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### ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANAMA</td>
<td>Azerbaijan National Agency for Mine Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERF</td>
<td>Central Emergency Response Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECHO</td>
<td>The Humanitarian Aid Department of the European Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EO</td>
<td>Explosive ordnance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOD</td>
<td>Explosive ordnance disposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EORE</td>
<td>Explosive Ordnance Risk Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERW</td>
<td>Explosive remnants of war</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GICHD</td>
<td>Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP</td>
<td>Internally displaced person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEPF</td>
<td>International Eurasia Press Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMAS</td>
<td>International Mine Action Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMSMA</td>
<td>Information Management System for Mine Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LoC</td>
<td>Line of contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDD</td>
<td>Mine detection dog</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-governmental organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMAS</td>
<td>National Mine Action Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TQAD</td>
<td>Training Quality Assurance Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United National Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEG</td>
<td>United Nations Evaluation Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations Children’s Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNMAS</td>
<td>United Nations Mine Action Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UXO</td>
<td>Unexploded ordnance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BACKGROUND

The Mine Action Agency of the Republic of Azerbaijan (ANAMA) was first established in 1998 by Presidential Decree. Subsequently, it was disbanded in December 2020 and re-established as a new structure with the same name. According to Presidential Decree No. 1251 of the Republic of Azerbaijan of 15 January 2021, it was granted the status of a public legal entity, and its Charter was approved as a legal document. The decree guarantees the coordination of all activities in Azerbaijan, including assessment, planning, coordination, management, as well as monitoring and evaluation of mine action-related activities.

The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) has played a key role in the establishment and the further development of the Agency and has provided it with invaluable support for the past 23 years. UNDP has in-depth knowledge of ANAMA’s activities in Azerbaijan and has been actively involved in analysing performance and priorities. UNDP helped build ANAMA’s capacity and supported its establishment an internationally recognized brand (as stated by the United Nations Secretary-General in his report, Assistance in mine action.¹)

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Project I: Unexploded Ordnance clearance rapid response 2020–2021 (CERF)
Project Number: Project ID: 00101570
Implementing partner: Mine Action Agency of the Republic of Azerbaijan (ANAMA)
Start date: 18 January 2021
End date: 17 July 2021

Project description

Humanitarian mine action ensures safe access to essential services such as schools, health facilities and other vital infrastructure and helps communities reduce their dependency on humanitarian aid and rebuild their livelihoods.

This Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF) funding focuses on assisting and collaborating with the Mine Action Agency of the Republic of Azerbaijan (ANAMA) to ensure a safe environment for rehabilitation and reconstruction of physical infrastructure in the areas situated along the line of contact (LoC).

The survey and clearance of landmines and explosive ordnances in areas affected by the recent conflict will help reduce the vulnerability of internally displaced persons (IDP) as they return to their residential compounds. The project covers a technical survey (identification of the location of explosive ordnance (EO), removal and destruction of found unexploded ordnances (UXO) and other explosive devices, and explosive ordnance risk education (EORE) to affected communities.

The objectives of the Mine Action Programme

Ensure a safe living environment, and rehabilitation and reconstruction of physical infrastructure in the areas situated alongside the line of contact (LoC).

Project summary

ANAMA is implementing surveying, demining and UXO clearance activities in affected areas (including cities), aiming at ensuring the safety and security of the population (including ANAMA personnel), IDP returnees, government entities’ field staff involved in rehabilitation and reconstruction of the infrastructure, United Nations and other intentional agencies’ mission members, as well as members of the network of civil societies.

In addition, activities focus on mine and UXO clearance in the Aghdam, Gubadli and Zangilan regions, through manual mine clearance, mechanical machines and mine detection dogs (MDDs).
Based on ANAMA’s report (January – July 2021) during demining operations carried out from 1 January 2021, 33,665,852 m² (3,366.6 ha) were inspected, 12,986 anti-personal and anti-tank mines, and 8,018 unexploded ordnances (UXO) were found and neutralized.2

UNDP procured 150 sets of mine detectors for newly recruited teams of deminers. The procurement process was successfully finalized and equipment delivered to the ANAMA base in Horadiz for further use.

As part of the Protection and Explosive Ordnance Risk Education (EORE) component, ANAMA’s EORE experts held a series of coordination meetings with community leaders, civil society representatives, and specialists from the Ministry of Education. It was agreed to focus on printing specific textbooks on EORE for school-age children and teachers attending schools located along the former LoC.

UNDP allocation on EORE was used to procure textbooks and was incorporated into the ongoing EORE programme funded by the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF). From 1 January 2021 to 31 July 2021, 66,980 educational printed materials3 were distributed, and around 110,000 citizens received EORE.

Evaluation Rating and Achievement Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Rating*</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project strategy</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Strategy meets all objectives related to capacity building of the programme and the country priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress towards Results</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Efficient progress related to all components related to explosive ordnance disposal (EOD) clearance and Explosive Ordance Risk Education (EORE) was achieved at an adequate level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project implementation and adaptive management</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>The programme was satisfactory in terms of project implementation within the time frame.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>The programme is sustainable because it was extended in the past and has all positive indicators for the future.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *6 – Highly Satisfactory (HS), 5 Satisfactory (S), 4 Moderately Satisfactory (MS), 3 Moderately Unsatisfactory (HU), 2 Unsatisfactory (U), 1 Highly Unsatisfactory (HU).

2 ANAMA progress report on activities carried out within the framework of the CERF/UNDP-ANAMA partnership (16 August 2021).
3 The UNDP CERF project provided 18,900 textbooks for pupils and teachers, distributed in affected areas.
Project Number: Project ID: 00101570
Implementing partner: ANAMA
Start date: 3 November 2017
End date: 31 December 2020

Project description
The history of cooperation between UNDP and ANAMA dates back to 1999 with the first phase of the Azerbaijan Mine Action Programme. The current project document represents Phase V of the Azerbaijan Mine Action Programme.

The objectives of the project
The immediate objective of the current phase of the project is to continue supporting ANAMA for three more years (2017–2019) to become a fully sustainable national institution capable of overseeing all aspects of the mine/UXO action programme. The project also aims to support ANAMA’s institutional capacity. UNDP’s short-term strategy is to continue to provide ANAMA with technical, advisory, financial, networking and promotional support so that it can sustain and further develop its capacity. In terms of building ANAMA’s institutional capacity, UNDP should focus on ANAMA’s ability to effectively undertake the following tasks: mine/UXO clearance, international networking, and the provision of support to other mine-affected countries. The project will also consider undertaking any possible actions required to continue the transformation of ANAMA into an International Centre for Mine Action.

Project summary
The Mine Action Agency of the Republic of Azerbaijan (ANAMA) was first established in 1998 by Presidential Decree. Subsequently, it was disbanded in December 2020 and re-established as a new structure with the same name. According to Presidential Decree No. 1251 of the Republic of Azerbaijan of 15 January 2021, it was granted the status of a public legal entity, and its Charter was approved as a legal document. Decree No. 1251 guarantees the coordination of all activities in Azerbaijan, including assessment, planning, coordination, management, as well as monitoring and evaluation of mine action-related activities.

UNDP has played a key role in the establishment and further development of the Agency and has provided invaluable support to ANAMA for the past 23 years. It has in-depth knowledge of ANAMA’s activities in Azerbaijan and has been actively involved in analysing performance and priorities.

Activities are concentrated on mine/UXO and other EO-affected areas of Azerbaijan. Mine and UXO clearing operations are carried out using manual mine clearance, mechanical machines and mine-detection dogs.

Based on ANAMA’s report for the project period (2017–2020), ANAMA cleared 53,604,63 million m².4 Following the project design stage from 2017 to 2020, no international conference was organized, since.

4 Email (report) by Idris Ismayilov, Head of Survey and Clearance Department, ANAMA, 30 September 2021.
2018, and no international training was delivered to the international mine action programmes of mine-affected countries by ANAMA’s Training Centre in Goygol.

