indicators. All the missing baseline data should be inserted.

**R2.** The agencies should look for more synergies among project components at the implementation stage, as during implementation more practical cooperation opportunities may arise in the field. Agencies should more effectively utilize the local impetus of the community focal points hired by Project team for that reason.

**R3.** The IAs may need to discuss practical challenges in implementing the recommendations of the international gender expert. The reasons as to why these recommendations are not being implemented, despite the fact that they were incorporated into the Project document and relevant interventions were defined based on those recommendations, should come to light. The IAs should also come up with solution the address those challenges.

*At the operational level the recommendations derived from this mid-term evaluation are the following:*

**R4.** Aside from the regular Inter-Agency Coordination Committee meetings, Project board meetings and regular cooperation meetings, additional managerial tools should be introduced for enhanced effectiveness of the project, such as a frequently updated database on project expenses and frequently updated project monitoring database. The Project should assign or hire a dedicated staff for updating those files and have them made readily available for project management decision-making at any point in time.

**R5.** The Project can consider applying for a no-cost extension, based on the revised work plan and reconsidered interventions with beneficiaries, additional investments from private sector representatives including farmers and processors and additional targeted capacity building events with fewer participants.

**R6.** Beneficiary needs should be reassessed, and intervention implementation approaches related to private sector development may need to be reconsidered accordingly.

**R7.** The Project needs to carry out further analysis of underspending and delays at the activity level to ensure that the issues are addressed in a timely manner.

**R8.** The project monitoring database should allow that synergy effects be reflected in the objective and output level indicators. The progress values of these indicators should be jointly reported by IAs periodically.

**R9.** The Project should have a sound monitoring system which will demonstrate the Project’s real impact. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic by the end of the project the macro level indicators will show negative trends, such as increased poverty and migration levels in target communities, decreased household income and food consumption and so forth. If such a system cannot be established at this stage, a budget can be allocated for this necessary task.

## Annex 1. Terms of Reference



**Terms of Reference**

**Post Title:** Project Evaluation Specialist

**Project Title:** Enhancing Human Security and building resilient societies in disadvantaged communities of Armenia

**Contract modality:** Individual Contract (IC)

**Starting Date:** February 27, 2020

**Duration:**  Up to (30) days

**Duty Station:** Yerevan, Armenia

1. **Background:**

United Nations in Armenia in partnership with 6 agencies (UNDP (lead agency), UNICEF, IOM, FAO and WFP) and in close cooperation with the GOA implements joint project “Enhancing Human Security and Building a Resilient Society in the Disadvantaged Communities of Armenia” funded by United Nations Trust Fund for Human Security.

The goal of the Project is to support Armenia’s efforts in achieving the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development by addressing the root causes of human insecurity for vulnerable people of Amasia, Alaverdi, Tumanyan and Berd communities in Shirak, Lori and Tavush regions of Armenia, aiming to: 1. ensure early prevention and sustainability of interventions through identification of root causes of threats to human security and enhancing community resilience; 2. strengthen social protection and inclusion to improve human security in targeted communities; and 3. address the economic and food insecurity in the target communities through strengthened livelihoods, creation of sustainable economic opportunities and capacity building.

Human security approach (HSA) within the project addresses, in its relevant aspects, individual rights, good governance, access to safe and inclusive education and health care, ensuring that opportunities and choices are fulfilled at maximum potential, and are aimed at reducing poverty, achieving economic growth and community resilience, as well as promoting understanding of human security in terms of the risks and insecurities faced by individuals and groups at grass roots level.

By identifying the concrete needs of populations under stress, human security highlights the complexity of the challenges and promotes integrated solutions that ensure greater coherence and stronger impact. Through the project implementation, the participating UN Agencies, along with the national implementing partners are addressing the following types of insecurities: economic, food, health, personal and environmental in Berd, Tumanyan, Alaverdi and Amasia consolidated communities of Armenia.

The comprehensive community profiles formulated within the Project serves as a baseline for any further monitoring and evaluation activities within the project. Moreover, the indicators would be aligned to the best possible extent to SDG indicators to be able to measure and monitor progress, though in the context of three regions.

The project is subject to mid-term evaluation in accordance with the project agreement with the UNTFHS.

1. **Objectives and Scope of work:**

The overall objective of the mid-term evaluation assignment is to assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency as well as impact and sustainability of interventions under the “Enhancing Human Security and Building a Resilient Society in the Disadvantaged Communities of Armenia” project.

Given that this is a mid-term evaluation, impact and sustainability are to be considered to the extent possible.

The geographical coverage of the evaluation includes Tumanyan, Alaverdi, Berd and Amasia consolidated communities together with their settlements, Considering the three-year duration of the project, the mid-term evaluation will be conducted for the period of October 2018- 31 March 2020 (18 months according to the Project Document).

The evaluation will focus on direct and indirect beneficiaries of the project interventions as will be spelled out in the inception report.

The evaluation will be carried out in close cooperation with the representatives from the above-mentioned six UN Agencies based on the results framework and joint work-plan, reviewing the project documents, conducting in-depth and key informant interviews, focus group discussions with main stakeholders, members of the beneficiary groups and selected communities. Findings of the mid-term evaluation will be communicated to the implementing partners and donor organization - UNTFHS.

**Evaluation Framework and Criteria**

All existing project documents containing result framework, joint work plan and others clearly setting objectives, results, activities, corresponding indicators on output and outcome levels, and means of verification, relevant to the object of the evaluation, should be thoroughly reviewed in the Inception phase by the Evaluator to finalize the evaluation design with a clear Evaluation Matrix.

Five core UN DAC evaluation criteria, namely the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability (to extent possible) and impact (to the extent possible) will be analyzed. Key evaluation questions will include, but are not limited to, the following:

***Relevance***

* Are the project activities/components relevant to the actual/defined needs of the beneficiaries? Were the objectives clear and feasible? How do the main components of the project contribute to the planned objectives and are logically interlinked?
* Is the project in line with the current priorities of the country? Is the Government committed (both in terms of timing and financially) to the project? How is the project aligned with and supports the national, regional and community strategies/plans?
* Has the project involved relevant stakeholders through consultative processes or information-sharing during its preparation phase? Was the human security needs assessment/analysis carried out at the beginning of the project reflecting the various needs of different stakeholders? Are these needs still relevant? Have there any new, more relevant needs emerged that the project should address?

***Effectiveness***

* How effective has the project been in establishing ownership by the stakeholders? Can the project management and implementation considered as participatory?
* Is the project making sufficient progress towards its planned objectives/outcomes/outputs? What are the key achievements, challenges and implementation lessons?
* How effectively are the beneficiary interventions in line with actual needs?

***Efficiency***

* To what extent the project made good use of the human, financial and technical resources, and have used an appropriate combination of tools and approaches to pursue the achievement of project results in a cost-effective manner?
* Was there a clear distribution of roles and responsibilities of key actors involved?
* To what extent did the project capitalize on other complementary initiatives to the project to reinforce the results of the project?
* Have project funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner? If not, what were the bottlenecks encountered?

***Sustainability (to the extent possible)***

* To what extent did the projectsupport the government and beneficiary communities in developing capacities and establishing mechanisms to ensure ownership and the durability of effects in line with Government reforms and strategies such as Community Consolidation, Disaster Risk Reduction, etc?
* Is there a need to adjust the project (e.g., extend duration due to COVID-19)?
* What are possible sustainability prerequisites already created on the ground?

***Impact (to the extent possible)***

* Has the project contributed or is likely to contribute to long-term social, economic, technical, environmental changes for individuals, communities, and institutions in achieving the SDG agenda?
* How does the project impact joint UN planning, implementation and programming?

Evaluation questions will be adjusted and refined by the Evaluator during the desk review phase.

In addition to five main evaluation criteria, the evaluation will review also how project incorporated principles of the human rights-based approach, gender equality aspect and other relevant cross-cutting issues. Gender equality concerns should be integrated in the evaluation scope of analysis and methods and tools for data collection, as well as, should be reflected in evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations wherever possible.

**Gender equality and inclusion of the most vulnerable groups (principle of Leaving No One Behind):**

* + - Assess steps, undertaken to ensure the active and equal participation of women, men, boys, and girls within the programme and advise the steps, required to be taken in the future to improve women participation;
    - Did the programme meet specific gender indicators and targets outlined within the project document?
    - How were vulnerable groups (including children and youth) involved in the project? What impact has the programme had on reducing vulnerabilities of these age groups?

**Evaluation methodology**

The evaluation methodology will be guided by the Norms and Standards of the United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG). The evaluation will be conducted in a participatory manner: key stakeholders, including communities, line ministries, NGOs, businesses etc. will be involved in all phases of the evaluation, including the planning, inception, fact-finding and reporting phases.

In this evaluation mixed method approach will be applied by combining qualitative and quantitative components to ensure complementarity. The independent evaluator will collect data from desk review and verify them with soft data from field, interviews and focus groups. The analysis will be built on triangulating information collected from different stakeholders (project staff, project partners, stakeholders and beneficiaries) through different methods including secondary data and documentation review and primary data. It should critically examine the information gathered from the various sources, and synthesize the information in an objective manner. If contradictory information is obtained from different stakeholders, an effort should be made to understand the reasons for such information, including any gender-based differences.

The evaluator will review the following documents before conducting any interviews or field trips: project documentation, progress reports, work plans, mission reports, monitoring data, workshop reports, minutes, country data, policies, legal documents, etc.

Preliminary suggestions for data collection methods to be envisaged include:

* Desk review including review of analysis of existing documents, legal and policy framework; review of monitoring and evaluation reports, available reports and analysis generated through the project;
* Key informant interviews with duty-bearers and policymakers, community focal points, partners organizations;
* Expert interviews with project implementing agencies;
* Focus group discussions with beneficiaries.

Because of COVID-19, interviews and focus group discussions may be conducted online to ensure no risk for evaluator and interviewees.

The independent evaluator will identify key stakeholders/informants (including but not limited to project implementers, decision makers, direct and indirect beneficiaries, etc.), and appropriate data collection methods for each informant category (such as semi-structured or in-depth interviews, expert interviews, focus groups), in close coordination with the project team.

A combination of these methods should be proposed by the independent evaluator in the detailed evaluation methodology.

In close cooperation with the project team, the independent evaluator will also be responsible for the development of appropriate instruments, including questionnaires, interview and focus group guides, for each of the methods selected. The materials should possibly be gender-sensitive in language and presentation, as well as take into consideration human rights and equity angles.

The evaluation will follow the principles of the UN Evaluation Group’s norms and standards in particular with regard to independence, objectiveness, impartiality and inclusiveness and will be guided by the UN ethics guidance as guiding principle to ensure quality of evaluation process, especially apropos conflict of interest, confidentiality of individual informants, sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs, discrimination and gender equality, to address issues of vulnerable population.

A major limitation to the evaluation will be the impossibility of face-to-face interviews due to COVID-19 restricting measures, thus data will be obtained through online means, though following all strict guidelines to the extent possible.

**Field based data collection**

[Because of COVID-19, interviews and focus group discussions may be conducted online to ensure no risk for evaluator and interviewees.]

* + - Interviews with or desk review of documents from national, and local government representatives, Heads of Amasia, Alaverdi, Berd and Tumanyan consolidated communities;
    - Interviews with other actors, such as partner organizations and contracted organizations;
    - Focus group discussions with beneficiaries;
    - Interviews with Community focal points.

1. **Duties and responsibilities:**

Under the direct supervision of UNDP Project Coordinator and in coordination with the project team, the incumbent will evaluate the following~~:~~

* + - Midterm Progress made by the Project towards the achievement of outcome and outputs;
    - Relevance, effectiveness, impact and sustainability of outputs vis-à-vis the Project Results and Resources Framework.