**Evaluation Rating and Achievement Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project strategy</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>The strategy meets all objectives related to capacity building of the programme and the country priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Progress towards results</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Efficient progress related to the cleared land, except achievements with respect to the training provided to other mine action programmes; there were no results related to United Nations Mine Action Service (UNMAS) certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project implementation and adaptive management</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>The programme was satisfactory with respect to project implementation within the time frame. There were obstacles due to military actions in the operations area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Due to its positive indicators, it will continue to be sustainable in the future.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** *6 Highly Satisfactory (HS), 5 Satisfactory (S), 4 Moderately Satisfactory (MS), 3 Moderately Unsatisfactory (HU), 2 Unsatisfactory (U), 1 Highly Unsatisfactory (HU).*
## Summary of conclusions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conclusion 1</strong></td>
<td>It is highly relevant, and most importantly, effectively delivered to beneficiaries. The combination of different types of assistance that provides socio-economic development of the impacted communities has been a clear advantage of the current support. Both projects provide an attractive mix of instruments that allows to tackle all relevant aspects of mine action including mine/UXO clearance, EORE. The evaluated projects are designed in line with sectoral requirements and are consistent with the country’s strategic needs. In addition, it allows EORE to maintain safety measures to illuminate the casualties among civilians settled along the LoCs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conclusion 2</strong></td>
<td>Due to its training capacities and acquired expertise, ANAMA is capable of offering its facilities and services to serve as an International Mine Action Training Centre. UNDP’s project is designed to strengthen the Mine Action Programme, and one of its key aims is to promote ANAMA as an International Mine Action Training Centre. Due to insufficient international engagement, the number of international training sessions decreased. Since 2018, ANAMA has not conducted any international training. Through this project, ANAMA is becoming a market-oriented agency that can promote, share and offer its expertise as an International Mine Action Training Centre. This is Azerbaijan’s long-term project contributing towards addressing demining on an international level. The current management’s strategy is to expand ANAMA’s Regional Training Centre in Goygol to meet international requirements. Following the project design stage from 2017 to 2020, no international conference was organized. Moreover, despite the long-term strategy since 2010, which was designed in the project, no UNMAS certification has been conducted, including training the trainers for EOD 1, 2, 3, and EOD 3+, as well as other training that could be delivered by ANAMA’s International Mine Action Training Centre to international mine action programmes. The current project successfully used the UNDP’s South-South and Triangular cooperation (SSC/TrC) approach. It builds on and maintains the training service. Today, ANAMA’s expertise is shared with other countries for obtaining accreditation from UNDP, UNMAS and other internationally recognized and certifying organizations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Conclusion 2 | Sustainability of the achievements of both projects are ensured  
The safe ground achieved by demining is sustainable, providing a durable basis for accident reduction and for further socio-economic development and investments.  
ANAMA was re-established by the Presidential Decree, and its structure is being reviewed to adapt to new challenges that emerged in the State’s agenda following the recent conflict |
| Conclusion 3 | There have been significant problems related to the legal framework, funding and the lack of coordination and communication between donors and ANAMA in the past, even during the period of its re-establishment. However, there are indications of specific improvements.  
One of the indicators suggesting progress is that ANAMA is in the process of drafting the Demining Law. (The previous draft law was prepared with UNDP’s support in 2003, and this initiative shows that the Agency maintains UNDP’s strategic priorities to strengthen mine action capacity in the country.) |
| Conclusion 4 | To assure public involvement and public confidence in transparency, the Public Council under ANAMA was established in accordance with the Law of the Republic of Azerbaijan on Public Participation,5 which regulates the activities of the Public Council in the Republic of Azerbaijan. This Law covers relations involving citizens of Azerbaijan in state governance. |
| Conclusion 5 | As a result of the project's implementation and field experience supported by lessons learned during the implementation phase of projects I and II, ANAMA developed specific procedures and criteria for land release.  
Since National Mine Action Standards (NMAS) have not been updated or amended since 2014, land release is not fully integrated into them. |
| Conclusion 5.1 | ANAMA’s NMAS have not been updated since 2014. Hence, ANAMA is aware of some points concerning specific innovations in International Mine Action Standards (IMAS), but cannot consistently apply them to its procedures because they are not a part of NMAS. In April 2021, ANAMA established a new department that is responsible for the methodology, and will accordingly review all requirements related to IMAS. |
| Conclusion 6 | ANAMA’s activity covers a very large area of operations, which includes affected areas that have been released and/or inspected and declared safe according to its own practice and implementation tool.  
There is no clear liability policy: EOs are the primary and ultimate responsibility of the national authority, i.e. ANAMA, because, in general terms, the State is accountable and liable for victims in areas affected by EOs. |

## Conclusion 7

ANAMA has been conducting the general survey in territories regained after the conflict, but due to a lack of reliable data and mine field records, resources cannot be allocated at this stage. ANAMA began to conduct the general survey in some post conflict settings, but due to emergency multi-tasking, inevitable mine clearance delays have been created. ANAMA uses an old version of the Information Management System for Mine Action (IMSMA), i.e. v2.2-IMSMA Legacy, and appropriate consultations are ongoing with the Geneva International Centre for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD). It is planned to migrate to IMSMA Core.

## Conclusion 8

EORE is the most important pillar of humanitarian mine action and one of the most appropriate tools for achieving the objectives of projects I and II.

## Conclusion 9

Gender considerations in mine action play a vital role. Due to the strictly technical nature of technical surveys and mine clearance, there have usually been no direct gender considerations identified as an indicator. Although based on United Nations-Azerbaijan Partnership Framework (UNAPF) Outcome 2, by 2020, Azerbaijan has enhanced institutional capacity for transparent, evidence-based and gender-sensitive policy formulation and implementation. Gender considerations have become particularly important with respect to socio-economic development and related topics. Accordingly, it was integrated into the delivery of outputs and activities under the gender-sensitive approach on mine action.

## Conclusion 10

Ottawa Treaty process and the Republic of Azerbaijan

## Conclusion 11

Since 2000, only two national non-governmental organizations (NGOs), International Eurasia Press Foundation (IEPF) and DAYAG, have been contracted by ANAMA. Both NGOs were established with UNDP’s support; only these two NGOs have a background in mine action. In addition, IEPF has diversified experience in humanitarian mine action and was involved in the Landmine Impact Survey in 2002.

## Conclusion 12

ANAMA considered the priorities related to the social-economic aspects and considers environmental factors while implementing projects I and II.

---

6 Mine Ban Treaty Voluntary Article 7 Report (June 2000 – November 2008), Form A.
### Recommendations summary table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong>-sensitive approaches are vital, and UNDP should ensure that ANAMA properly consider the needs of different groups in a community and that employment opportunities are equally available to women and men.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP can help ANAMA develop a <strong>liability policy</strong>, which would include the shift of liability from the Government or the local community once specific criteria are fulfilled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The design of UNDP projects should consider demining/EO clearance as a vital part of <strong>socio-economic development</strong> as a post-clearance action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In order to achieve progress, ANAMA should pay detailed attention to the <strong>demining law</strong>, i.e. the Humanitarian Mine Action Law, whose bases were provided by UNDP in 2003.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan should join the <strong>Ottawa Treaty</strong> because it is capable of clearing all mines on its territory within the time frame stated therein. This would also attract the attention of the donor community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The <strong>land release</strong> is not fully integrated into NMAS. Introducing a new concept of land release to ANAMA would require that it actively manage a cost-effective approach. ANAMA should fully integrate the land release policy according to IMAS, lessons learned, and the best international practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NMAS of ANAMA</strong> has not been updated since 2014. Consequently, ANAMA is aware of some points about specific innovations in IMAS, but cannot regularly apply to these procedures because it is not a part of NMAS. Hence, ANAMA with UNDP support should update all its NMAS according to IMAS. All of these factors impact the implementation of projects I and II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explosive Ordnance Risk Education (EORE)</strong> is the important pillar of humanitarian mine action and one of the most appropriate tools for achieving the objectives of projects I and II. Accordingly, qualitative and accurate planning and resource mobilization should be carried out for EORE trainees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANAMA personnel involved in the <strong>training</strong> should undergo ‘training of trainers’ and obtain the appropriate international certification with UNDP, UNMAS, or another Internationally certifying organizations for EOD 1, 2, 3 and 3+ as well as other training that can be delivered by <strong>ANAMA’s International Mine Action Training Centre</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANAMA and international partners/stakeholders should dedicate efforts to develop national NGOs that can participate in tenders for mine action. It will increase the level of the competition and therefore efficiency in involving civil society engagement with humanitarian mine action.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**An international conference.** An international conference has not been organized even though it could have attracted more donors and partners for ANAMA. Therefore, Azerbaijan should host an international mine action conference.

**Environmental management in mine action operations.** ANAMA is working on the draft NMAS on Environmental Management in Mine Action according to IMAS 07.13, which is not fully integrated into daily operations.

ANAMA’s **vision:** “The territory of Azerbaijan is safe for the people to live free from the threat of landmines and explosive devices, in an environment conductive to development, where **mine victims** are fully integrated into society.”

The **vision** should be slightly revised in accordance with the new developments in humanitarian mine action. The definition of ‘mine victims’ should be replaced by ‘survivors’.

**Mission:** ANAMA will promote, plan and implement a safe, effective and efficient national mine action programme in Azerbaijan to remove the threat of landmines and explosive devices. The mission could also be revised and highlight new challenges related to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).
2. INTRODUCTION

Purpose of the evaluation and objectives

This evaluation provides lessons learned and recommendations covering the following areas:
• adequacy of the project design for achieving the country programme output;
• the progress made towards achieving the outcome, the reasons for any shortfalls and whether there are unintended effects;
• the relevance and effectiveness of the strategies to achieving the outcome;
• factors beyond UNDP’s control that affect the outcome;
• any part played by UNDP’s outputs and other interventions (including soft assistance) in achieving the output;
• the effectiveness of UNDP’s partnership strategy and whether it assisted in achieving the outcome;
• with its current capacities, whether ANAMA can become an international training centre of excellence.

Between 2017 and 2021, UNDP provided support for several mine action projects in collaboration with ANAMA, and this evaluation assesses the performance of the following two projects:

Project I: Unexploded Ordnance clearance rapid response, 2020–2021

This evaluation provides lessons learned, findings and recommendations covering the following areas:
• adequacy of the project design for achieving the country programme output;
• progress made towards results and to what extent the expected outcomes and objectives were achieved;
• project implementation and adaptive management related to the project efficiency and cost-effectiveness;
• sustainability: the extent to which financial, institutional, socio-economic and environmental risks sustain long-term project results;
• factors beyond UNDP’s control that affect the outcomes;
• with its current capacities, whether ANAMA can become an international training centre of excellence.

The goal and objective of the evaluation
The goal of this evaluation is to provide the UNDP Country Office with sufficient information to evaluate the performance of the two projects (in terms of efficiency, effectiveness, and impact), document lessons learned, and provide practical recommendations.

The specific objectives are to:
• assess in particular the efficiency, effectiveness and impact of the implemented projects, indicating to what extent the results, purposes and goals of the two projects were achieved;
• identify and document lessons learned, focusing on the design, implementation and management of the two selected projects for possible improvement and the identification of future actions;
• provide recommendations for practical follow-up actions with an emphasis on actions related to the sustainability of project benefits.

To this end, the evaluation must be participatory and should include: a review of project documentation (desk phase); interviews with all relevant stakeholders (project managers, implementing entities, counterparts, beneficiaries, etc.); selected site visits (field phase); and feedback collected from project stakeholders aimed at validating the evaluators’ findings, conclusions and recommendations.

Scope and methodology: Principles of design and execution of the evaluation, the evaluation approach and data collection methods, and limitations to the final evaluation

The final evaluation will assess progress towards the achievement of the two projects’ objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Proposals.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable, and useful. The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information.

The evaluator is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach ensuring close engagement with the UNDP Country Office, the project team, the government counterpart (ANAMA) and other key stakeholders.

The ANAMA evaluation report should fully describe the evaluation approach taken and its rationale. The scope of the final evaluation will cover all activities undertaken within the framework of the project as presented in the proposals.