1. **Timeline and expected deliverables:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Description of deliverables** | **Delivery time** |
| **Deliverable 1 – Design phase**   * Desk review of the project materials, international and national frameworks and documents, etc.;   - UNDP Project Coordinator and project team will support the evaluator to compile the list of most important background materials, documents, and reports for review.  - The project result framework will be reviewed by the evaluator along with other key documents.   * Stakeholder mapping   - The evaluator will prepare a mapping of stakeholders relevant to the evaluation. The mapping will include ministries, regional and local authorities, implementing partners, service providers, direct and indirect beneficiaries, development partners. The project team will assist the evaluator in preparing the stakeholder matrix.   * Implementation plan and methodology   - Evaluation methodology, including evaluation matrix will be developed based on mixed method design.  - Data collection tools, including questionnaires (qualitative and quantitative) will be developed.  - The set of evaluation questions will be finalized.  - Field work schedule and approach will be drafted.   * Inception Report   - Inception report will be developed and presented to UNDP Project Coordinator and project team with all the document/tasks listed above for this phase embedded. | **30 May 2020** |
| **Deliverable 2 – Data collection phase/ field phase**  - Collection of evaluation data (primary and secondary) will be carried out through different techniques, including [online] in-depth, informal and semi-structured interviews, focus group discussions and expert interviews.  - The analysis will be based on protocols/transcripts of interviews, focus groups and comparative analysis.  Debriefing  - Debriefing meeting will be organized for the Project team on the preliminary findings, testing elements of conclusions and tentative recommendations. | **15 June 2020** |
| ***Deliverable 3 - Report development and validation phase:***   * 1st draft Evaluation Report submitted to UN participating agencies for review and feedback; * Comments provided by UN participating agencies and other key stakeholders (government, donor) will be addressed. * Validation meeting will be organized with partners and stakeholders to present evaluation findings. * The refined draft report is presented to/validated by UN implementing Agencies * The Evaluation Report is finalized based on the feedback of the above-mentioned parties. | **June 30th, 2020** |

**Key outputs**

1. Evaluation methodology, including data collection tools/questionnaires, list of beneficiaries and stakeholders to be interviewed. Field mission plans and reports – outlined in an evaluation inception report.
2. Data collection and analysis and draft outline of the Evaluation Report.
3. Evaluation report in English including key recommendations (max 21 pages plus annexes). Evaluation report shall be in line with the UN Evaluation Group standard 4.9. It shall be evidence-based, presenting the project’s progress vis-à-vis the Results Framework, based on triangulated data. The report shall present findings and recommendations on project planning, programming, relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of interventions.

**Key Documents to review**

Joint Project and Agency Project Document(s)

Results and resources Frameworks

1st Annual Progress Reports

Project Budgets and Expenditure Reports

Detailed Workplans and Revisions

CCA, UNDAF Evaluation, Agency and relevant other evaluations

UNDAF Results Groups Monitoring and reporting documents

Monitoring files with analysis of disaggregated data (women, men, boys, girls), data from the field

Other relevant documents requested by the Evaluator

**Suggested contents page**

**Opening pages (acknowledgments, list of acronyms)**

**Executive Summary (5-6 pages)**

**Chapter I Background, Object and Methodology**

* 1. Introduction
  2. Background and context of the project
  3. Object of the Evaluation
  4. Purpose, Objectives and Scope of the Evaluation
  5. Evaluation Methodology (short)
  6. Major Limitations
  7. Ethical considerations, Human Rights and Gender

**Chapter II Analysis and Findings**

* 1. Relevance
  2. Effectiveness
  3. Efficiency
  4. Sustainability
  5. Impact
  6. Cross-cutting topics

**Chapter III Conclusions and Recommendations**

3.1 Conclusions and Lessons Learned

3.2. Recommendations

**ANNEXES**

1. Terms of Reference
2. Desk Review and Background Documents
3. List of Stakeholders Interviewed
4. Detailed Methodology
5. Interview Guides and Survey Instruments, not new, Deliverable 1
6. Output tables
7. **Required qualifications:**

***Education:***

* Advanced university degree (MA and equivalent or higher) in development studies, economics, social science or related field.
* Knowledge and proven experience in managing and leading evaluation assignments for a range of major aid agencies or NGOs in particular evaluating community based, country wide or large donor programmes e.g. EC, ECHO, etc.;
* Strong data collection, analysis and **writing skills;**
* Broad knowledge of development issues and national policy and practice in community consolidation process, disaster risk reduction, social/child protection, etc.;
* Familiar with the human security local economic development, and resilience concepts;
* Understanding of gender equality issues;
* Proven experience of working in community development projects/programmes
* Fluency in Armenian and English

**Experience:**

* **Eight years of professional experience** in programme/project development, implementation, monitoring and evaluation for the international organizations in the above-mentioned areas; experience in development and application of methodologies for evaluation and assessment, including tools and techniques.

***Competencies/Skills:***

* + - Substantive knowledge of concept and principles of local development and governance processes, as well as subject-matter international instruments;
    - Strong analytical capacity and creative thinking;
    - Proven capacity to write analytical reports;
    - Strong planning skills and ability to respect deadlines;
    - **Excellent writing skills in English;**
    - Excellent teamwork skills; ability to consult, involve and work with stakeholders of different backgrounds, points of view and interests;
    - Demonstrated initiative, high sense of responsibility and discretion;
    - High level of integrity, **professionalism and respect for diversity.**
    - Availability to travel as required.

1. **Payment mode:**

100% of the payment will be made upon effective conclusion of the Deliverablesand submission for approval by DRR Programme Manager.

## Annex 2. Desk Review and Background Documents

1. UNDP Independent Country Programme Evaluation
2. Final Evaluation of the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) for Armenia (2016-2020)
3. UNDP CPD/CPAP Action Plan 2016-2020
4. Project document
5. Project Annual Report 2019
6. Project Budget, Updated Project Budget as of 24 May 2018
7. Interim Financial Reports submitted by IOM, UNDP
8. Project monitoring file updated as of October 2019
9. Programme of the GOA 2019-2023
10. Report on Gender Analysis within the framework of the Project Enhancing Human Security and Building a Resilient Society in the Disadvantaged Communities of Armenia
11. Applying LLRM Methodology to Ensure the Human Security Approach Based Community Planning
12. Applying Human Security Approach to the LLRM Methodology and Toolkit HS
13. School Safety Seismic Assessment Reports
14. Human stories and video materials on supported migrants and migrant families
15. Labor migration mapping on <http://imigrant.am/map>
16. School Seismic Safety Assessment Reports
17. UNICEF DRR Programme in 2019
18. Armenia-UNICEF Programme of cooperation 2016-2020
19. Alaverdi Community Social Needs Assessment
20. Lori Marz Social Needs Assessment
21. Shirak Marz Social Needs Assessment
22. Early Prevention and social needs assessment manual draft
23. MoU between UNICEF, Lori Regional Administration and Alaverdi Multi-settlement consolidated community on development and implementation of community social and disaster risk reduction programs for children in Alaverdi multi-settlement consolidated community.
24. Advancing Child Friendly Solutions at the Local Level in Armenia, Programme Document
25. Protection of Children from Violence, ToT Guide for Social Workers
26. Feasibility Study on Promotion of Production, Post-harvest Management, Storage, Processing and Marketing of Grains in Berd Community of Tavush Marz
27. Evidences from the Sites Human Stories and video stories of beneficiaries
28. Training and Capacity Building Reports, LoPs

*Media Coverage Links and websites*

<https://www.facebook.com/norashentavush/videos/2733768556732186/?v=2733768556732186>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uGVb99wTkEQ&list=PLmkq9ega4KMde4-1W2JVX8iEUm-2kJPOd>

<http://imigrant.am/map>

<https://www.gov.am/files/docs/3562.pdf>

## Annex 3. List of Stakeholders Interviewed

1. Mr. Artak Voskanyan, *Project Coordinator,* ***UNDP***
2. Mr. Sergey Matevosyan, *Project Lead,* ***UNIDO***
3. Mr. Artak Poghosyan, *Project Lead,* ***IOM***
4. Mr. Vahan Amirkhanyan, *Project**Lead,* ***FAO***
5. Mr. Armen Zakaryan, *Project Expert,* ***FAO***
6. Mr. Tigran Tovmasyan, DRR Programme Officer, ***UNICEF***
7. Ms. Armenuhi Hovakimyan, Social Protection Officer, ***UNICEF***
8. Mr. Vahan Arakelyan, *Monitoring Officer*, ***WFP***
9. Ms. Karine Khojayan,Programme Coordinator, **IOM**
10. Ms. Arshaluys Vardanyan, DRR Programme Assistant, **UNDP**
11. Mr. Armen Chilingaryan, *DRR Project Coordinator,* ***UNDP***
12. Ms. Jemma Harutyunyan - *Amasia Community Mayor,* **Amasia Municipality**
13. Mr. Sasun Khechumyan - *Alaverdi Community Mayor,* **Alaverdi Municipality**
14. Mr. Levon Zavaryan - *Tumanyan Community Mayor,* **Tumanyan Municipality**
15. Mr. Harytyun Manucharyan - *Berd Community Mayor,* **Berd Municipality**
16. Mr. Arthur Mkrtchyan - *Amasia Focal Point,* ***UNDP***
17. Ms. Anahit Badalyan - *Berd Focal Point,* ***UNDP***
18. Ms. Armenuhi Galstyan - *Alaverdi and Tumanyan Focal Point,* ***UNDP***
19. Mr. Ashot Sargsyan - HSA Expert, **Independent Expert**
20. Mr. Armen Arakelyan - *Lore Search and Rescue Team Leader*, **LLRM Expert**
21. Mr. Suran Arakelyan - *Georisk Scientific Research Company*, **Science Based Multi Risk Assessment Expert, Director of Georisk**
22. Mr. Hektor Babayan - *Georisk Scientific Research Company*, **Science Based Multi Risk Assessment Expert**
23. Mr. Hovik Hovhannisyan - Head of Division, Department of Population Protection, Rescue Service, **MES**
24. Ms. Armine Danielyan – Leading Specialist at IT Center at **State Cadaster Committee**
25. Mr. Smbat Petrosyan – **Expert** on Early Warning Systems

Ms. Amalya Yenokyan–Leading Specialist, Labour Migration Division, **State Employment Agency.**

Ms. Nelly Davtyan Public Relations Coordinator, **Migration Service of Armenia**

Mr. Vardan Kalantaryan – supplier for production of preserves, settlement Choratan, **Project beneficiary**

Mr. Vardan Petrosyan – supplier for dried fruit production, settlement Chinari, **Project beneficiary**

Mr. Arayik Hovakimyan – supplier for dried fruit production, settlement Chinari, **Project beneficiary**

Mr. Levon Ordyan –producer of turkey meat, settlement Chinari– returned migrant, **Project beneficiary**

Mr. Narek Muradyan - strawberry producer, settlement Akner – returned migrant, **Project beneficiary**

Mr. Vardan Muradyan – strawberry producer, settlement Akner returned migrant, **Project beneficiary**

Mr. Grigor Aleksanyan – field cultivation, Community Amasia, **Project beneficiary**

Ms. Anna Grigoryan – field cultivation, community Amasia, **Project beneficiary**

Mr. Armen Zakaryan, **FAO Project Expert**, Demo Farms in Shirak Marz

Ms. Hratsin Grigoryan-demo farm owner, integrated pest management – vineyard, **Project beneficiary**

Mr. Andranik Manukyan - demo farm owner, integrated pest management – winter wheat, **Project beneficiary**