The evaluation will follow the four Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD-Development Assistance Committee (OECD-DAC) evaluation criteria – relevance, coherence, effectiveness and efficiency; sustainability, impact and gender equality will be added as cross-cutting criteria.

UNDP may continue to support EORE and mobile EOD teams in the future.

Methodology

The evaluation will follow the global practices of UNDP’s updated evaluation guidelines. The evaluator will conduct an extensive project-related document review, based on which a draft work plan will be prepared with detailed evaluation methodology proposed such as qualitative/quantitative/mixed methods. At the next stage, the evaluator should conduct a field assessment applying methodologies as per the inception report. The evaluator will also organize a validation/debriefing meeting with relevant key government counterparts and UNDP to test the assumptions, findings and recommendations regarding achievement and experiences, challenges and lessons learned, as well as any improvement for its continuation and/or replication.

Evaluation criteria and evaluation questions

The evaluation is structured around the evaluation criteria (design quality, performance, relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability, and management).
Tools

The evaluation deployed a mix of evaluation tools, including sampling, documentation review, desk research, case studies and semi-structured interviews.

Evaluation matrix

The evaluators created an evaluation matrix (Annex 2) to guide them through the evaluation. This included a specific methodological tool to answer the evaluation questions. This methodology ensured uniformity of data collection during the field phase and its consistent analysis during the synthesis phase.

Structure of the evaluation report

The main body of this Evaluation Report comprises 4 sections. In addition to the first two sections, which deal mostly with background and methodological matters, there are two more sections: Section 3 presents the project description and background, and Section 4 presents the main conclusions and findings.

The main report is also supported by a series of annexes, including a more detailed analysis of specific aspects or the provision of background information, in particular:

Annex 1 provides the full Terms of Reference for this evaluation.
Annex 2 presents the details of the evaluation methodology.
Annex 3 provides the general scope and sample of the evaluation.
Annex 4 lists the stakeholders and beneficiaries interviewed during the evaluation.
- lists the documents reviewed during this evaluation.

This Evaluation Report was prepared from 7 September 2021 to 11 October 2021, and reflects the situation as of August 2021. The deadline for the Report was 11 September 2021.
3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND

Both projects I and II aim to protect people from the negative impacts of ERW and ensure a safe environment for persons affected by conflict. Mine/UXO clearance will directly contribute to the following SDGs.

SDG 1. End poverty in all its forms everywhere.
SDG 2. End hunger, achieve food security and improve nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture.
SDG 3. Ensure healthy lives and promote well-being for all at all ages
SDG 6. Ensure clean water and sanitation
SDG 8. Promote sustained, inclusive, and sustainable economic growth, full and productive employment, and decent work for all.
SDG 9. Build resilient infrastructure, promote inclusive and sustainable industrialization, and foster innovation.
SDG 11. Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable

Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objectives and scope.

Project I: Unexploded Ordnance clearance rapid response, 2020–2021

Objectives
Ensure a safe living environment, and rehabilitation and reconstruction of physical infrastructure in the areas situated along the LoC.

The goal of the project is to protect people from the negative impact of ERW and ensure a safe environment for persons affected by conflict. Mine/UXO clearance will directly contribute to the SDGs. This CERF funding focuses on assisting and working with ANAMA to ensure a safe environment for rehabilitation and reconstruction of physical infrastructure in the areas situated along the LoC.

Problems that the project sought to address: threats and barriers targeted
The survey and clearance of ERW in areas affected by the recent conflict will help reduce the vulnerability of IDP returnee communities including in residential compounds.

The project aims to identify and destroy UXO and other explosive devices in conflict-affected residential areas, health and educational facilities, agricultural fields, farms, factory yards, roadsides, forests, and other parts of infrastructure, based on United Nations humanitarian assessment and government priorities that pose threats and create barriers to the socio-economic development of the affected communities.

The project aims to achieve the following outcomes:
• ANAMA’s special mobile emergency operation teams’ capacity is strengthened and maintained to ensure adequate response to urgent requests received from UXO-affected communities;
• ANAMA’s technical base is strengthened and equipped with required modern tools and equipment to expedite the process (please find attached list of required equipment);
• UXO-free land allow IDP communities to return voluntarily and in safety to their places;
• a safe environment is guaranteed for the normal functioning of humanitarian and developmental stakeholders as well as government counterparts entrusted to deal with the issues of refugees and IDPs;
• affected communities and individuals have the skills (knowledge, attitude and practice) to avoid unintentional detonation of ERW, as well as knowledge on how to report (through the 102 hotline) to ANAMA when there is a suspicion of new device.

Project description and strategy: objective, outcomes and expected results, description of field sites and context

ANAMA is implementing survey, demining and UXO clearance activities in several conflict affected areas aiming to ensure the safety and security of a population of over 50,000, including ANAMA personnel, IDP returnees, government entities’ field staff involved in rehabilitation and reconstruction of infrastructure, United Nations and other intentional agencies’ mission members and civil society representatives.

During demining operations carried out from 1 January to 31 July 2021, 33,665,852 m² (3,366,6 ha) were inspected, 12,986 anti-personal and anti-tank mines, and 8,018 UXO were found and neutralized. Within the framework of ongoing restructuring and increased staffing of ANAMA, UNDP provided technical support in the form of 150 sets of mine detectors for newly recruited teams of deminers.

Within the Protection and EORE component, ANAMA’s EORE experts held a series of coordination meetings with community leaders, members of the network of civil society, and specialists from the Ministry of Education.

From 1 January 2021 to 31 July 2021, according to a cooperation agreement with UNICEF, 66,980 educational printed materials were distributed in affected areas and around 110,000 citizens received EORE. Project implementation arrangements: a short description of the Project Board and key implementing partner arrangements, etc.

Implementation

UNDP has an ongoing project with ANAMA until December 2023. The project is implemented by ANAMA according to UNDP rules on full national implementation modality (NIM). ANAMA is the implementing partner and project beneficiary, and is also a fully operational national agency.

Project Board: The Project Board will be the executive decision-making body for the project, providing guidance to the Project Manager, and approving work plans, budgets and project revisions. The Project Board Group will consist of three members:

• The Chair (Implementing Partner) will convene the Project Board. The Chair is the Chairman of the Board of ANAMA.9
• The senior supplier. This position will be held by the UNDP DRR or a designated UNDP Development Adviser.
• The beneficiary representative will be identified by UNDP and ANAMA to represent the project beneficiaries.

---

9 The UNDP CERF project covered 18,900 textbooks (for pupils and teachers) distributed in affected areas.
9 ANAMA was re-established as per the Decree of the President of the Republic of Azerbaijan of 15 January 2021, and the title of the position of Director of ANAMA became Chairman of the Board.

Project timing and milestones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>Baseline value</th>
<th>Land clearance</th>
<th>International training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year – 2017</td>
<td>Year 1 – 2018</td>
<td>Year 2 – 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANAMA</td>
<td>448 million m²</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25 million m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25 million m²</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25 million m²</td>
<td></td>
<td>25 million m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25 million m²</td>
<td></td>
<td>25 million m²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mine and ERW contamination in Azerbaijan is the consequence of the 1988–1994 armed conflict with Armenia, where landmines were laid by both sides, and ammunition abandoned by the Soviet army in 1991. The most heavily contaminated areas are along the LoC, including the area in and around Nagorno-Karabakh.

For the purposes of this project, ‘mine action’ refers to a combination of activities designed to: reduce real and perceived risks to affected populations of landmines, cluster munitions, ammunition stockpiles and ERW; reduce developmental consequences of contamination; and further boost ANAMA’s access to the international mine action sector as a potential service provider and regional training centre.

Full linkage of demining and development demands a new paradigm for mine action at the local level, where clearance is seen as an enabling activity or a service in support of development, rather than a separate activity. When fully linked to development goals, mine action has the specific role of ensuring that it will bring about the greatest possible significant development change through the reduction of the humanitarian and socio-economic impacts of mines.

ANAMA is integrated into the State Social and Economic Development Programme. The former mine action strategy covered the 2014–2018 period. ANAMA’s long-term strategy is to expand its services to the international market and clear regained territories.


Problems that the project sought to address: threats and barriers targeted

The project aims to identify and destroy EO in conflict-affected residential areas, health and educational facilities, agricultural fields, farms, factory yards, roadsides, forest and other parts of infrastructure, based on United Nations Humanitarian assessment and government priorities that pose the threats and create barriers in the socio-economic development of the affected community. The project covers survey (identification of the location of explosive devices), removal and destruction of found UXO, and other explosive devices. In addition, the project will provide EORE to affected communities to reduce the likelihood of an accident occurring.

Project description and strategy: objectives, outcomes and expected results, description of field sites and context

The project will provide further support for mine clearance operations on currently accessible land contaminated with mines and explosives. It will also enhance awareness of ANAMA among international mine action community by sharing its knowledge, expertise, training and research as part of a South-South and Triangular cooperation, which will use UNDP’s global network.
Contamination affects any potential economic, industrial or agricultural activities that can improve the livelihoods of the population.

The lack mine maps increases the time and cost required to perform demining operations. In addition, the state budget allocated to ANAMA is not sufficient to resolve the current mine problem.

The immediate objective of the current phase of the project is to continue to support ANAMA for three more years (2017–2019) to become a fully sustainable national institution capable of overseeing all aspects of the mine/UXO action programme. UNDP’s short-term strategy is to continue to provide ANAMA with advisory, financial, networking and promotional supports so that it can sustain and further develop its capacity. UNDP’s areas of interest, in terms of building ANAMA’s institutional capacity, should focus on its ability to effectively undertake international networking and support other mine-affected countries.

UNDP’s long-term strategy should be to provide ANAMA with technical support in preparing and implementing the Contingency Plan in order to intervene, as rapidly as feasible, in all aspects of the mine/UXO action programme in the occupied territories once the peace agreement is reached.

UNDP aims to help improve the resource endowments of the poor and boost food and human/community security, employment and livelihoods by using mine action to:

- empower and protect people and their communities;
- restore livelihoods;
- support recovery and development.