Mr. Ashot Poghosyan – demo farm owner, winter wheat, **Project beneficiary**

Mr. Seyran Sargsyan- demo farm owner, winter wheat, **Project beneficiary**

1. Mr. Gor Abrahamyan - Head of the Legume Producers’ Cooperative, **Project beneficiary**
2. Mr. Arayik Atoyan – Member of Legume Producers’ Cooperative, **Project beneficiary**
3. Mr. Alik Hayrapetyan- Member of Legume Producers’ Cooperative, **Project beneficiary**
4. Mr. Sasun Saiamyan - Member of Legume Producers’ Cooperative, **Project beneficiary**
5. Mr. Roland Yesayan - Member of Legume Producers’ Cooperative, **Project beneficiary**
6. Ms. Armine Avagyan - Member of Legume Producers’ Cooperative, **Project beneficiary**
7. Ms. Anahit Khachatryan – Member of Legume Prodicers’ Cooperative, **Project beneficiary**
8. Ms. Tehmine Avalyan-Member of Legume Producer’s Cooperative, **Project beneficiary**
9. Mr, Armen Mkrtumyan - New Member of Legume Producers’ Cooperative, **Project beneficiary**
10. Mr. Artem Paityan – New Member of Legume Producers’ Cooperative, **Project beneficiary**
11. Ms. Nazeli Mangasaryan – New Member of Legume Producers’ Cooperative, **Project beneficiary**
12. Mr. Gagik Mkhitaryan – School Director, **Norashen** **School**
13. Levon Hovsepyan, Shirak Regional Rescue Department of MES, Deputy Director
14. Levon Dallakyan, Lori Regional Rescue Department of MES, Deputy Director
15. Ms. Rita Melkumyan, Deputy Director, Basic School #1, Berd
16. Ms. Ruzan Toumanyan, Director, Basic School #3, Berd
17. Mr. Meruzhan Khechoyan, Secondary School, Tumanyan community, Head of Military Unit
18. Ms. Nune Karapetyan, Deputy Director, Amasia secondary school, Amasia Community, Shirak
19. Ms. Naira Manukyan, Deputy Director, Bandivan secondry school, Bandivan Settlement,
20. Ms. Anahit Musayelyan, Director, Tsahkashat Secondary School, Tsakhashat Settlement
21. Ms. Armine Arakelyan, Deputy Director, Basic School #12 of Alaverdi, Alaverdi community
22. Ms. Irina Khachatryan, Meghrashat Basic School Deputy Director
23. Ms. Lilit Mkhitaryan, Teacher at Meghrashat Basic School
24. Ms. Sona Piruzyan, Teacher of Armenian Language, Haghpat Basic School
25. Ms. Haykuhi Aslamazyan, Teacher at Haghpat Basic School
26. Ms. Sofia Evoyan, Alaverdi #12 School Nurse
27. Ms. Alvard Shahnazaryan, Tavush Basic School, Special Teacher
28. Ms. Heriknaz Egnatosyan, Gtashen Basic School Teacher
29. Mr. Ashot Chilingaryan, Dried Fruit Manufacturer, **Project beneficiary**
30. Mr. Koryun Sumbulyan, Head of collective farm of buckwheat production, **Project Beneficiary**
31. Mr. Hamlet Sargsyan, Owner of soft drink production business, potential **Project beneficiary**.
32. Mr. Gnel Nazanyan, Founder and owner of Darman Herbal Tea Production business, **Project potential beneficiary**

Ms. Anush Halivoryan- *Preschool Teacher,* **Jiliza Preschool**

Anush Hovhannisyan *Head of Alaverdy Branch,* **Vanadzor Regional Padagogical and Psychological Center**

Vahan Davtyan - *Head of Amasia Kindergarten and Gtashen Preschool*, **Amasia Kindergarten**

1. Mr. Ara Barseghyan - DRRNP – DRRNP director, expert on First Aid During Emergency Situations
2. Ms. Astghik Minasyan - Advisor to Minister of Labour and Social Affairs, **MLSA**

Mr. Abraham Artashesyan - **Communities Finance Officers Association**

Mr. David Tumasyan - Legal Expert

## Annex 4. Detailed Methodology

The evaluation follows the principles of the UN Evaluation Group’s norms and standards in particular with regard to independence, objectiveness, impartiality and inclusiveness and is guided by the UN ethics guidance as guiding principle to ensure quality of evaluation process, especially apropos conflict of interest, confidentiality of individual informants, sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs, discrimination and gender equality, to address issues of vulnerable population.

Below in this section detailed evaluation questions are defined, objective and output level indicators presented with their relevant baseline and progress values (as much as the data is available) as a bases of this mid-term evaluation. Further data collection, data analysis and sampling method are presented.

***Evaluation Questions***

Five core OECD/DAC evaluation criteria, namely the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability (to extent possible) and impact (to the extent possible) will be analyzed. The evaluation process will be guided through key questions related to each evaluation criteria which may include but not limited to:

***Relevance:*** the extent to which intended outputs and outcomes of the project are consistent with national and local policies and priorities and the needs of intended beneficiaries.

* Are the project activities/components relevant to the actual/defined needs of the beneficiaries? Were the objectives clear and feasible? How do the main components of the project contribute to the planned objectives and are logically interlinked?
* Are there suitable and informative targets, e.g. are they Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Time-bound (SMART)?
* Is the project in line with the current priorities of the country? Is the Government committed (both in terms of timing and financially) to the project? How is the project aligned with and supports the national, regional and community strategies/plans?
* Has the project involved relevant stakeholders through consultative processes or information-sharing during its preparation phase? Was the human security needs assessment/analysis carried out at the beginning of the project reflecting the various needs of different stakeholders? Are these needs still relevant? Have there any new, more relevant needs emerged that the project should address?
* Have the relevant cross-cutting issues (environment, gender, human rights and governance, donor coordination or others) been adequately mainstreamed in the project design?

**Effectiveness:** the extent to which the intended results have been achieved and whether opportunities created by the project were equally accessible for women and men.

* How effective has the project been in establishing ownership by the stakeholders? Can the project management and implementation be considered as participatory?
* Is the project making sufficient progress towards its planned objectives/outcomes/outputs? What are the key achievements, challenges and implementation lessons?
* Are the targets for the project appropriate and are they being reported against?
* How effectively are the beneficiary interventions in line with actual needs?
* Are the risks and assumptions holding true? Are risk management arrangements in place?

**Efficiency:** evaluate to what degree have resources been optimally used during project implementation, and has the project achieved satisfactory level of cost effectiveness.

* To what extent the project made good use of the human, financial and technical resources, and have used an appropriate combination of tools and approaches to pursue the achievement of project results in a cost-effective manner?
* Was there a clear distribution of roles and responsibilities of key actors involved?
* To what extent did the project capitalize on other complementary initiatives to the project to reinforce the results of the project?
* Have project funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner? If not, what were the bottlenecks encountered?
* Are coordination, management and financing arrangements clearly defined and do they support institutional strengthening and local ownership?
* How well is the implementation of activities managed? Does the project co-ordinate with other similar interventions to encourage synergy and avoid overlaps?
* Do the inter-institutional structures e.g. steering committees, technical team meeting and monitoring systems, allow efficient project implementation?

**Sustainability:** evaluate the contribution to sustainability of benefit streams (to what extent benefits will continue after the life of the project).

* Is sustainability an integral part of the design i.e. is there a phase out/hand over strategy?
* To what extent did the projectsupport the government and beneficiary communities in developing capacities and establishing mechanisms to ensure ownership and the durability of effects in line with Government reforms and strategies such as Community Consolidation, Disaster Risk Reduction, etc?
* Is there a need to adjust the project (e.g., extend duration due to COVID-19)?
* What are possible sustainability prerequisites already created on the ground?
* What is the likelihood that key partners will continue to make use of relevant results?
* Do the key partners have any plans to continue delivering the stream of benefits and if so, are they likely to materialize?

***Impact (to the extent possible)*** evaluate the project impact, if available at this early stage.

* Has the project contributed or is likely to contribute to long-term social, economic, technical, environmental changes for individuals, communities, and institutions in achieving the SDG agenda?
* How does the project impact joint UN planning, implementation and programming?
* What are the direct impact prospects of the project at overall objective level?
* What, if any impacts are already apparent?
* What impacts appear likely?
* Are any external factors likely to jeopardize the project’s direct impact?

**Recommendations, lessons learned and best practices.**

Recommendations related to the project design; project implementation; project management and management of resources will be provided. The lessons which can be learned from the project implementation so far will also be documented in order to improve performance, result and effectiveness in the coming months.

In addition to five main evaluation criteria, the evaluation will review also how project incorporated principles of the human rights-based approach, gender equality aspect and other relevant cross-cutting issues. Gender equality concerns as described in the evaluation scope are also considered in the methods and tools for data collection, and hence will be reflected in evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations wherever possible.

**Questions to be addressed by this evaluation task related to Gender equality and inclusion of the most vulnerable groups (principle of Leaving No One Behind) are as follows:**

* + - What are the steps undertaken to ensure the active and equal participation of women, men, boys, and girls within the programme? What step are required to be taken in the future to improve women participation?
    - Did the programme meet specific gender indicators and targets outlined within the project document?
    - How were vulnerable groups (including children and youth) involved in the project? What impact has the programme had on reducing vulnerabilities of these age groups?

The Project progress will be evaluated based on the **objective and output level indicators**. The Table # 1 above presents the objective and output level indicators as defined in the monitoring file of the Project. For the Project progress to be possible to evaluate, the monitoring file was updated based on the data available at that time for project experts as of 31 March, 2020.

In addition to these indicators, the evaluation will review to what extent the gender related indicators suggested by international expert (see Annex 5) were incorporated in the project and addressed.

***Methods and Sources of Data Collection and Analysis: Limitations of Each Method***

This evaluation is applying mixed method approach by combining qualitative and quantitative components to ensure complementarity. The independent evaluator collects data from desk review and verifies them with soft data from field, interviews and focus groups. The analysis is built on triangulating information collected from different stakeholders (project staff, project partners, stakeholders and beneficiaries) through different methods including secondary data and documentation review and primary data. The collected data from various sources is critically examined and synthesized in an objective manner. In case contradictory information is obtained from different stakeholders, the issue will be studied further to reveal the reasons behind, including any gender-based differences.

The data collection methods for this evaluation task with their descriptions is provided below:

1. ***Monitoring system/files*** - performance indicators are used to measure progress, particularly actual results against expected results. Advantage of this method is reliability, cost-efficiency, and objectivity. However, this method dependent upon viable monitoring systems that have established baseline indicators and targets and have collected reliable data in relation to targets over time, as well as data relating to outcome indicators.
2. ***Project document, project reports and other relevant documents*** - Existing documentation, including quantitative and descriptive information about the Project, its outputs and objectives, such as documentation from capacity development activities, donor reports, relevant national policies and other evidentiary documents. This is a cost efficient method, however the main limitation or shortcoming of these sources is that it can be difficult to code and analyze in response to evaluation questions, also it is difficult to verify reliability and validity of data.
3. ***In depth Interviews*** - The predetermined questions are designed to obtain in-depth information about interviewee’s impressions or experiences. This data source will facilitate fuller coverage, range and depth of information of the topic and issues. The disadvantage/limitation of this tool is that it can be time-consuming and difficult to analyze. Also miscommunication is a possible risk in this data collection method.
4. ***Key Informants’ Interviews*** - Qualitative in-depth interviews, with stakeholders who have first-hand knowledge about the initiative’s operations and context. The key informants can provide particular knowledge and understanding of problems and recommend solutions. They can provide insight on the nature of problems and give recommendations for solutions. This data collection method though is subject to sampling bias.
5. ***Expert interviews*** - External experts to provide input on technical or other substance topics covered by the evaluation. This method adds trustworthiness, can serve as added source of information that can provide greater depth. Can verify and validate information and results in topic area. This data collection method also is subject to bias; in case the expert is involved in project implementation.
6. ***Case studies***- Involves comprehensive examination through cross-comparison of cases to obtain in-depth information with the goal to fully understand the operational dynamics, activities, outputs, outcomes and interactions of the Project. This method is useful to fully explore factors that contribute to outputs and outcomes, however this method is time consuming and usually the data obtained through this method is hard to analyze.