The key development outcomes and results to be achieved by UNDP’s Development and Mine Action Programme in Azerbaijan are:

- improved physical capital (e.g. irrigation systems, road construction, water and sanitation systems);
- improved human capital (agricultural production, land title issues, and land use planning);

Project implementation arrangements: a short description of the project board, key implementing partner arrangements, etc.

Implementation

UNDP has an ongoing project with ANAMA until December 2023. The project is implemented by ANAMA according to UNDP rules on full NIM. ANAMA is acting as an implementing partner and project beneficiary, and it is a fully operational national agency that is fully staffed and capable of delivering the expected results. ANAMA’s Head Office is located in Baku and it has two regional offices, in Fizuli and Goygol regions. ANAMA has dedicated top, senior and middle management staff that have been working for the Agency since the beginning of 2000 and are aware of the requirements and the challenges related to humanitarian mine action.

Project Board: The Project Board will be the executive decision-making body for the project, providing guidance to the Project Manager, and approving work plans, budgets and project revisions. The Project Board Group will consist of three members:
• The Chair (implementing partner) will convene the Project Board. The Chair of the Board is the Chair of the Board of ANAMA.\textsuperscript{11}
• The Senior supplier. This position will be held by the UNDP DRR or a designated UNDP Development Advisor.
• The Beneficiary Representative will be identified by UNDP and ANAMA to represent the project beneficiaries.

The Project Board has regular project reviews to assess the project’s performance and review the multi-year work plan to ensure realistic budgeting during the project implementation. In the project’s final year, the Project Board holds an end-of-project review to draw on lessons learned to address relevant audiences.

Figure I. The Project Board

Main stakeholders

Currently, ANAMA maintains its regular relations with the following stakeholders like UNDP, ICRC, GICHD, UNICEF, Marshal Legacy Institute, and several other United Nations-affiliated bodies. In the past, ANAMA had excellent relations with stakeholders such as the European Commission (EC), UNMAS, the United States Department of State, United State Department of Defense and United States European Command (EUROCOM), which purchased specific equipment provided funding and regular training, including management capacity building. Furthermore, the Slovenian International Trust Fund For Demining and Mine Victims Assistance, the US-based Marshal Legacy Institute, James Madison University (United States of America) and Cranfield Mine Action (United Kingdom) provided regular management training. Bilateral relations with the UK Government, the Government of Japan, EC, United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and the UK Department for International Development (DFID), and some other extensive donor/programmes of mine action were a unique example of the stakeholder engagement in the past that is no longer the case today.

The last Presidential decree on the coordination of the mine clearance on the territory of the Republic of Azerbaijan\textsuperscript{12} is aimed to improve the coordination with national stakeholders, the Ministries of Defence, Internal Affairs and of Emergency Response, and the State Border Service that is involved in Mine/UXO clearance activity.

\textsuperscript{11} ANAMA was re-established by the Decree of the President of the Republic of Azerbaijan of 15 January 2021, and accordingly the title of the position of Director of ANAMA became the Chairman of the Board.
\textsuperscript{12} Decree of the President of the Republic of Azerbaijan of 16 September 2021, On additional measures for coordinating demining activities in the Republic of Azerbaijan.
4. FINDINGS

4.1. Project strategy

The project design of Project I: Unexploded Ordnance Clearance Rapid Response, 2020–2021

Overall, the objective of the reviewed projects is to ensure a safe living environment, and rehabilitation and reconstruction of physical infrastructure in the areas situated along the LoC. Accordingly, the overall goal is to eliminate the socio-economic impacts from EOs.

Gender considerations in mine action play a vital role. Due to the technical nature of the technical survey and mine clearance, there has usually been no direct, gender-related effect identified as an indicator. This is despite being based on United Nations-Azerbaijan Partnership Framework (UNAPF) Outcome 2, By 2020, Azerbaijan has enhanced institutional capacity for transparent, evidence-based, and gender-sensitive policy formulation and implementation. Gender considerations have become particularly important with respect to socio-economic development and related topics. Accordingly, they were integrated into the delivery of outputs and activities under the gender-sensitive approach to mine action.

In incorporating a gender lens, land release activities have the potential to significantly empower women and girls. Indeed, their primary purpose is to increase the safety of communities, preventing casualties and violence. The land release also eases access to previously blocked resources, aiding socio-economic development. Many daily activities such as agriculture, wood and water collection, mobility within between villages, and access to markets, which are usually carried out by women and girls, can be hindered or rendered more strenuous by contamination. Clearly, women and girls are an integral part of the process related to land release and EORE. Hence, this vulnerable group should be fully integrated into the project design.

The specific tools and innovations related to the application of the land release process have not been fully explored in the project II design.

The design of new procedures and the testing of new methodologies for land release have not been given full visibility in the logical framework. Introducing the new concept of land release to ANAMA would require that it actively manage a cost-effective approach.
Land release is the process by which all reasonable efforts are applied to remove the presence or suspicion of EO so that the land, housing and infrastructure can be safely used by a community.

Operational efficiency and the land release approach

Output 1 indicator EORE of the UXO Rapid Response project covers impacted communities and areas in the effort towards the socio-economic development of the impacted areas. In general, the quality of projects I and II, and the logframe design is good and objective, and indicators are specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and timely (SMART).
### Project I: Unexploded Ordnance clearance rapid response (2020–2021)

**Objective:** Ensure a safe living environment and rehabilitation and reconstruction of physical infrastructure in the areas situated along the line of contact (LoC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline level</th>
<th>End-of-project target</th>
<th>Achievement rating</th>
<th>Traffic light indicator</th>
<th>Justification for rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 1.1a EOD clearance</td>
<td>558 million m²</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>01.01.2021 – 31.07.2021 33,665,852 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 1.1b UXO/mine</td>
<td>820,726</td>
<td></td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>12,986 Anti-personnel and anti-tank mines and 8,018 UXO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 1.2 Procurement of PPE and mine detectors</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>150 mine detectors procured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 1.3: Number of people who have received explosive ordnance (EO) risk education</td>
<td>130,826</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>110,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


**Output 1:** Strengthening the Mine Action Programme in Azerbaijan and promotion of the Azerbaijan National Agency for Mine Action as an International Centre for Mine Action, 2017–2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline level</th>
<th>End-of-project target</th>
<th>Achievement rating</th>
<th>Traffic light indicator</th>
<th>Justification for rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 1.1 m² of land cleared</td>
<td>448 million m²</td>
<td>523 million m²</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>510,171,079 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 1.2 Number of training services provided by ANAMA to other mine-affected countries</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>HU</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>No progress achieved (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 1.3 ANAMA underwent UNMAS certification (Y/N)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>HU</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Notes:**

- a Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards.
- b Populate with data from the Project Document.
- c Use the 6-point Progress towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU.
- d Colour code this column only. Green=achieved; yellow=on target to be achieved; red= not on target to be achieved.

Progress towards outcomes analyses

| Green= Achieved | Yellow= On target to be achieved | Red= Not on target to be achieved |
Project I: Unexploded Ordnance clearance rapid response (2020–2021)
Objective: Ensure a safe living environment, and the rehabilitation and reconstruction of physical infrastructure in the areas situated along the LoC.

Outcome 2
“By 2020, Azerbaijan has enhanced institutional capacities for transparent, evidence-based and gender-sensitive policy formulation and implementation indicative outputs.”
Accordingly, Outcome indicators in the Country Programme Results Framework, including baseline and targets.

Outcome 2.5 Azerbaijan’s institutions have the capacity to provide knowledge services to other developing countries.

The project has the following indicators in line with Output 1:

Indicator 1.1a EOD clearance – baseline 558 million m² (excluding the end-of-project target)
Indicator 1.1b UXO/mine – baseline 820,726 (excluding the end-of-project target)
Indicator 1.2 Procurement of PPE and mine detectors
Indicator 1.3 Number of people who have received EORE – baseline of 130,826

Hence, the following achievements were accomplished according to the indicators:

Indicator 1.1a EOD clearance – 33,665,852 m² (during the project implementation phase) against the baseline of 558 million m²
Indicator 1.1b UXO/mine – 12,986 anti-personnel and anti-tank mines and 8,018 UXO against the total baseline of 820,726
Indicator 1.2 Procurement of PPE and mine detectors – 150 sets of mine detectors
Indicator 1.3 Number of people in affected areas who received EORE – 110,000 against the baseline of 130,826 (this may be considered successful considering ANAMA resources)

4.1.1. Country Programme
Objective: Ensure a safe living environment and rehabilitation and reconstruction of physical infrastructure in the areas situated along the LoC.

Outcome 2
“By 2020, Azerbaijan has enhanced institutional capacities for transparent, evidence-based and gender-sensitive policy formulation and implementation indicative outputs”.
Accordingly, Outcome indicators in the Country Programme Results and Framework, including baseline and targets:

Outcome 2.5 Azerbaijan’s institutions have the capacity to provide knowledge services to other developing countries

This output has been met partially due to appropriate facts highlighted below:
Indicator 1.1 that requires land clearance (baseline 448.mln.sq.m) with target 25 mln.sq.m. The table below provides the numbers of specific key targets (based on output) m2 cleared vs. actual clearance results.

### Planned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Year 1 – 2018</th>
<th>Year 2 – 2019</th>
<th>Year 3 – 2020</th>
<th>Final</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANAMA</td>
<td>448 mln. m²</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>25 million m²</td>
<td>25 million m²</td>
<td>25 million m²</td>
<td>523 million m²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Actual

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Year 1 – 2018</th>
<th>Year 2 – 2019</th>
<th>Year 3 – 2020</th>
<th>Final</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANAMA</td>
<td>448 mln. m²</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>45,492,690 m²</td>
<td>9,059,900 m²</td>
<td>7,618,489 m²</td>
<td>510,171,079 million m²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It can be observed that compared to significant progress in land clearance made in 2018 (45,492,690 m²), which exceeded the project target of 25 million m², the targets set in 2019 and 2020 were not fully met. ANAMA was engaged in emergency activities outside of its annual work plan that began at the end of 2019 before the armed conflict started, and also throughout 2020.

Output indicator 1 was generally achieved; it, even exceeds the final target, but there is some question regarding target settings and operational procedures used.

ANAMA has over 20 years of experience in humanitarian mine action, and operates with the following limited resources to meet the government requests for the clearance of key infrastructure and ensuring the safety for construction works and further repatriation of IDPs. Two national NGOs, IEPF and DAYAG, provide technical support and implement mine action projects.

| Headquarters | 1 |
| Departments | 6 |
| Regional bases | 6 (2 main, 4 temporary) |
| Total number of personnel involved in humanitarian mine action | 574 |
| Operational personnel | 275 (154 deminers) |
| Mine detection dogs (MDDs) | 38 (22 operational) |
| MDD personnel | 42 |
| Training, survey and quality assurance | 16 |
| Mechanical demining machines (MDMs) | 6 |
| MDM personnel | 19 |
The Training Quality Assurance Division (TQAD) was established in 2003 as part of UNDP’s capacity-building strategy, through which ANAMA periodically runs training courses to build local employees’ humanitarian mine action capacity. TQAD plays an essential role within ANAMA by providing capacity building training and quality assurance/quality control (QA/QC) in all aspects of humanitarian demining operations in Azerbaijan and overseas contractors.

As a result, close relations with field staff make their activity highly flexible and workable, allowing to invent and bring many innovations with sets of new scenarios during on-job training.

Knowledge (e.g. most of the team speaks English, Russian and Turkish) and experience in training and QA allows trainers to conduct the training at an international level. Moreover, it is planned to allocate resources to build the capacities and expand the regional training centre in Goygol.

Based on the statistics, in addition to local training from 2009 to 2017, TQAD conducted 21 international courses for seven international organizations and 315 international students. Based on the statistics between 2017 and 2020, ANAMA failed to maintain the same level of success in its relationship with stakeholders, which led to a failure in obtaining relevant certification to be granted the status of International Training Centre from UNDP, UNMAS or another internationally recognized and certified organization.

The Azerbaijani Government continued to support ANAMA, contributing U$2,400,000 from 2017 to 2020.

Moreover, in December 2020, ANAMA requested the extension of the project for another three years and expressed its willingness to allocate US $4,200,000 million. This contribution shows the Government’s commitment to prioritize mine action. And government’s strong support and financial commitment are helping to strengthen donor’s confidence.

Remaining barriers to achieving project objectives

The lack of mine records and maps increases both time and cost required to perform demining operations to meet project objectives. In addition, the state budget allocated to ANAMA is insufficient to effectively carry out mining activities. The unresolved conflict limits donor contributions allocated to Azerbaijan by the international mine action community. The land release procedure by IMAS 7.11 is not integrated into NMAS since the last update and amendments were carried out in 2014. ANAMA started to conduct a general survey in some impacted areas, but due to emergency multitasking, out-of-operational planning has created inevitable delays in mine clearance, thus hindering the efficient implementation of project objectives.

Information management plays a vital role in priority setting and planning related and old version of IMSMA v2.2-IMSMALegacy in use in ANAMA (it is planned to migrate to IMSMA Core).

14 It was established as the Training, Survey and Quality Assurance Division (TSQAD).
15 UNDP-ANAMA Steering Committee Meeting, 3 December 2020 (Zoom conference).
4.3. Project implementation and adaptive management

Management arrangements

Project management. The role of the Project Manager is delegated to the ANAMA Plans and Contract Officer. She/he is responsible for the day-to-day management of the project activities and financial and administrative reporting. The Project Manager is also responsible for project implementation, is guided by annual and quarterly work plans and follows the results-based management (RBM) standards. She or he prepares quarterly work plans and quarterly progress reports, including updates of risk and issue logs, which they submit to the Project Board for approval.

Coordination

ANAMA reports to the presidential administration and the Cabinet of Ministers, ensuring that mine action efforts are aligned with the overall government priorities. The Ministry of Internal Affairs, the Crisis Management Centre of the Ministry of Emergency Situations, and local executive authorities jointly manage the 102 hotline where requests are received for urgent clearance/removal of dangerous items scattered in and around residential areas. In close coordination with these actors, ANAMA prioritizes the tasks and appropriate response.

ANAMA, with UNDP's support, established a coordination mechanism on EORE involving UNICEF and other actors.

Work plans

ANAMA is not a signatory of the Ottawa Treaty, which allows it to enjoy the flexibility regarding priority setting and develop its own annual and quarterly work plans to meet project timelines. ANAMA can therefore focus on a realistic work plan aimed at social-economic development rather than on the Treaty-driven objectives and within binding time frames.

Finance and co-finance

UNDP had provided capacity building and resource mobilization support to ANAMA since its establishment in 1999, when the international donor community provided 90 percent of the budget of ANAMA. Today, the Government of Azerbaijan provides more than 80 percent of the financial resources required by ANAMA to implement mine action activities in the country. The South-South cooperation dimension of the project will provide the basis for ANAMA to scale up its training and demining capacities once other countries ask for support.
Stakeholder engagement

Project II, “Strengthening the Mine Action Programme in Azerbaijan and promotion of the Azerbaijan National Agency for Mine Action as an International Centre for Mine Action”, primarily enables ANAMA to sustain its current demining and training capacity through the expansion of the services to other mine-affected countries. The project will also support government priorities for the clearance of land used for the resettlement of IDPs.

Currently, ANAMA maintains regular relations with UNDP, ICRC, GICHD, UNICEF, Marshal Legacy Institute, and other United Nations-affiliated bodies. In addition, the President of Azerbaijan issued a new Decree on 16 September 2021, “On additional measures to coordinate demining activities in the Republic of Azerbaijan “, which aims to improve coordination with national stakeholders, the Ministries of Defence, Internal Affairs, and Emergency Response, as well as the State Border Service that are involved in mine/UXO clearance activity.

Reporting

Both project I and II reporting were conducted regularly. Furthermore, reporting channel works efficiently. ANAMA’s Project Manager/Planning Officer submits the progress reports on a quarterly and annually basis to the Project Board and key stakeholders. The report consists of progress data showing the results achieved against pre-defined annual targets at the output level, the annual project quality rating summary, an updated risk log with mitigation measures, and any evaluation or review report prepared over the period. At the end of the project, she/he provides the completion report to the Project Board and stakeholders.

Communications

Communications during the implementation of both projects were a key component in the success of meeting the projects’ goal. ANAMA communications were adequately carried out with stakeholders, staff members, and field personnel involved in the implementation phase. During the implementation phase, the baseline was provided for the checkpoints and the activities to carry out to achieve the Output indicators. ANAMA used a different approach for communications through formal and informal methods. Moreover, this method of communication increased the chances that messages would be received in the right way, at the right time, and by the appropriate recipients.
4.4 Sustainability

Financial risks and sustainability

The main aim of the Government of Azerbaijan is the socio-economic development of regained territories, hence the importance to focus on mine action. Subsequently, on 15 January 2021, the President issued a decree regarding the re-establishment of ANAMA as a new entity capable of meeting the current challenges, and on 16 September 2021, a decree was issued to improve the capacity and efficiency of ANAMA.

In 2010, approximately 80 percent of all budget revenue was derived from the oil industry through the State Oil Fund of the Republic of Azerbaijan (SOFAZ) and taxes on the oil sector.

The Government set economic goals and objectives, including to ensure macro-economic stability and balanced development of the non-oil sector, and increase income-generating opportunities towards becoming a knowledge-based economy, increase the country’s competitiveness and diversify the economic structure. The various programmes and plans aim to achieve sustainable economic development, moving away from its dependence on oil and oil wealth and towards investments that would provide the foundation for sustainable non-oil sectors.

A persistent financial crisis in Azerbaijan could impact ANAMA’s financial sustainability and thus its operational sustainability. ANAMA is highly committed to expanding its operational horizon and exploring new opportunities to provide its services abroad and engage with donor organizations and institutions to obtain additional funds.

Socio-economic sustainability

Both projects combining demining and socio-economic development are highly relevant concerning priorities of both UNDP and the Government of Azerbaijan. The projects primarily focus on saving lives, preventing injuries and rebuilding infrastructure in conflict affected areas to ensure community safety. Providing the conditions for return and sustainable local development is the main aim of the socio-economic activities. Development-oriented mine action not only entails clearing EO (landmines, UXO and other ERW), but also promoting the development of local communities by enabling them to use the land after clearance has taken place.
Figure III. Title Principal logic for combining Mine Action and socio-economic developments

Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability

UNDP provides ANAMA with an efficient and clear road map that highlights the importance of a strengthened institutional framework for sustainable development that enables it to effectively respond to challenges and successfully implement projects I and II.

In April 2021, ANAMA reorganized and set up a new structure based on the Presidential Decree of 15 January 2021 on the Establishment of Mine Action Agency. The institutional framework is designed so that it provides transparency and effective coordination to avoid duplication of tasks, and systematically reviews progress to ensure sustainability.

ANAMA strives to meet challenges and it remains committed to updating and amending NMAS according to IMAS and lessons learned in order to improve the quality and implementation of the projects. Since 2002, efforts have been made to adopt new mine action legislation in Azerbaijan, and the first draft was prepared in 2003, and new draft legislation is under review. To respond to the absence of a demining law, which has posed challenges for the sustainability of the institution, the President of Azerbaijan issued a new Decree, “The Decree of the President of the Republic of Azerbaijan, of 16 September 2021, For the Additional Measure for the Coordination of Mine Clearance”.

Environmental risks to sustainability

According to UNDP’s project arrangements, ANAMA considered the social-economic priorities and takes into account environmental factors while implementing projects I and II. The operations cover the area that will be used by affected communities not only for their safety and security but also for socio-economic development since it aims to reduce the social-economic and environmental impact of mines, ERW and other EOs. ANAMA as a state entity is strongly focused on complying with the Law of the Republic of Azerbaijan on the Protection of the Environment.

A wrong approach to environmental issues could clearly damage environmental protection and affect sustainability. Hence, the environmental risks can have negative socio-economic and political impacts at the local, regional and national levels.