Secondary and Primary data collection includes:

1. Retrieving existing documents and data. The list of documents (to be) reviewed is presented in the Annex 4 of this report.
2. Collecting data from individuals via Interviews and discussions. The instruments of primary data collection are developed and presented in the Annex 6 of this report.

In general, a major limitation to the evaluation is the impossibility of face-to-face interviews due to COVID-19 restricting measures, therefore data will be obtained through online means and telephone following all strict guidelines to the extent possible.

Since the ***telephone interviews*** will be major instrument for primary data collection it is important to be aware of and consider its advantages and disadvantages.

***Advantages***

1. Can be conducted many interviews per day as the time for traveling is saved.
2. Almost all people have telephones so they can be reached easily
3. Have higher response rate than web survey for example;
4. Have personal touch, misunderstandings can be modified
5. Can be recorded and rechecked to minimize misunderstanding
6. Is cost effective.

***Disadvantages***

1. Can be perceived as telemarketing and thus negatively received by potential respondents. This might decrease the response rate.
2. It can be challenging to design an effective phone survey because the questions need to be short and precise for easy comprehension.
3. Respondents may be reluctant to disturb their daily routine for a phone call and might want to cut the answers short.

As presented above, each data source has its strengths and limitations. For this reason, purposefully integrating different data collection methods and/or triangulating different data sources to answer the Key Evaluation Questions is chosen to overcome the weaknesses inherent in each data source when used alone. A mixed methods approach also is intended for improving the credibility of the findings and deepen the understanding of the key evaluation criteria of the Project.

The collected data will be analyzed in order to summarize them and look for patterns. Because most of the information collected within the scope of this evaluation will be **qualitative and textual data**, the relevant methods for analysis will be used. In particular ***content analysis*** will be carried out for reducing large amount of unstructured textual content into manageable data relevant to the evaluation questions. ***Thematic coding*** will be conducted for identifying passages of the spoken text which are linked by common theme or idea. Clear and coherent ***narratives*** will be built related to the changes occurring for the communities, direct or indirect beneficiaries, or other stakeholders.

Most of the numeric data is obtained from the provided project related documents including human security baseline analysis, project monitoring framework and budget implementation report. Another source of numeric data collection within this evaluation will be records of service providers /if available/.

The main techniques to be used for analyzing this data will be ***exploratory techniques*** which involves taking a ‘first look’ at a data set and summarizing its main characteristics, through the use of visual methods.

The information collected through the interviews and key informants will be verified or corroborated with triangulation method.

The detailed evaluation matrix for this evaluation task, which matches the key evaluation questions with possible data collection techniques, is presented in the table below.

Table # 1 Evaluation matrix: Matching data collection to key evaluation questions

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Key Evaluation Questions** | **Source of Information** | **Monitoring System/Files** | **Project Document, project reports** | **Beneficiary interviews** | **Key informant interviews** | **Expert interviews** | **Case Studies** |
| **Relevance** | | | | | | | |
| Are the project activities/components relevant to the actual/defined needs of the beneficiaries? Were the objectives clear and feasible? How do the main components of the project contribute to the planned objectives and are logically interlinked? | Analysis of the Project document, available assessments carried out within the project.  Interview results of Project Experts | X | X |  |  | X |  |
| Are there suitable and informative targets, e.g. are they Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Time-bound (SMART)? | Analysis of Project Document and Project monitoring file.  Interviews with project Experts. | X | X |  |  | X |  |
| Is the project in line with the current priorities of the country? Is the Government committed (both in terms of timing and financially) to the project? How is the project aligned with and supports the national, regional and community strategies/plans? | Interviews with public sector representatives and project Experts.  Analysis of and reports on the national strategic and policy documents and commitments of the country |  | X |  | X | X |  |
| Has the project involved relevant stakeholders through consultative processes or information-sharing during its preparation phase? Was the human security needs assessment/analysis carried out at the beginning of the project reflecting the various needs of different stakeholders? Are these needs still relevant? Have there any new, more relevant needs emerged that the project should address? | Analysis of Project Report, assessment reports carried out within the project.  Interviews with Project Experts and project focal points. |  | X |  | X | X |  |
| Have the relevant cross-cutting issues (environment, gender, human rights and governance, donor coordination or others) been adequately mainstreamed in the project design? | Analysis of the Gender report conducted within the project, project monitoring files, project report.  Interviews with project experts, community focal points and partners. | X | X |  | X | X |  |
| **Effectiveness** | | | | | | | |
| How effective has the project been in establishing ownership by the stakeholders? Can the project management and implementation be considered as participatory? | Interviews with project experts, project partners.  Analysis of project report and project document |  | X |  | X | X |  |
| Is the project making sufficient progress towards its planned objectives/outcomes/outputs? What are the key achievements, challenges and implementation lessons? | Analysis of project monitoring file, project report.  Interview with project expert, beneficiaries and implementing partners. | X |  | X | X | X |  |
| Are the targets for the project appropriate and are they being reported against? | Analysis of project monitoring file, project report.  Interview with project experts | X | X |  |  | X |  |
| How effectively are the beneficiary interventions in line with actual needs? | Interviews with project beneficiaries and implementing partners.  Analysis of project report and assessments conducted within the project to reveal beneficiary needs. |  | X | X | X |  | X |
| Are the risks and assumptions holding true? Are risk management arrangements in place? | Analysis of project document, project report.  Interviews with project experts. |  | X |  |  | X |  |
| **Efficiency** | | | | | | | |
| To what extent the project made good use of the human, financial and technical resources, and have used an appropriate combination of tools and approaches to pursue the achievement of project results in a cost-effective manner? | Analysis of project report, project monitoring file, project budget and budget revision files.  Interviews with project experts. | X | X |  |  | X |  |
| Was there a clear distribution of roles and responsibilities of key actors involved? | Analysis of project document  Interviews with project experts |  | X |  |  | X |  |
| To what extent did the project capitalize on other complementary initiatives to the project to reinforce the results of the project? | Analysis of project report, relevant programms and reports of IAs.  Interviews with project experts. |  | X |  | X | X |  |
| Have project funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner? If not, what were the bottlenecks encountered? | Analysis of project budget and budget implementation documents,  Interviews with project experts |  | X | X |  | X |  |
| Are coordination, management and financing arrangements clearly defined and do they support institutional strengthening and local ownership? | Analysis of project document, project report, budget, budget revision and budget implementation files.  Interviews with project experts | X | X |  |  | X |  |
| How well is the implementation of activities managed? Does the project co-ordinate with other similar interventions to encourage synergy and avoid overlaps? | Analysis of project document, project report, project monitoring files, other project related reports.  Interviews with project experts | X | X |  |  | X |  |
| Do the inter-institutional structures e.g. steering committees, technical team meeting and monitoring systems, allow efficient project implementation? | Analysis of project document.  Interviews with project Experts | X | X |  |  | X |  |
| **Sustainability** | | | | | | | |
| Is sustainability an integral part of the design i.e. is there a phase out/hand over strategy? | Analysis of project document, project report.  Interviews with project beneficiaries, project experts, implementing partners and public sector representatives. |  | X | X | X | X | X |
| To what extent did the projectsupport the government and beneficiary communities in developing capacities and establishing mechanisms to ensure ownership and the durability of effects in line with Government reforms and strategies such as Community Consolidation, Disaster Risk Reduction, etc? | Analysis of project document, project report, Programme documents of IAs, MOUs signed, national policy documents.  Interviews with beneficiaries, project experts, implementing partners and public sector representatives. |  | X |  | X | X | X |
| Is there a need to adjust the project (e.g., extend duration due to COVID-19)? | Interviews with project experts, project beneficiaries, implementing partners.  Analysis of project reports, work plans, monitoring file. | X |  | X | X | X |  |
| What are possible sustainability prerequisites already created on the ground? | Analysis of project document and reports,  Interviews with implementing partners, beneficiaries, project experts. |  | X |  | X | X |  |
| What is the likelihood that key partners will continue to make use of relevant results? | Interviews with project implementing partners, project beneficiaries and project experts.  Analysis of project monitoring files |  | X |  | X | X |  |
| Do the key partners have any plans to continue delivering the stream of benefits and if so, are they likely to materialize? | Analysis of project monitoring file and reports.  Interviews with project beneficiaries, implementing partners, public sector representatives, deeper analysis of several cases. |  | X |  | X | X | X |
| **Impact** | | | | | | | |
| Has the project contributed or is likely to contribute to long-term social, economic, technical, environmental changes for individuals, communities, and institutions in achieving the SDG agenda? | Analysis of project monitoring files, project reports, SDG documents.  Interviews with key implementing partners, project experts, project beneficiaries, public sector representatives. |  | X | X | X | X |  |
| How does the project impact joint UN planning, implementation and programming? | Analysis of project document, UNDAF and UNDAF evaluation document, HSA document.  Interview with project experts and key partners. |  | X |  | X | X |  |
| What are the direct impact prospects of the project at overall objective level? | Analysis of project document, project monitoring files and reports,  Interview with project beneficiaries, implementing partners and experts | X | X | X | X | X |  |
| What, if any impacts are already apparent? | Analysis of project document, project monitoring files and reports,  Interview with project beneficiaries, implementing partners, public sector representatives. | X | X | X | X |  |  |
| What impacts appear likely? | Analysis of project document, project monitoring files and reports,  Interview with project beneficiaries, implementing partners and experts | X | X |  | X | X |  |
| Are any external factors likely to jeopardize the project’s direct impact? | Analysis of project monitoring files and reports,  Interview with project beneficiaries, implementing partners and experts |  | X | X | X | X |  |

***Sampling Rationale***

Considering that this is a mid-term evaluation and most of the activities/interventions during the evaluation period, were still in their infancy stage, while carrying out sampling of stakeholders and beneficiaries for data collection there were three main considerations: ***A. Contacting beneficiaries who already have felt tangible impact of the project interventions. B. Contacting beneficiaries and stakeholders who can narrate typical cases***. ***C. Contacting stakeholders and Experts best informed on project components and interventions.***

Based on these three considerations, **Purposive Sampling** is the main option for recruiting beneficiaries and stakeholders for interviews. This sampling is used to study information rich cases from a given population to make analytical inferences about the population. In rare cases, when it will be impossible to contact a beneficiary from the Purposive Sampling then ***Convenience sampling*** may be used to interview another beneficiary from the same list. In general convenience sampling option use individuals who are readily available for interview and volunteer for interview/focus group. This sampling option however will be avoided in all possible cases.

Different ways of sampling will introduce different types of bias when assessing the results of the Project. Therefore, where possible, in the data analysis this bias will be addressed though triangulation or clearly will be described how these limitations affect the conclusions drawn about the Project.

Neither of the sampling options are based on representation or randomness which is the main limitation for the suggested choices, however purposeful sampling does allow selecting those units from which one can learn a great deal about the issues that are important to the evaluation (such as ’key informants’). This option also does allow for “analytical generalization” (i.e., making projections about the likely transferability of findings based on a theoretical analysis of the factors producing the outcomes and the effect of context. In most of the cases the option convenience sampling is best to be avoided as it has the lowest credibility of all known sampling options, however for the purpose of this evaluation this option will allow enriching and deepening the collected data as well as triangulating. It should be noted however that the information from convenience sample will not be generalized and no estimated will be made for the total population based on the findings.