Accordingly, ANAMA is working on the draft NMAS on Environmental Management in Mine Action according to IMAS 07.13.
5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Conclusions

Comprehensive and balanced statements (evidence-based and connected to the evaluation findings) that highlight the project’s strengths, weaknesses and results

Conclusion 1: UNDP support to ANAMA (two projects)

Project I: Unexploded Ordnance clearance rapid response (2020–2021) – corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of the project


The project is highly relevant and, most importantly, effectively delivered to beneficiaries. The combination of different types of assistance that encourage socio-economic development of the impacted communities has been a clear advantage of the current support.

Both UNDP projects provide an attractive mix of instruments that allows to tackle all relevant aspects of mine action including mine/UXO clearance and EORE. The evaluated projects are designed in line with sectoral requirements and are consistent with the country’s strategic needs. In addition, they enable EORE to maintain safety measures to reduce the number of casualties among civilians settled along the LoC. Implementation of the project modalities has adequately reflected the strengths and weaknesses of delivering projects.

Conclusions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conclusion 1</th>
<th>Due to its training capacities and acquired expertise, ANAMA is capable of offering its facilities and services to serve as an International Mine Action Training Centre, as clearly evidenced by its distinguished past.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UNDP’s projects are designed to strengthen the Mine Action Programme, and one of the key aims is to promote ANAMA as an International Mine Action Training Centre. Insufficient international engagement led to a decline in the number of international training sessions. Since 2018, ANAMA has not conducted any international training.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Through this project, ANAMA is becoming a market-oriented agency that can promote it, share and offer its expertise as an International Mine Action Training Centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Following the project design stage from 2017 to 2020, no international conference was organized. Moreover, despite the long-term strategy since 2010, which was designed in the project, no UNMAS certification has been conducted, including training the trainers for EOD 1, 2, 3, and EOD 3+, as well as other training that could be delivered by ANAMA’s International Mine Action Training Centre to international mine action programmes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South-South and Triangular Cooperation (SSC/TrC) was a successful approach of UNDP with an important focus of the current project that builds and maintains the training service based on the experience of ANAMA to share its services to other countries in getting the accreditation from UNDP, UNMAS and other Internationally recognized and certified organizations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Conclusion 2 | **Sustainability of the achievements of both projects is ensured**  
The safe ground achieved by demining is sustainable, providing a durable basis for accident reduction and for further socio-economic development and investments.  
ANAMA, which re-established by the Presidential Decree, and its structure is being reviewed to enable facing new challenges in the State agenda following the recent conflict.  
The strategies of projects I and II are adequately supported by the necessary legal, financial and institutional means for sustainably achieving its goals. |
| Conclusion 3 | There are significant problems related to the legal framework, funding and the lack of coordination and communication between donors and ANAMA in the past and prior to its re-establishment. However, there are indications of specific improvements since then.  
There is a very diverse list of stakeholders involved in complex situations, which includes donors, states, entities and local governments, as well as communities. This increases management challenges in linking mine action and socio-economic development. Moreover, this sector is a top priority on the State agenda, and there are indications that this topic is increasingly gaining more international publicity and exposure.  
There is a very diverse list of stakeholders involved in complex situations. One of the indicators of progress is that ANAMA is drafting the demining law. (The previous draft law was prepared with UNDP’s support in 2003, and this initiative shows that the Agency maintains UNDP’s strategic priorities to strengthen mine action capacity in the country.)  
There has been increased interest from foreign donors, including other governments. Moreover, the law assures the efficient coordination and the social protection status of the personnel involved in mine action. |
| Conclusion 4 | To assure public involvement and public confidence in transparency, the Public Council under ANAMA was established in accordance with the Law of the Republic of Azerbaijan on Public Participation that regulates the activities of the Public Council in the Republic of Azerbaijan. This Law covers relations involving the citizens of Azerbaijan in state governance. The seven members of the Public Council were elected by representatives of civil society institutions on 21 June 2021. |

---

| Conclusion 5 | As a result of the project's implementation and field experience supported by lessons learned during the implementation phase of projects I and II, ANAMA developed specific procedures and criteria for land release. Since National Mine Action Standards (NMAS) have not been updated or amended since 2014, land release is not fully integrated into them. The specific tools and innovations related to the application of the land release have not been fully explored in the project II design. The design of new procedures and testing of new methodologies for land release have not been given full visibility in the logical framework. Introducing the new concept of land release to ANAMA would require that it actively manage a cost-effective approach. |
| Conclusion 5.1 | ANAMA’s NMAS have not been updated since 2014. Hence, ANAMA is aware of some points concerning specific innovations in International Mine Action Standards (IMAS), but cannot consistently apply them to its procedures because they are not a part of NMAS. In April 2021, ANAMA established a new department that is responsible for the methodology, and will accordingly review all requirements related to IMAS. One of the positive points related to the above is that the Government and the Presidential Office strongly focus on the implementation of NMAS following the best international practice according to IMAS. The latest Presidential Decree stated that “the Cabinet of the Ministers should approve the requirements for demining activities within three months, taking into account international humanitarian demining standards, and inform the President of the Republic of Azerbaijan about it”.

| Conclusion 6 | ANAMA’s activity covers a very large area of operations, which includes impacted areas that have been released and/or inspected and declared safe according to its own practice and implementation tool. There is no clear liability policy: EOs are the primary and ultimate responsibility of the national authority, ANAMA, because, in general terms, the State is accountable and liable for the victims in areas affected by EOs. |

---

21 Decree of the President of the Republic of Azerbaijan of 16 September 2021, On additional measures to coordinate demining activities in the Republic of Azerbaijan.
| Conclusion 7 | ANAMA aims to conduct a general survey in impacted/areas where Azerbaijan regained control, but due to lack of reliable data and sources of information on unpopulated territories (insufficient minefield records provided by the Armenian side) and some emergency tasks, its resources cannot be allocated. ANAMA has started to conduct a General Survey in some impacted areas, but due to emergency multitasking, out-of-operational planning creates inevitable delays in mine clearance related to an efficient implementation of the project objectives.

ANAMA uses IMSMA v2.2-IMSMA Legacy, and appropriate consultations are ongoing with GICHD. In addition, it is planned to migrate to IMSMA Core, which improves the mobility and quality of information management. It will serve as one of the vital tools to strengthen mine action capacity and as a solid base for the implementation of both projects. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion 8</td>
<td><strong>Explosive Ordnance Risk Education (EORE)</strong> is the important pillar of humanitarian mine action and one of the most appropriate tools for achieving the objectives of projects I and II. The design of both projects of UNDP highlighted the number of the target group who receives the EORE within the project.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Conclusion 9 | **Gender considerations play a vital role in mine action.** Due to the technical nature of technical survey and mine clearance, there has usually been no direct gender-related considerations identified as an indicator. Although based on United Nations-Azerbaijan Partnership Framework (UNAPF) Outcome 2 by 2020, Azerbaijan has enhanced institutional capacity for transparent, evidence-based, and gender-sensitive policy formulation and implementation. Gender considerations have become particularly important with respect to socio-economic development and related topics. Accordingly, they were integrated into the delivery of outputs and activities under the gender-sensitive approach on mine action.

The projects mentioned gender considerations as an integral part of socio-economic development. In addition, UNDP projects focus on gender mainstreaming and diversity; however, ANAMA did not fully do so. Nevertheless, ANAMA aims to integrate its project components with a stronger presence of women. |
### Conclusion 10

**The Ottawa Treaty process and the Republic of Azerbaijan**

The Republic of Azerbaijan has not acceded to the Mine Ban Treaty-Ottawa Convention. Azerbaijan stated that it supports its goals, including a comprehensive ban, but that it:

> cannot accede to the Ottawa Convention without settlement of the conflict. Therefore adherence to the Ottawa Convention will be possible only after the final settlement of the conflict between Azerbaijan and Armenia.\(^\text{22}\)

Azerbaijan has shown support for the Treaty. It has voted in favour of the annual United Nations General Assembly Resolution promoting the universalization of the Treaty every year since 2005, including Resolution 73/61 of December 2018, and submitted voluntary Mine Ban Treaty Article 7 transparency reports in 2008 and 2009.\(^\text{23}\)

Azerbaijan is not a party to the Convention on Conventional Weapons-CCW nor to the Convention on Cluster Munitions-Oslo Protocol.

### Conclusion 11

In 2000, two NGOs, **IEPF** and **DAYAG**, were established and developed with UNDP’s support. Since then, **only these two NGOs** have been contracted by ANAMA and are the only NGOs to have a background in mine action. In addition, IEPF has diversified experience in humanitarian mine action and jointly conducted the Landmine Impact Survey in 2002.

### Conclusion 12

UNDP set the environmental priorities. ANAMA considered the priorities related to the social-economic considerations and took into account environmental factors while implementing projects I and II. The environmental risks can have negative social-economic and political impacts at the local, regional, and national levels that can put sustainability at risk. UNDP and ANAMA are working on the draft NMAS on Environmental Management in Mine Action according to IMAS 07.13, which is not fully integrated into daily operations.

---

\(^{22}\) Mine Ban Treaty Voluntary Article 7 Report (June 2000 – November 2008), Form A.

5.2 Recommendations

Corrective actions for the project design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation

UNDP project should be designed based on the lessons learned, recommendations and analysis of the factual situation in ANAMA. Accordingly, the design should consider ANAMA’s needs, interests, priorities and resources. The project duration should be adequate depending on the scale and scope of the project to be implemented. The planning phase is vital, and should therefore consider a project logical framework.

Monitoring of the project implementation should be an ongoing process that regularly measures progress. Considering the long-standing partnership between UNDP and ANAMA, there are lessons learned that should be used to identify the actual vs. the planned situation. Hence, the monitoring process should identify potential risks during implementation.

Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project

Action 1: One of the main recommendations by UNDP related to the gender-sensitive approach is vital to ensure that ANAMA properly considers the needs of different groups in a community and that employment opportunities are equally available to all women and men, which is a vital part of planning, prioritization, training and EORE.

Action 2: ANAMA should develop a liability policy, which includes shifting liability to the Government or the local community when specific criteria have been fulfilled. Liability for dealing with items found after land release should be clarified in NMAS, i.e. the national land release policy and procedures that are based on international best practices and IMAS.