When carrying out the beneficiary and stakeholder mapping and sampling for this project, a comprehensive beneficiary and stakeholders’ lists organized per activity, outcomes and objectives with a gender disaggregated data, was not available for the Project. Therefore, all project experts were asked to provide list of beneficiaries for the activities which were implemented during the evaluation period. The experts were asked to suggest the names of beneficiaries and stakeholders per activity and output, who are mostly informed about project interventions. When suggesting interviewees, the project experts considered the following aspects:

* Beneficiaries from various target communities should be involved in the list of interviewees;
* Women and men beneficiaries should have equal opportunities to be interviewed;
* Beneficiaries who can present typical cases;
* Beneficiaries who already have felt some tangible impact of the project results or can provide informed forecast for the anticipated results.
* All key stakeholders from public and private sector who can provide information to support evaluation process based on the defined criteria should be suggested for interview.

Additionally, the project experts were asked to make sure that the beneficiaries on the suggested for interviews list cover all targeted communities. Another consideration was to make sure that men and women have equal opportunities to be heard during this evaluation.

Below is the beneficiary mapping according to the Project Logic.

***Table# 2 Evaluation Matrix: Matching Project Logic with Beneficiary mapping, data collections methods and sources***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Project logic*** | ***Indicators*** | ***Project Beneficiaries and Stakeholders to be contacted*** | ***Data Collection***  ***Methods*** |
| ***Objective 1:*** *To ensure early prevention and sustainability of interventions through identification of root causes of threats to human security and enhancing community resilience.* | # of communities where HS approach is integrated into community development planning.  # of recommendations for risk-informed community development implemented by communities | 1. *Project Experts* 2. *Community heads/LG representatives* 3. *HSA Expert* 4. *LLRM Expert* 5. *GIS Multi Level Risk Assessment Expert* 6. *UNDP DRR Project Coordinator* 7. *Representative of Ministry of Emergency Situation* 8. *Representative of State Cadaster Committee* | Desk Review  In-depth semi structured interviews with key informants and stakeholders |
| ***Output 1.1:*** *Localized, people-centered and comprehensive situation analysis were conducted.* | *# of communities where HS situation analysis were held.*  # of local community members engaged in HS situation analysis. | 1. *Project Experts* 2. *Community heads/LG representatives* 3. *HSA Expert* 4. *LLRM Expert* 5. *GIS based Multi-Level Risk Assessment Expert* 6. *UNDP DRR Project Coordinator* 7. *Community Focal Points* | Desk Review  In-depth semi structured interviews with key informants and stakeholders |
| ***Output 1.2:*** *Disaster risk reduction mechanisms are established and capacities enhanced in target communities to reduce disaster-related losses with special focus on children and schools. Early Warning Systems in communities were installed through technical upgrade, improved coordination and mechanisms.* | *# of innovative DRR mechanisms operational within Regional and National Crisis Management Centers*  *# of schools with school safety plans* | 1. *Project Expert* 2. *Representative of MES* 3. *School Staff members trained in DRM related topics;* 4. *Members of Regional Rescue service representatives* 5. *Community heads/LG representatives* 6. *LLRM Expert* 7. *GIS Multi Level Risk Assessment Expert* 8. *UNDP DRR Project Coordinator* 9. *Representative of DRR National Platform* 10. *Community Focal Point* | Desk Review  In-depth semi structured interviews with key informants, stakeholders and beneficiaries |
| ***Objective 2:*** *To Strengthen social protection and inclusion to improve human security in targeted communities.*   * *% increase in coverage by basic social services of the most vulnerable families and children* |  | 1. *Project Experts* 2. *Community heads/LG representatives* 3. *Representative from Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs* 4. *Community focal points* | Desk Review  In-depth semi structured interviews with key informants and stakeholders |
| ***Output 2.1:*** *Cross-sectorial cooperation among social service providers is increased to better identify and respond to the human security needs of vulnerable communities and families.*   * *# of implemented protocols on cooperation* |  | 1. *Project Experts* 2. *Community heads/LG representatives* 3. *Representative from Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs* 4. *Community focal points* 5. *Representative from State Migration Agency,* 6. *Representative of State Employment Agency* | Desk Review  In-depth semi structured interviews with key informants and stakeholders |
| ***Output 2.2:*** Members of vulnerable households are empowered to increase knowledge and access to social services. | *# of vulnerable children and women that benefit from social projects*  *# of children that benefitted from interventions provided by trained social service providers* | 1. *Project Experts* 2. *Community heads/LG representatives* 3. *Representative from Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs* 4. *Representative of MoTAI.* 5. *Legal Expert involved in the change of SP system in Yerevan Municipality* 6. *TSP Expert – Assessor* 7. *Representative from Communities Finance Officers Association* 8. *Representatives of preschools newly established in Alaverdi and Gtashen and 1 renovated preschool in Amasia* 9. *Community Focal point* | Desk Review  In-depth semi structured interviews with key informants, stakeholders and beneficiaries |
| ***Objective 3.*** *To address the economic and food insecurity in the target communities through strengthened livelihoods, creation of sustainable economic opportunities and capacity building.* | *% of income raise among the most vulnerable target groups of the project*  *% of decrease of food insecurity levels within the targeted population*  *% of beneficiary farmers' capacities strengthened on good practices* | 1. *Project Experts* 2. *Representatives of beneficiary businesses* 3. *Beneficiary farmers* 4. *Representative from Ministry of Economy* 5. *Women benefiting from economic opportunity /typical case/* 6. *Migrant families benefiting from economic opportunities /typical case/* 7. *Community focal points* | Desk Review  In-depth semi structured interviews with key informants, stakeholders and beneficiaries |
| *Output 3.1.* Income-generation opportunities are created for the most vulnerable groups through sustainable and modern agricultural and non-agricultural activities. | *% of women benefiting from economic opportunities*    *% of returning migrants benefiting from economic opportunities* | 1. *Project Experts* 2. *Representative of beneficiary businesses* 3. *Women benefiting from economic opportunity /typical case/* 4. *Migrant families benefiting from economic opportunities /typical case/* 5. *Community focal points* | Desk Review  In-depth semi structured interviews with key informants, stakeholders and beneficiaries |
| ***Output 3.2*** Environmentally resilient agricultural and non-agricultural practices are introduced to reduce the impact of environmental risks on economic and food security. | *% of RE in overall energy mix used by the industries in the target regions;*  *# of trainings organized on good practices* | 1. *Project experts* 2. *Beneficiary farmers* 3. *Training service providers* 4. *Beneficiary businesses which upgraded their energy sources with the project support* | Desk Review  In-depth semi structured interviews with key informants, stakeholders and beneficiaries |
| ***Output 3.3:*** Productive safety net to the school feeding programme is established in the targeted communities to decrease food insecurity and malnutrition**.** | *% increase of locally procured food for the implementation of School Feeding Programme* | 1. *Project experts* 2. *Cooperative head* 3. *Newly joined and founding members of the cooperative* 4. *Representative of schools benefiting from the project.* 5. *Representative from the ministry of Ministry of Education, Science, Culture and Sport* | Desk Review  In-depth semi structured interviews with key informants, stakeholders and beneficiaries |

## Annex 5. Interview Guides and Survey Instruments

**Qs for the interviews with the *community focal points.***

1. Please describe your role in the project. In which activities are you involved? How do you support the Project team to carry out their activities? Did you support in selecting the farmers for demo projects? Are you involved in identifying migrant families and presenting them about the support opportunities and linking them with the Project experts? Are you involved in activities related to school feeding programme? Do you disseminate information in the community about a capacity building opportunity within the scope of the project? In which capacity building exercises have you participate yourself?
2. Did you participate in HS Needs assessments and GIS based multi risk assessment? How did you ensure participation of the communities? How did you ensure active participation of the communities during this assessments?
3. What will be your role in following up that the recommendations of the assessments are incorporated in the 5 year development plans of the communities?
4. When you disseminate an information how do you ensure that it reaches all the targeted groups equally?
5. What is your relationship with the LG? How do you work with and for the targeted settlements?
6. Do you carry out monitoring and follow up on Project Interventions?
7. Do you think there is a way and a need to continue your services to the relevant communities after the project ends? What could be the format and funding source for that?

**Qs for the interviews with the *Community Heads***

1. Please describe if your community was involved in the project design phase? How? What were the needs identified? Is this project meeting your current priority needs? How?
2. Please describe what are the challenges of your community after consolidation? How does this project help in overcoming your temporary challenges stemming from the consolidation?
3. Please describe in general terms what value did this project add for your community so far? What interventions have been carried out within the scope of this project and what did it give to various socially vulnerable groups?
4. Does the Project support your development planning? How?
5. Are you aware of the findings of HS needs assessments? What are the main challenges and how/when are you going to incorporate them in your 5 year development plans?
6. Do you think that the communities were involved and active enough in the assessment processes? Were the voices of all social groups heard during the assessment processes?
7. Do you think that your community has enough resources to address the issues revealed by the assessment processes? If not do you have any plans to fundraise?
8. How often do you think these assessments should be repeated in order to properly inform your development planning process? Do you think that your community has the resources and/or capacities to carry out similar assessments of updating the results upon need? If not, do you think there will be a possibility to fundraise? Can that be funded by state budgets?
9. What will be sustainable impact of this project in your community? How can the LG ensure (or has already ensured) the sustainability of the project interventions and scale up of the activities (encouraging to comment on the EWSs established, pre-schools established, support to repatriated families, economic opportunities created (farmers and businesses), teachers trained, developed school safety plans, school feeding programme, established cooperative to supply school feeding programme)?
10. Have you shared any of the work within the project with other communities, regionally or globally?

**Qs for the interview with the *HSA Expert***

1. Could you please describe your role in the project? At which stage were you involved?
2. Please describe how the HSA Approach was integrated into LLRM tool and how the Application of LLRM ensured the HSA based community planning. What was the aim of this activity?
3. Do you think that as a result of this activity the Project have revealed the specific insecurities in all pillar of insecurity in the communities and could plan for timely and proper interventions? How?
4. Do you think there is a need to repeat the exercise to find out if this needs are still relevant?
5. If you had to carry out this activity together with the project team again what would you do differently?

**Qs for the interview with the *LLRM expert***

1. Please describe your involvement in the project. In which of the targeted communities did you carry out your activities.
2. Please describe at which state were the activities at each of the communities as of March 31, 2020.
3. How did the communities contribute? What was the role of the LGs? Where the LGs and Communities actively involved and participating? How active were different social groups of the community? How would you describe the participation of women in the assessment process?
4. Please describe how the communities will benefit from your activities? Do the communities recognize the benefits of your interventions? Are there special organizations/institutions or group of people that particularly will benefit? How?
5. Do you think the LG will follow up your recommendations? How will you/did you ensure that?
6. You now already have preliminary results of LLRM. Based on that, do you think any urgent follow up activities are needed to be carried out by the communities/ the Project?
7. What will ensure the sustainable impact of your interventions? Do you think that the Project should have further role in ensuring the sustainability of your interventions? Do they need to design specific activities for that further or do you think that the communities will take up the issues from where you will phase out?
8. Do you think you will be able to finish your activities within the scope of this project on time, given the current situation? What are the issues that may arise?
9. Do you think the communities have capacity in updating LLRM results by themselves when the need will arise? How often the assessment should be carried out and in what scope, in order to make sure that the development plans of the communities are properly informed? How can the communities organize that without major expenses?
10. Did you have experience of carrying out LLRM assessment in other communities of the country? Did you follow up if your interventions had sustainable impact? What is your experience?
11. If you had to carry out these activities over again would you do something different for better results?
12. Do you think your interventions somehow could mitigate this situation (COVID19) in the communities?

**Qs for the interviews with the *GIS Experts***

1. Please describe your involvement in the project. In which of the targeted communities did you carry out your activities.
2. Please describe at which state were the activities at each of the communities as of March 31, 2020. Did the situation with COVID19 in the country hinder your interventions? Do you think you will be able to finish your activities within the scope of this project on time, given the current situation? What are the issues that may arise?
3. How did the communities contribute? What is the role of the LGs and the community members in the process of GIS based multi risk assessment?
4. Please describe how the communities will benefit from your activities? Do the communities recognize the benefits of your interventions? Are there special organizations/institutions or group of people that particularly will benefit? How?
5. Do you think the LG will follow up your recommendations? How will you/did you ensure that?
6. You now already have preliminary results of GIS based multi risk assessment. Based on that, do you think any urgent follow up activities are needed to be carried out by the communities/ the Project?
7. What will ensure the sustainable impact of your interventions? Do you think that the Project should have further role in ensuring the sustainability of your interventions? Do they need to design specific activities for that further or do you think that the communities will take up the issues from where you will phase out?
8. Do you think the communities have capacity/resources in updating GIS Based multi risk assessment results by themselves when the need will arise? How often the assessment should be carried out and in what scope, in order to make sure that the development plans of the communities are properly informed? How can the communities organize that without major expenses?
9. Did you have experience of carrying out GIS Based Multi risk assessments in other communities of the country? Did you follow up if your interventions had sustainable impact? What is your experience?
10. If you had to carry out these activities over again would you do something different for better results?

**Qs for the interview with the *representative of State Cadaster Committee***

1. Please describe your cooperation with UNDP within the Project.
2. Please describe what is the added value of the GIS based multi risk assessment results for State Cadaster Committee.
3. Is the Committee interested in using, managing and updating the database created as a result of the assessment on a regular basis and does it have capacity for that?
4. How often do you think this data is to be updated and will State Cadaster Committee be able to carry out those updates?
5. Would you consider replicating these assessments for other communities of the country? If so which will be your priority communities and why? Does State Cadaster Committee have resources for that?
6. Do you use the information available for other communities from similar assessments /e.g. Kapan/.
7. What additional interventions do you expect from the Project to address the challenges that you have for using, managing and updating this data?

**Qs for the interview with the *representative of MES***

1. Please describe the cooperation between the Ministry and the Project.
2. How was the Ministry involved during the design phase of the Project? How is it now involved in the implementation phase?
3. Is this Project currently in line with the Ministry’s (sector’s) priorities? Please describe how. Please mention about a. Early Warning Systems that are being established in the communities. b. school safety plans c. communitysafety plans
4. What do you think for the sustainable impact of the mentioned activities of the Project? Is there a need for additional interventions by the Project for sustainability or can the MES take over where the project will phase out?
5. What is the contribution of the Ministry for the enhanced sustainable impact of the Project Results?

**Qs for the interview with the *EWS Expert***

* + - 1. *Please describe your involvement in the project. What was your experience with EWSs before.*
      2. *Please describe the established Early Warning Systems.*
      3. *How the choice for establishing in this or that community was made?*
      4. *What issues do these systems solve for the communities? What maintenance andutilization costs and efforts are needed?*
      5. *Do you think that the community will be able to utilize and maintain the established systems properly? Why?*

**Qs for the interview with the representative of State Employment Agency**

1. Please describe the cooperation between IOM and State Employment Agency within the scope of this project.
2. Was the State Employment Agency involved in the Project design phase?
3. Is the Project implemented in line with the State Employment Agency’s priorities? Please describe how.
4. Please describe what are the most relevant types of vulnerabilities among local population related to migration and the main strategic approaches adopted by the government to address those.
5. Please describe what is the added value of the developed on-line platform [www.imigrant.am](http://www.imigrant.am). How does this contribute to effective management in the field of labor migration?
6. Please describe how this platform will be managed and updated in the future. Does the State Employment Agency have enough resources and capacities to update the database in the website if needed?
7. What is your opinion on IOM’s support for the communities where there are labor migrants? Do you think that the economic opportunities created in those communities may prevent or diminish labor/seasonal migration?
8. Do you think that the interventions will prevent families’ decisions to leave the country again? Are the supported families able to re-adapt in their communities? Are they enabled enough to overcome economic hardships? What additional interventions can be designed with these families to ensure sustainable impact.

**Qs for the interviews with representative of Migration Service of Armenia**

Please describe the cooperation between IOM and Migration Service of Armenia within the scope of this project.

Please describe what are the most relevant types of vulnerabilities among local population related to migration and the main strategic approaches adopted by the government to address those.

Is this project (information campaign on promotion of safe and informed migration) implemented in line with the Migration Service of Armenia’s priorities?

What is your opinion on IOM’s interventions related to promoting safe migration concept? Does it address most relevant and frequently occurring challenges of returning migrants to Armenia? How does it reduce the harmful human, economic and social costs of migration from the target communities?

Do you think that the interventions will prevent families’ (returning migrant’s) decisions to leave the country? Are they enabled enough to overcome economic hardships? What additional interventions can be designed with these families to ensure sustainable impact.

***Qs for the interview with the retuning migrant families supported by the Project***

1. Please tell me about yourself and your family?
2. *Why did you migrate from Armenia? Did you migrate alone or together with the family?*
3. *In which country/countries did you live and what were your living conditions? What were your main occupation in those countries?*
4. *Why did you decide to repatriate? What can influence your decision of staying in Armenia or leaving the country again?*
5. How did you learn about this Project opportunity? What support did you get from the Project? Did it improve your family’s economic situation? How?
6. What do you produce. Which are the sales opportunities for your produce?
7. What are your upcoming plans related to your work/business?
8. Do you like your business in Armenia? Is it exactly what you wanted to be involved in or have as an occupation? Are you accustomed to this type of occupation?
9. What kind of challenges do you face when running your business?
10. What additional support do you anticipate from the project in order to be able to sustain your business and meet your and your family’s social and economic needs?

***Qs for the interview with owners of demo farms***

1. Please describe your farming activities. What do you produce? Do you have seasonal workers? Do you hire paid service providers? Men or women? Are you aware if they are from vulnerable families?
2. What are/were the planned or implemented support which you have got/will get from the Project? How will this support improve your farming operations? What is your obligations within the scope of this project?
3. What learning potential do you create for the farmers in your communities in which you operate or beyond? How many farmers visit your site for experience exchange per season? Are these farmers visiting your fields with their own initiative or are they invited through the Project interventions? Do you take notes of the visitors? Do you take any actions to promote visit of other farmers to your place for learning? What is your motivation in being a demo farm?
4. What are the main learnings of visiting farmers from your farms? How do you consult other farmers on these learnings? Do you have developed materials or all the information is given orally?
5. As a result of the Project support do you anticipate higher quality of your usual agricultural products or more quantity? How will your sales and marketing strategies change in parallel with enhanced quality and quantity of your produce? Will you need a support in this to be able reach higher end markets and sell your products with appropriate prices or will you organize the sales with your same old channels and strategies? What additional income do you expect?
6. Are you happy with the Project (envisaged) support in general? Do you have any suggestion for the Project? In your opinion what additional interventions should the Project team design/carry out, with what groups, to enhance the sustainability or effectiveness/efficiency of the support provided to its beneficiary farmers?

***Qs for the interview with demo farm expert of FAO***

1. Please describe your role in the Project and the activities that you carry out within the scope of this Project.
2. At what stage is currently the project activities. Are tangible results observable? How do you carry out monitoring of the activities during the COVID19 situation in the country?
3. How and based on which criteria did you select the beneficiaries of demo farms? Was the gender component considered while selecting the farmers for demo projects? How?
4. What exact support is being provided for the demo fields and what is the envisaged outcomes?
5. Do you think that the selected farmers will continue keeping the promoted practices beyond the project? What can hinder them? Or what will motivate them?
6. What is the motivation of the farmers of being a demo farm and sharing their experience with other farmers? How will you ensure that the learnings/experiences will be shared by the farmers with the visitors?
7. In general, how does the project promote the replication of the new farm practices? Do you organize experience exchange visits from other communities? How do you select the participants of experience exchange? How do you promote the access to information for other farmers on a permanent basis?
8. Do you monitor the replication?
9. If you had to start over this project intervention what would you change in the design of your activities/support?
10. What can be done to improve the efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability of this intervention? What can be done for further larger impact? Do you plan any addition interventions in this sense?

**Qs for the interviews with *the Legume Producers’ Cooperative member farmers including the head of the cooperative.***

1. Please present your farming activities. What do you produce? With what quantities? What is your field size? How do you sell your products?
2. Please present why did you choose to become a cooperative member? What value added do you anticipate from being a cooperative member? How did your business operations, including production and sales channels change, as a result of joining the cooperative? How did your product quality and quantity improve as a result of joining the cooperative?
3. What services do you get from the cooperative? Are this services being provided upon request or is there a predetermined format of service provision?
4. What support did your cooperative get from the Project? How is this support adding value for each of the cooperative members?
5. Please describes your role in the cooperative, your rights and responsibilities?
6. How is the cooperative managed? How, why and how often do you conduct cooperative meetings? Do you participate to this meetings?
7. Where you part of the selecting head of the cooperative? Did you vote or did you join later?
8. Is your cooperative open for other farmers who want to enter? Is there a geographic or other limitations to that? In general, can you present the conditions for cooperative membership? Did you discuss that with other cooperative members?
9. Is the cooperative going to supply local schools? What part of your own harvest will be sold to the schools? Do you think that the school as a potential buyer important for your cooperative? What will be other sales channels? In your opinion which sales channel has the most potential?

**Qs for the interviews with the *target school director from the school feeding Programme.***

1. Please describe how do you organize the school feeding of children. Who are your main suppliers? What portion of the food supplied for children are local products what portion comes from the importers?
2. Do you prefer local or imported food? Please describe the advantages and disadvantages for both.
3. What produce can be provided to your school by the established cooperative in the community? Are there any preliminary agreement with cooperative’s management team? Do you think that they will be able to provide 100% of needed legume supplies for your school?
4. Do individual farmers provide to schools? What are the main supplies from individual farms? What are the main constraints of working with local farms? What added value can provide the cooperative as a supplier vs. individual farmers.

**Qs for the interviews with the *participants to the training on “Enhancing capacities on DRR plan development for Regional Rescue Service representatives /this was done for all Armenia/.***

1. Please describe your learnings and how can it improve the Regional Rescue Service team’s work in the region?
2. Did you participate to similar training before? What was new?
3. Please describe if any additional resources and capacities will be required to follow the recommendations/learnings from the training. /Since this is a ToT, will you be able to provide trainings to the intended audience (school admin)? Do you already have a plan how and when to organize intended information sharing?
4. How do you work with schools. Did you support in developing the school DRM plans?

**Qs for the interviews with the *participants to the training on First Aid and First Social Psychological support***

1. Please describe the learnings from the training. (to remind the topic of the training and dates provided, trainer’s name). Did you participate to similar trainings before? What was new and different?
2. What is the added value of this training for you and for the school where you are working? How (will you) are you practically using this learning in your work at school?
3. After this training what do you think about your school’s preparedness in organizing first aid in emergency situations? Do you think based on the learnings from the training you can enhance the level of preparedness for first aid? Are there issues that can be addressed with School resources and current capacities? Are there issues which are of high importance and the school needs to fundraise for that? Where do you think this resources can be found?
4. After this training what do you think about your school’s preparedness in organizing first social and psychological support in emergency situations? Do you think based on the learnings from the training you can enhance the level of preparedness for first aid? Are there issues that can be addressed with School resources and current capacities? Are there issues which are of high importance and the school needs to fundraise for that? Where do you think this resources can be found?
5. Did you discuss your learnings with your school management and did you suggest any changes? Do you think that your suggestions will be addressed by school management? What are the hindering factors what are the contributing factors?

**Qs for the interviews with the participants to the training on how to teach DRR**

1. Please describe your learnings from the training (remind the topic). What was new? Did you participate to similar training before? How was this one different?
2. What is your role at your school? Why were you selected to participate to this training?
3. How will you use the learnings from this training at your school? Will you be teaching DRR related topic as a separate subject or is it going to be within the scope of another subject?
4. Do you think your knowledge in this field is enough to teach the this subject? Do you think in general your school has capacities and resources to offer this subject? How can your skills be improved and how can the capacities of the school be improved?