Action 3: All UNDP projects should consider that the goal of development-oriented mine action is not only to clear EO (landmines, UXO, and other ERW), but also to promote the development of local communities as the final goal by enabling them to use the land for their economic benefit after clearance. The project design should consider demining/EO clearance as a vital part of socio-economic development in post-clearance action.

Action 4: In order to achieve progress, ANAMA should pay detailed attention to the demining law, i.e. the Humanitarian Mine Action Law, which is at the drafting stage. (The previous draft law was prepared with UNDP’s support in 2003, and this initiative shows that the Agency maintains UNDP’s strategic priorities to strengthen mine action capacity in the country). Interest from foreign donors, including other governments, has increased. Moreover, the law could assure the efficient coordination and the social protection status of the person involved in Mine Action.

Action 5: Alternatively, Azerbaijan should join the Ottawa Treaty. This was indeed mentioned as one of the options for a collective approach in joining together with other neighbouring countries. To date, only Turkey has joined and ratified the Ottawa Treaty. Azerbaijan, Armenia, Georgia, Russian Federation and Iran have yet to join. Joining the Ottawa Treaty can also attract the attention of donor communities.

Action 6: Since National Mine Action Standards (NMAS) have not been updated or amended since 2014, the land release is not fully integrated into them. The specific tools and innovations related to the application of the Land Release have not been fully explored in project II’s design. The design of new procedures and the testing of new methodologies for land release have not been given full visibility in the logical framework. Introducing the new concept of land release to ANAMA would require that it actively manage a cost-effective approach. ANAMA should fully integrate the land release policy in accordance with IMAS, lessons learned, and UNDP’s best international practice. Accordingly, UNDP can provide advisory services to ANAMA to develop the survey and land release concept.
Action 7: ANAMA’s NMAS have not been updated since 2014. Hence, ANAMA is aware of some points concerning specific innovations in International Mine Action Standards (IMAS), but cannot consistently apply them to its procedures because they are not a part of NMAS. Hence, ANAMA should update all its NMAS in accordance with IMAS in the shortest time to avoid specific challenges in the field. This particularly involves the certification process, which can refer to specific applicable standards. All of the above-mentioned factors impact the implementation of projects I and II. ANAMA should update some new NMAS and develop new standards in accordance with IMAS, lessons learned and UNDP’s best international practice. Accordingly, UNDP can provide advisory services to ANAMA to develop and update NMAS.

Action 8: EORE is the important pillar of humanitarian mine action and one of the most appropriate tools for achieving the objectives of projects I and II. Accordingly, the planning and resource mobilization process should be carried out properly and qualitatively for the recipients of EORE. Moreover, the project should assure that areas containing EOs are marked (signs and fencing), fenced (but not by the EORE team) and monitored to warn people about any imminent threats.

Action 9: ANAMA has sufficient trained capacity to offer its facility and experience to act as an International Mine Action Centre, as clearly illustrated by its distinguished past. UNDP designed the project to strengthen the Mine Action Programme, and one of the key elements is to promote ANAMA as an International Mine Action Training Centre. UNDP took into account the insufficient international engagement, which led to the decline in the number of international training sessions to zero. ANAMA staff involved in the training should undergo ‘train the trainers’ training and obtain appropriate international certification (including all components of operations and information, EORE, etc.) with UNDP, UNMAS or another internationally recognized and certified organization (including “train the trainers”) for EOD 1 and 2 (ANAMA has the capacity to train trainers on EOD 1 and EOD 2, but the training began at the beginning of 2000).

Action 10. UNDP and ANAMA and international partners/stakeholders should dedicate efforts to develop a national NGO that can participate in tenders for mine action. It will increase the level of the competition (accordingly efficiency) in involving civil society engagement in humanitarian mine action.

Action 11: The International Conference. ANAMA has sufficient training capacity to offer its facilities and expertise to act as an International Mine Action Centre, as clearly illustrated in the past. UNDP project was designed to conduct an international conference related to the Mine Action issue in the Republic of Azerbaijan. An international conference was not organized even though it could have attracted more donors to ANAMA activities and address the mine action challenges. Therefore, Azerbaijan should host an international mine action conference.

Action 12. Environmental management in mine action operations. ANAMA is working on the draft NMAS on Environmental Management in Mine Action according to IMAS 07.13, which is not fully integrated into daily operations. ANAMA should then apply for the ISO 14001 in order to comply with the requirements of the environmental management system.

Action (optional) 13: ANAMA’s vision: “The territory of Azerbaijan is safe for people to live free from the threat of landmines and explosive devices, in an environment conducive to development, where mine victims are fully integrated into society”.
The vision should be slightly revised in accordance with the new developments in humanitarian mine action. Hence, the term ‘mine victims’ should be replaced by ‘survivors’ and the same should be applied to explosive devices” which should be replaced by ERW terminology.

Mission: ANAMA will promote, plan and implement a safe, effective and efficient national mine action programme in Azerbaijan to remove the threat of landmines and explosive devices.

The vision, mission and goals should be reviewed in accordance with the new challenges and requirements related to humanitarian mine action and the SDGs.

Proposals for future directions highlighting the main objectives

The objectives of UNDP’s projects are to achieve a safe and secure environment for the local population with increased socio-economic opportunities regarding land use and individual socio-economic empowerment, including better coordination between different actors.

Socio-economic activities increase the visibility of demining. Moreover, local communities’ appreciation and recognition of demining actions increase their visibility, especially when accompanying socio-economic activities bring immediate, visible and additional benefits to communities.

Accordingly, output indicators should provide an accurate overview of the baseline status and describe the implemented action. Hence, it should provide the figures related to the type of contamination that should be separated as former battlefield or mine field. Moreover, baseline and end project target should contain the information/figures and description of the clearance/land release status – technical survey (with the involvement of mechanical assets and MDDs) and actual clearance, land certification (end-user certificate), and who the beneficiaries/end users are. Moreover, the indicators should highlight the precise targets and number of direct beneficiaries.

Specific recommendations that would promote efficiency and effectiveness of a possible follow-up project of two mobile EOD and marking teams operating over a 24-month period (ECHO Project Proposal)

In many cases, the ERW contamination is scattered and not found within defined former ‘battle areas’. Here, it is not efficient to carry out widespread search/clearance on a just-in-case basis. The mine action programme establishes mobile EOD teams to respond to reports by the state entities, municipalities, or community of items of EO in the area. It should be taken into account that mobile EOD teams do not mark and release large areas by clearance because their work is concentrate on more critical, smaller areas having to provide a rapid response to remove explosive hazards that directly threaten communities, and thus reduce the loss of life and risk of serious injury from explosions. Moreover, it is well-known that demining teams involved in demining activity face the problem of demolishing the explosive items found. And in accordance with IMAS 09.30, all items found should be destroyed the same day. However, due to overload and some logistic issues, these requirements were not implemented on time. One of the duties of the mobile EOD teams can be the destruction of explosive items found during battle area and mine field clearance.

EOD operations may also be undertaken to dispose of ERW discovered outside hazardous areas. These operations may involve a single item of ERW or several items at a specified location such as a mortar or artillery position. It may also involve stockpiles of ammunition, small arms and light weapons (SALW), abandoned explosive ordnance (AXO) left in bunkers, or ammunition points.
Mobile EOD teams deal with sensitive remaining ammunition and thus deployment of the robot can bring a specific value to the operations because a robot will be used for surveillance and neutralization of explosive threats from a safe standoff distance. Hence, the team members should be certified in EOD 1, 2 and 3, and there should be one paramedic in each team. The project design should consider all factors mentioned above.
6. ANNEXES

Terms of Reference for Individual Consultants/Contractors (ICs) and Reimbursable Loan Agreements (RLAs), through the Global Policy Network (GPN)/ExpRes roster

Services/Work Description: Evaluation of two projects –
   (I) Unexploded Ordnance clearance rapid response, 2020–2021

Project/Programme Title: Evaluation of UNDP/ANAMA Mine Action Projects, 2017–2021

Consultant’s Title: Project Evaluator
Duty Station: Baku, Azerbaijan
Duration: 35 consultancy days
Expected start date: 23 August 2021

1. BACKGROUND

Between 2017 and 2021, UNDP supported a number of mine action projects and activities in collaboration with ANAMA. This document outlines a consultancy for the evaluation of two of them:

• Unexploded Ordnance clearance rapid response (2020–2021)

I. Unexploded Ordnance clearance rapid response (2020–2021)

Humanitarian mine action allows affected communities safe access to basic services including schools and health services, and other socio-economic infrastructure to reduce their dependency on humanitarian aid and restart livelihoods. This CERF funding focuses on assisting and working with ANAMA to ensure a safe environment for the rehabilitation and reconstruction of physical infrastructure in the areas situated along the LoC. The survey and clearance of ERW in areas shelled during the recent armed hostilities will reduce the vulnerability of IDP returnee communities including in residential compounds. The project aims at identifying and destroying UXO and other explosive devices in conflict-affected residential areas, health and educational facilities, agricultural fields, farms, factory yards, roadsides, forests and other parts of infrastructure, based on United Nations humanitarian assessment and government priorities. The project covers the technical survey (identification of the location of explosive devices), removal and destruction of found UXO and other explosive devices. In addition, the project will provide EORE to affected communities to reduce the likelihood of accident occurring.
The objective of the action
Ensure a safe living environment, and rehabilitation and reconstruction of physical infrastructure in the areas situated along the LoC.

This is to be achieved through the delivery of outputs and activities under two results:

Result 1: EOD Clearance: Emergency Response Teams are trained, equipped and deployed
- Procurement of personal protection equipment and mine detectors
- Transportation/lodging/food/DSA
- Salaries for emergency response teams.

Result 2: EORE risk education
- EORE provided to affected communities
- EORE training sessions undertaken in schools and related institutions
- Distribution of warning and educational material booklets for adults and children.


The history of cooperation between UNDP and ANAMA dates back to 1999 with the first phase of Azerbaijan Mine Action Programme. The current project document represents Phase V.