**Qs for the interviews with the *trained school administrators on DRM at schools.***

1. Please describe the learnings from the training. (to remind the topic of the training and dates provided, trainer’s name). Did you participate to similar trainings before? What was new and different? What is the added value of this training for you and for the school where you are working? How (will you) are you practically using this learning in your work at school?
2. Does your school have the capacities and resources for implementing your learnings for better DRM at your schools?
3. Was there seismic risk assessment for your school? Did you participate? What were the findings and how were they communicated to the staff?
4. Do you think that the school is able to address the findings? Are government resources available for that?
5. Please describe the process of developing school safety (or school disaster management) plans. Who participated? Has your school shared the plan with the Marz rescue Service for reviewing? Did you communicate the information of the school safety plan to your colleagues, Children and their parents?
6. Do you think these plans are of added value for your schools? Did you have similar plans before? How will these new plans be used and updated if necessary? Does the school have resources to update the document? Does the school have capacity to update the document?
7. Will your school need resources to implement school safety (or school disaster management) plans? If “yes” please describe from where the resources will be obtained.
8. Do you address the specific needs of children with disabilities, girls and boys in your plans?
9. What are the factors hindering you personally to contribute to ensuring safety of children in your school?

**Qs for the interview with the teacher in the Preschool Service of Jiliza Settlement and the Director Alaverdi Kindergarten (responsible for the Gtashen Preschool Service)**

1. Please describe the project. Is the preschool service newly established or did you have similar service before? What issues does this project address at your community?
2. Please describe the added value for children and parents. Do you see changes in behavior, development?
3. How many work spaces has the preschool created for mothers in these settlements?
4. Does the preschool operate already? Given the Covid19 situation? If yes, how do you address the safety issues?
5. How many children are there in Jiliza /Gtashen settlement and how many of them attend the preschool.
6. How are the current conditions at the preschool for children, what facilities are there? How and with what funding is the maintenance being ensured? How is the payment for staff being provided?
7. Does the staff need support in capacity building for working with children? Did they receive any capacity building and guidance? Are there enough experienced pre-school teachers in the community?
8. What are the economic/employment opportunities for women at Jiliza/Gtashen settlement? What other entertainment/ development /educational opportunities are there in your communities aside from this preschool.

**Qs for the interview with the Director of Alaverdi Pedagogical Psychological Center**

* + - 1. Please describe the project. Is this center newly established or renovated? What issues does this project address for your community?
      2. How many children attend this center? Are they all from Alaverdi community or there are also children from nearby settlements? What kind of special needs do these children have?
      3. Please describe the added value of your Center for children and parents?
      4. What other similar centers operate in Alaverdi community?
      5. Are the current facilities sufficient for the centre? How and with what resources is the maintenance being ensured?
      6. Is the school staff properly trained? Was training provided within the project with UNICEF? Is there a need for capacity building for the Centers workers/teachers?

**Qs for the interviews with the DRRNP representatives as a training facilitator**

1. What did the training on First Aid and Social Psycological Support gave to the participants? What was the added value for them? Do you think there were new learnings for the participant from this training? What do you think what are their needs and how will they use the new knowledge?
2. What did the training on DRR Plan Development gave to the participants /Representatives of Regional Rescue Team/? What was the added value for them? Do you think there were new learnings for the participant from this training? What do you think what were their needs and how will they use the knowledge?
3. What did the training on DRM of Schools gave to its participants/School Admin Staff members and School Directors/? What was the added value for them? Do you think there were new learnings for the participant from this training? What do you think what were their needs and how will they use the knowledge?
4. Do you think for a sustainable impact follow up interventions will be needed by the Project targeted to the participant groups?

**Qs for the interview with the representative of MLSA**

1. Please describe why the manual for early prevention – identification of behavior needs within social needs assessment - was needed? What issues does it solve for socially vulnerable families? What services are going to be provided differently and in what terms will those services be improved?
2. How is the development of this manual in line with the current priorities of the Ministry? Also, how is territorial/local social planning linked to Ministry priorities?
3. Please describe the required steps that should be taken by the Ministry after the acceptance of the Manual in order to improve the services based on the developed new methodology? Does the Ministry have the resources and capacities to implement those steps? If not, please describe how those resources can be attracted.
4. Who was involved in the development of the manual? What was the methodology for developing the manual? Did it imply involvement of various actors in the field, including validation?
5. When do you think the socially vulnerable groups will benefit from better needs assessment by trained social workers as per the manual?

**Qs for the interview with the *representative of Communities Finance Officers Association***

What was your role in the project, which activities are you coordinating/facilitating in cooperation with UNICEF in Lori, Tavush and Shirak regions?

In your opinion how will the new manual on early prevention improve the quality of services provided by social workers?

1. Please describe how the validation and capacity building of social workers on the new manual will be organized? With what resources?
2. How was the social needs assessment organized in the three regions and communities of the project? What was the methodology applied? How will the territorial/community social needs assessments be validated? And how will community social projects be developed for future co-funding? How are TSPs/LSPs later integrated into the community or regional development plans?
3. Please describe what issues does the newly established/renovated kindergartens/preschool services solve for the communities? What value added are these organizations for children and for their parents.
4. Please mention what are the funding sources for the ongoing operations of the kindergartens/preschool services. How will the maintenance costs be covered and what was CFOA’s role?

**Qs for the interview with the Legal expert**

1. Please describe your cooperation with the Project.
2. Please describe the new SP system in Yerevan in general terms and state how does it improve the quality of services provided to the vulnerable families?
3. How is this new system in line with the new government policies on Social Protection?
4. Is this system already implemented in Yerevan?
5. Please describe if this system/tools/methodologies developed are also implementable in the regions in terms of capacities in the regions. What will it take to install the system and methodologies/tools for all the consolidated communities in the country? Please describe the steps to be taken by MTAI for installing this system in the regions.
6. Please describe your cooperation with MLSA and MTAI in developing and installing this system in the country.

## Annex 6. Budget implementation and progress of values of indicators

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Activities Refer to the programme proposal regarding the list of activities.** | **Implementing organization** | **Badget planned for the evaluation period from the Trust Fund** | **Amount spent in the evaluation period from the Trust Fund** | **Budgeted amount from Trust Fund (US)** | **% of the budget planned for the period spent** | **Objectively verifiable indicators\* (OVI)** | **Baseline\*** | **Target\*** | **Progress Values of indicators as of March 31, 2020 (gender disagregated)** |
| **Objective 1: To ensure early prevention and sustainability of interventions through identification of root causes of threats to human security and enhancing community resilience.** |  |  |  |  |  | *a. # of communities where HS approach is integrated into community development planning b. # of recommendations for risk-informed community development implemented by communities* | *a. 0 b. 0 (2017)* | *a. 3 b. at least 50% of recommendations* | ***a. The integration process in progress in 4 consolidated communities (Amasia, Alaverdi, Berd and Tumanyan). b. The recommendations of the LLRM and GIS based multi-risk assessments and community DRM Plans were provided to the Community administrations in March, 2020 Due to Covid-19 state emergency, the official adoption of these recommendations was postponed to August*** |
| Output 1.1: Localized, people-centered and comprehensive situation analysis is conducted. | **UNDP** |  |  |  |  | *a. # of communities where HS situation analysis was held b. # of local community members (representation) engaged in HS situation analysis* | *a. 0  b. 0  (2017)* | *a. 3 consolidated communities b. 1000* | ***a. 4  b. 3738*** |
| Activity 1.1.1: Conduct comprehensive and participatory community development planning with application of UN common methodology updated in accord with Human Security approach, including disaster risk profiling using child and gender sensitive Local Level Risk Management (LLRM) methodology as a comprehensive approach to disaster risk reduction and resilience at community level. | **UNDP** | 100,180 | 44,850 | 114,580 | 45% | *# of community development plans including gender-responsive disaster risk profiling* | *0  (2017) Berd, Amasia, Toumanyan, Alaverdi* | *3 (by Q4 2019)* | ***Covid delay*** |
| **Output 1.1 Subtotal** |  | 100,180.00 | 44,850.00 | 114,580.00 | 45% |  |  |  |  |
| Output 1.2.Disaster risk reduction mechanisms are established and capacities enhanced in target communities to reduce disaster-related losses with special focus on children and schools. | **UNDP, UNICEF** |  |  |  |  | *a. # of innovative DRR mechanisms operational within Regional and National Crisis Management Centers b. # of schools with school safety plans* | *a. 0  b. 0 (2017)* | *a. 3 mechanisms  b. 52* | ***a. 3 b. 30*** |
| Activity 1.2.1 Enhance Early Warning Systems in communities through technical upgrade, improved coordination and mechanisms. | **UNDP** | 34,000 | 53,515 | 60,000 | 157% | *# of Early Warning system established* | *0 EWS in 3 target consolidated communities (2017)* | *3 EWS established (by Q2 2020)* | ***3*** |
| Activity 1.2.2 Develop geographic information systems (GIS) based software relying on scientific multi-risk assessment (earthquake, landslide, mudflow, and climate related hazards). | **UNDP** | 70,000 | 69,930 | 70,000 | 100% | *# of GIS based sofware developed* | *0 (2017)* | *1 (by Q4 2019)* | ***1*** |
| Activity 1.2.3 Strengthen capacities of target communities for creating community profiles and developing online risk database using human security approach . | **UNDP** | 10,799 | 10,749 | 16,175.00 | 100% | *a. # of local community members (focal points/resource persons) engaged in Capacity building trainings* | *0 (2017)* | *a. 72 (by Q1 2020)* | ***105 (96m, 34f)*** |
| Activity 1.2.4: Support the implementation of the Comprehensive School Safety in target schools and preschools | **UNDP** | 7,800 | 8,070 | 7,800.00 | 103% | *a. # of teachers and school administrators with enhanced DRR skills.  b. # of DRR and Emergency Response plans developed for the schools in target communities  c. # of children benefiting from comprehensive school safety* | *a. 0  b. 0 c. 0 (2017)* | *a. 80 teachers, 20 school adminsitrators b. 3  c. 1000 students (by Q4 2020)* | ***a. 217 teachers (84 male, 133 female); 52 school admin (20 male, 32 female) b. 28;  c. 0*** |
| **UNICEF** | 47,238 | 42,661 | 49,238.00 | 90% |
| Activity 1.2.5 Enhance the capacity of children and youth for engaging in community DRR and organize community level DRR/Resilience advocacy campaigns. | **UNICEF** | 18,700 | 3,227 | 45,070.00 | 17% | *a. # of children/youth with enhanced participation skills in DRR;  b. # of behavior change communication (BCC) strategy is developed with children* | *a. 0;  b. 0 (2017)* | *a. 550  b. 1 (by Q4 2020)* | ***a. 0; b. 0*** |
| Activity 1.2.6: Establish Public-Private Partnership (PPP) with local business community to invest in DRR | **UNDP** | 52,000 |  | 107,000.00 | 0% | *# of Public-Private Partnership (PPP) with business community to invest in DRR established* | *0 (2017)* | *1 (by Q3 2020 )* | ***0*** |
| **Ooutput 1.2 Subtotal** |  | 240,536.37 | 188,152.60 | 355,283 | 78% |  |  |  |  |
| **Objective 1 Subtotal** |  | 340,716.37 | 233,002.60 | 469,863 | 68% |  |  |  |  |
| **Objective 2: To strengthen social protection and social inclusion to improve human security in targeted communities.** |  |  |  |  |  | *% increase in coverage by basic social services of the most vulnerable families and children* | *0  (2017)* | *20%* | ***tbd*** |
| **Output 2.1: Cross-sectorial cooperation among social service providers is increased to better identify and respond to the human security needs of vulnerable communities and families.** | **UNICEF, IOM** |  |  |  |  | *# of implemented protocols on cooperation* | 0 (2017) | 3 | **1 MoU signed with Alaverdi municipality** |
| Activity 2.1.1 Support to effective cooperation modalities among social service providers for early identification of human security needs of vulnerable families and children. | **UNICEF** | 14,235.00 | 13,000.89 | 19,885 | 91% | *a. availability of early identification/ prevention modalities of cooperation developed b. # of trained professionals on early identification of human security needs* | *a. Cooperation mandated, but with no explicit early identifiation/ prevention mechanisms in place b. 0 (2017)* | *a. Explicit early identifiation/ prevention cooperation mechanisms in place b. 630 (by Q4 2020)* | ***a. Manual on early identification/prevention drafted b. 250/health providers and social workers (all through complementary funding, no disaggregation available)*** |
| Activity 2.1.2 Enhance capacity of the State Employment Agency to outreach to local communities and reduce human insecurity of Armenian labour migrants, reduce exposure to labour trafficking and exploitation. | **IOM** | 28,310.00 | 12,300.96 | 34,870 | 43% | *# of Labour migrants outreached* | 120 (2017) | 1500 (by Q3 2020) | **Information on safe and secure migration was provided through Public Service Announcements and video stories, which ensure access to more 300,000 people** |
| **Output 2.1 Subtotal** |  | 42,545.00 | 25,301.85 | 54,755 | 59% |  |  |  |  |
| **Output 2.2: Members of vulnerable households are empowered to increase knowledge and access to social services** | **UNICEF** |  |  |  |  | *a. # of vulnerable children and women that benefit from social projects b. # of children that benefitted from interventions provided by trained social service providers* | *a. 80 children; 9 women b. 0 (2017)* | *a. 500 children, 50 women b. 200* | ***a. 260 children (132 boys, 128 girls), 40 women b. 153 children (within inclusive preschools)*** |
| Activity 2.2.1 Support proactive and early prevention case management and community social work practices in the target regions/communities. | **UNICEF** | 14,280.00 | 8,057.26 | 22,460 | 56% | *# of trained case managers, social workers, other social service providers* | *0 (2017)* | *360 (by Q3 2020)* | ***241 (157 through UNICEF complementary interventions) - no disaggregation available. 84 social workers (49 female, 35 male) from Yerevan and as part of focus groups (experts funded through HSTF, training itself - through WV, the other FGs through HSTF)*** |
| Activity 2.2.2. Develop and implement community social projects addressing collective vulnerabilities of families and children | **UNICEF** | 64,590.00[[4]](#footnote-4) | 20,255.24 | 89,170 | 31% | *a. # of developed local social plans b. # of co-funded local social projects* | *0 (2017)* | *a. 4 b. 6 (by Q4 2020)* | ***a. Needs assessment conducted in 3 regions and Alaverdi b. 6 (for preschools)*** |
| **Output 2.2 Subtotal** |  | 78,870.00 | 28,312.50 | 111,630 | 36% |  |  |  |  |
| **Objective 2 Subtotal** |  | 121,415.00 | 53,614.35 | 166,385 | 44% |  |  |  |  |
| **Objective 3: To address the economic and food insecurity in the target communities through strengthened livelihoods, creation of sustainable economic opportunities and capacity building.** |  |  |  |  |  | *a. % of income raise among the most vulnerable target groups of the project b. % of decrease of food insecurity levels within the targeted population c. % of beneficiary farmers' capacities strengthened on good practicies* | *a. AMD 40,867 maximum monthly income of the poor population  b. Food Consumption Score (FCS) - baseline value to be determined  c. 0 (2017)* | *a. 20% b. 60% decrease c. 30%* | ***Early to Measure*** |
| Output 3.1: Income-generation opportunities are created for the most vulnerable groups through sustainable and modern agricultural and non-agricultural activities. | **UNDP, UNIDO, IOM** |  |  |  |  | *a. % of women benefiting from economic opportunities b. % of returning migrants benefiting from economic opportunities* | *0 (2017)* | *a. 50% b.30 %* | ***Not measured*** |
| Activity 3.1.1. Support developing new business models for agro-processing industries in three clusters of communities in Shirak, Tavush and Lori regions, based on existing value chain diagnostics for the dairy, fruits and berries, dried fruits herbs and high value field crops. | **UNIDO** | 4,300.00 | 4,300.00 | 4,300 | 100% | # of new business models developed based on conduected value chain analysis | VC studies conducted:   - high-value cheese; - high-value field crops; - processed fruits, incuding dried fruits; - Honey  (2017) | 3 (by Q1 2018) | **3** |
| Activity 3.1.2 Support establishing new businesses of producer groups consisting of members from vulnerable communities and families, including women and returning migrants through training and developing of bankable business plans. | **UNIDO** | 15,860.00 | 9,460.00 | 18,360 | 60% | # of producer groups trained   # of producer groups established | 0 (2017)  (previous projects Shirak - 23, Lori- 7) | **80** 20  (by Q3 2020) | **80** |
| **IOM** | 27,495.00 | 8,201.65 | 29,079 | 30% | **6 producer groups are created and 40 micro-businesses established (15 female and 25 male are suppoted to setup a business)** |
| Activity 3.1.3 Support building human and physical capacities among new businesses from vulnerable communities and families including women and returning migrants, to implement the business models developed, as well as provide access to loan funds. | **IOM** | 146,310.00 | 107,060.29 | 200,798 | 73% | a. # of people engaged in small-scale production b. # of fruit processing units established c. # of small-scale grape and fruit processing units established for vulnerable households. d. # of cheese-making units established | *a. 0 b. 0 c. 0 d. 0 (2017)* | a. 50 b. 1 (Tavush or Lori)  c. 10 d. 2 (Shirak) (by Q3 2020) | **a. 103 (74m, 29f)** |
| **UNIDO** | 116,200.00 | 4,000.00 | 260,000 | 3% | **b.1** |
| **UNDP,** | 50,000.00 |  | 69,000 | 0% |  |
| **Output 3.1 Subtotal** |  | 360,165.00 | 133,021.94 | 581,537 | 37% |  |  |  |  |
| **Output 3.2: Environmentally resilient agricultural and non-agricultural practices are introduced to reduce the impact of environmental risks on economic and food security.** | **FAO, UNIDO** |  |  |  |  | *a. % of RE in overall energy mix used by the industries in the target regions; b. # of trainings organised on good prcatices* | *a. 0 (2017) b. 0* | *a. 10% b. 30* | ***Early to Measure*** |
| Activity 3.2.1 Promotion of integrated pest management, advanced irrigation technologies, pruning techniques, etc. to ensure sustainable agriculture development in Tavush and Shirak marzes. | **FAO** | 63,996.55 | 54,276.87 | 115,026.55 | 85% | *a.# of demonstration fields on IPM b. # of demonstration fields on advanced irrigation techniques established  c. # of training particiapnts (gender disaggregated)* | *a. 0  b. 0 c.0 (2017)* | *a. 3  b. 3  c. 200  (by Q4 2020)* | ***a.3 (2 men, 1 woman) b.5 (4 men, 1 woman) c. over 60 people*** |
| Activity 3.2.2: Improve integrated soil and nutrition management including soil conservation in Shirak Marz. | **FAO** | 10,500.00 | 9,669.32 | 26,000.00 | 92% | *a. # of demonstration fields on Conservation agriculture established  b. # of trained beneficiaries (gender disaggregated)* | *a, 0 b. 0 (2017)* | *a. 3  b. 70 (by Q4 2020)* | ***a.3 b. 16 men*** |
| Activity 3.2.3: Provide assistance on application of innovations and renewable technologies, (e.g. solar heaters, small biogas units) in agro-processing industries (dairy, dried fruit, greenhouses, etc.). | **UNIDO** | 43,800.00 | 2,300.00 | 88,100.00 | 5% | # of upgraded units with RE technologies | 0 (2017) | 2 (by Q4 2019) | **0** |
| Activity 3.2.4 Introduce sustainable waste-management through separate collection and recycling of plastic waste in Alaverdi/Toumanyan and surrounding communities. | **UNIDO** | 40,920.00 | 11,000.00 | 40,920.00 | 27% | # of waste management units | *0 (2017)* | 1 (by Q2 2019) | **0** |
| **Output 3.2 Subtotal** |  | 159,216.55 | 77,246.19 | 270,046.55 | 49% |  |  |  |  |
| **Output 3.3: Productive safety net to the school feeding programme is established in the targeted communities to decrease food insecurity and malnutrition.** | **WFP** |  |  |  |  | *% increases of locally procured food for the implementation of School Feeding Programme* | *40% (2017)* | *100%* | ***Early to Measure*** |
| Activity 3.3.1 Strengthen the capacities of local producers and retailers to participate in the competitive procurement processes to cover the supply of the school feeding programme. | **WFP** | 18,560.00 | 9,500.00 | 18,560.00 | 51% | *# of local producers and retailers trained (gender disaggregated)* | *0 (2017)* | *50 (by Q3 2018)* | ***60*** |
| Activity 3.3.2 Establish two Home Grown School Feeding pilots, linking small-scale local farmers enterprises to School Feeding Program in Shirak region. | **WFP** | 109,400.00 | 111,335.77 | 109,400.00 | 102% | *# of HGSF pilots established* | *0 (2017)* | *2 (by Q3 2018)* | ***2*** |
| Activity 3.3.3 Train the management of the enterprises on maintenance (procurement, storage, etc.) as well as school staff on preparing safe, nutrition-sensitive, healthy and culturally accepted diversified school meals. | **WFP** | 32,440.00 | 30,883.00 | 32,440.00 | 95% | *# of school staff and local authorities (gender disaggregated) trained* | *0 (2017)* | *55 (by Q3 2018)* | ***82***  ***(44 female; 38 male)*** |
| **Output 3.3 Subtotal** |  | 160,400.00 | 151,718.77 | 160,400.00 | 95% |  |  |  |  |
| **Output 3 Subtotal** |  | 679,781.55 | 361,986.90 | 1,011,983.55 | 53% |  |  |  |  |
| **Programme Coordination Costs** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Programme Coordination Costs | **UNDP** | 43,684.58 |  | 177,934.58 |  |  |  |  |  |
| **UNIDO** | 21,300.00 |  | 42,615.00 |  |  |  |  |  |
| **UNICEF** | - |  | 0.00 |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Programme Coordination Subtotal** |  |  |  | 220,549.58 |  |  |  |  |  |
| **SUB-TOTAL** |  | 1,141,912.92 | 648,603.85 | 1,868,781.13 | 57% |  |  |  |  |
| **Indirect Support Costs** |  |  |  | 130,814.68 |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Total Programme Budget** |  |  | 648,603.85 | 1,999,595.81 |  |  |  |  |  |

1. <https://www.armstat.am/file/article/poverty_2016_eng_2.pdf>

   Part 1, Armenia Poverty Profile 2008-2015 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG), UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation, 2008. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Based on the budget revision, for Activity 2.2.2 under Objective 2, the budget was transferred from Year 1 to Year 2. Because there was no such demand in the budget revision process, the respective IA did not divide the budget per quarters. Hence, there is no reference/information on the budget for the evaluation period for this particular activity. All the analysis was conducted based on the initial budget amount for this activity. This fact also distorts the overall picture of the budget expenditures at overall Objective and Project levels. Expenditures for this Objective are likely to be higher than those calculated. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Based on the budget revision, for the Activity 2.2.2 under the objective 2, the budget was transferred from the year 1 to year 2. Because there was no such demand, the respective IA did not plan the budget on quarterly bases. Hence, there is no reference/information on the budget for the evaluation period for this particular activity. All the analysis was conducted based on the initial budget amount for this activity. This fact also distorts the overall picture of the budget expenditures at overall Objective and Project levels. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)