The objectives of the action are as follows:

The immediate objective of the current phase is to continue to support ANAMA for a period of three more years (2017–2019) in its formation of a fully sustainable national institution capable of overseeing all aspects of mine/UXO action programme. The project aims to support ANAMA's institutional capacity. UNDP’s short-term strategy is to continue to provide ANAMA with technical, advisory, financial, networking and promotional support so that it can sustain and further develop its capacity. UNDP’s areas of interest, in terms of building ANAMA’s institutional capacity, should focus on its ability to effectively undertake the following tasks: mine/UXO clearance, international networking and support to other mine-affected countries. The project will also consider undertaking any possible actions required to continue the transformation of ANAMA into an International Centre for Mine Action.

This will be achieved through the delivery of outputs and activities under 5 core results:

Result 1. Mine clearance operations are prioritized and continued to maximize socio-economic impact
Under this activity, improvements in physical capital will be achieved through:
- clearance of land suitable for Irrigation systems
- clearance of land for road construction
- clearance of land for water and sanitation systems: more households with access to safe water sources;
- clearance of land for resettlement of IDPs according to government priorities.

Result 2. Unexploded ordinance clearance operations are sustained to ensure safe livelihoods for population living close to contaminated land
This activity will help clear **explosive remnants** of bombs, shells, grenades, cluster munition, etc. that did not explode when employed and still pose a risk of detonation, at times many decades after they were used or discarded. This will be achieved through:

- clearance of UXOs in former munition stores left over from the Soviet Army;
- house clearance operations for communities and individuals that are most affected by UXO.

**Result 3. Networking and certification support is provided to further promote ANAMA as an International Mine Action Centre**

This will be achieved through:

- an international conference on mine action organized in Azerbaijan for potential service recipients to become familiar with the current ANAMA premises, facilities and training capacity;
- an assessment mission organized for the ANAMA’s certification to enable it to participate in UNMAS projects worldwide;
- support in mine clearance and training provided to other mine-affected countries.

**Result 4. Infrastructure for maintenance and implementation of the demining operations and UXO clearance is upgraded**

This will be achieved through:

- the procurement of relevant equipment.

**Result 5. A gender-sensitive approach on mine action is introduced**

This will be achieved through:

- training of trainers (ToT) training for ANAMA staff to create a pool of trainers on the gender-sensitive approach to working with affected populations;
- development of a training manual for ToT to be used by ANAMA staff for future training.

2. SCOPE OF WORK, RESPONSIBILITIES AND DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED WORK

The final evaluation will assess progress towards the achievement of the two project objectives and outcomes as specified in the project proposals.

The evaluation must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information.

The evaluator is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach ensuring close engagement with the UNDP Country Office, the project team, the government counterpart (ANAMA) and other key stakeholders.

The evaluation report should describe the full evaluation approach taken and the rationale for its approach.
The scope of the final evaluation will cover all activities undertaken within the project framework of as presented in the proposals. The evaluator will compare planned outputs of the project to actual outputs and assess the actual results to determine their contribution to the attainment of the project objective.

UNDP may continue to support EORE and mobile EOD teams in the future. The recommendation section of the evaluation should pay special attention to better inform such future activities in order to draw on good practices and provide direction to inform continued mobile EOD or EORE work.

3. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND GUIDING QUESTIONS

The evaluation will follow the four OECD-DAC evaluation criteria - Relevance, Effectiveness, Efficiency, and Sustainability. Impact, and Gender Equality will be added as cross-cutting criteria. The guiding questions outlined below should be further refined by the evaluator and agreed with UNDP.

4. EXPECTED OUTPUTS AND DELIVERABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Evaluation questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Relevance      | How relevant were the overall design and approaches of the project?  
                  • To what extent was the project able to address the needs of the target groups in the changed context?  
                  • To what extent are the objectives of the project design (inputs, activities, outputs and their indicators) and its theory of change logical and coherent? Does the project contribute to the outcome and output of the country programme document?  
                  • To what extent has the project been able to adapt to the needs of the different target groups (including tackling the gender equality and social inclusion aspects)? |
| Effectiveness   | To what extent were the project activities delivered effectively in terms of quality, quantity and timeline?  
                  • What factors have contributed to achieving or not achieving the intended outputs?  
                  • What were the lessons learned and feedback and how were they incorporated in the subsequent process of planning and implementation?  
                  • How effective has the project been in enhancing the capacities of the communities and the Government to create an enabling environment for the response?  
                  • To what extent were the project interventions effective? |
| Efficiency      | How efficiently were the human, material, and financial resources used to achieve the above results in a timely manner?  
                  • To what extent was the project management structure appropriate and efficient in generating the expected results?  
                  • To what extent has the project implementation strategy and its execution been efficient and cost-effective? |
### Criteria Evaluation questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- To what extent did the project interventions contribute towards sustaining</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the results achieved by the project?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What are the plans or approaches of the Government to ensure that the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>initiatives will be continued after the project ends?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Identify the potential new areas of work and innovative measures for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sustaining the results?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- To what extent have lessons learned been continually documented by the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>project to inform it for any necessary change?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- What efforts could be made to strengthen existing strategies and project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sustainability?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- To what extent do the project initiatives indicate that intended impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>will be achieved in the future?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender equality and social inclusion</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- To what extent was the project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approach effective in promoting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender equality and social</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inclusion, particularly focusing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on the marginalized and the poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>through technology transfer,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reconstruction action, planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and training?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- To what extent has the project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promoted positive changes of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>women and marginalized groups?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were there any unintended effects?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Deliversable Description Timing Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Deliveraable</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Inception report</td>
<td>Evaluator will review the available documentation and will provide a working plan for the evaluation</td>
<td>No later than 2 weeks before the evaluation</td>
<td>Evaluator submits it to the UNDP Country Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Evaluation conducted</td>
<td>Meetings, interviews and presentation of initial findings</td>
<td>End of the data gathering</td>
<td>Evaluator submits it to project management and the UNDP Country Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Draft final Report</td>
<td>Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes</td>
<td>Within 2 weeks of the data gathering phase of the evaluation</td>
<td>It is sent to the UNDP Country Office, reviewed by Project Coordinating Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Final report*</td>
<td>Revised report with audit trail detailing how all of the received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final review report</td>
<td>Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft</td>
<td>It is sent to the UNDP Country Office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.1. Methodology

The evaluation will be guided by the updated UNDP evaluation guidelines on its global practices. It is expected that the evaluator will conduct an extensive project-related document review, based on which a draft work plan is prepared with detailed evaluation methodology proposed such as qualitative/quantitative/mixed methods. At the next stage, the evaluator should conduct a field assessment applying methodologies as per the inception report. It is expected that the evaluator will organize a validation/debriefing meeting with relevant key government counterparts and UNDP to test the assumptions, findings and recommendations, covering achievement and experiences, challenges and lessons, as well as any improvement for its continuation and/or replication.

- UNDP CERF Proposal, 22 January 2021
- Project Document, 15 February 2021
- Project-related financial reports
- The Humanitarian Aid Department of the European Commission (ECHO) project documentation concerning EOD teams (2021–2023).

The following documents will also be available:
- Programme and Operations Policies and Procedures
- UNDP country/countries programme document(s)
- Minutes of any relevant meetings.

5. EVALUATOR ETHICS

Evaluations in UNDP will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the United Nations Evaluation Group’s (UNEG) ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’.

This evaluation will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG ‘Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation’. The evaluator must safeguard the rights and confidentiality of information providers, interviewees and stakeholders through measures to ensure compliance with legal and other relevant codes governing collection and reporting on their data. The evaluator must also ensure security of collected information before and after the evaluation and protocols to ensure anonymity and confidentiality of sources of information where expected. The information knowledge and data gathered in the evaluation process must also be solely used for the evaluation and not for other uses with the express authorization of UNDP and partners.

The evaluator is expected to read carefully, understand and sign the Code of Conduct for Evaluators in the United Nations System, which may be attached to the evaluation report.

6. INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENT

- UNDP ensures the participation of key stakeholders and beneficiaries through meetings, discussions and the sharing of evaluation report.
- The UNDP Evaluation Owner (Resident Representative/Deputy Resident Representative) as advisory body will provide a sounding board for the international evaluator while protecting his/her independence, and will ensure UNDP’s ownership of the report’s findings and recommendations.
- The UNDP Country Office will support the conduct of the evaluation, including the provision of feedback to the inception report, participation in the validation meeting, provision and coordination for comments on the draft report, distribution of the final report, and initiation of the recommendations’ implementation.
• The UNDP Country Office will be responsible for facilitating the provision of the available data/documents to the international evaluator and field data collection, including preparation of field assessment schedules and logistic coordination.
• Detailed arrangements including service days and schedule of payments will be defined in UNDP’s contract with the recruited Individual Consultant.
• The UNDP Evaluation Commissioner/Owner will approve the final evaluation report.

7. GENERIC GUIDELINES ON CONTENTS FOR THE EVALUATION REPORT

i. Basic Report Information (for opening page or title page)
   • Title of UNDP-supported project
   • UNDP project ID#
   • Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report
   • Geographic areas included in the project
   • Executing Agency/Implementing Partner and other project partners
   • Acknowledgments

ii. Table of Contents

iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations

1. Executive Summary (2–3 pages)
   • Project Information Table
   • Project Description
   • Project Summary (200–500 words)
   • Evaluation Ratings and Achievement Summary Table
   • A concise summary of conclusions
   • Recommendation Summary Table

2. Introduction (1–2 pages)
   • Purpose of the Evaluation and objectives
   • Structure of the Evaluation Report

3. Project Description and Background (2–5 pages)
   • Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope
   • Project link to national priorities, UNSDCF priorities, and other programme and country-specific plans
   • Problems that the project sought to address: threats and barriers targeted
   • Project Description and Strategy: objective, outcomes and expected results, description of field sites and context
   • Project Implementation Arrangements: Short description of the Project Board, key implementing partner arrangements, etc.
   • Project timing and milestones
   • Main stakeholders: summary list.

4. Evaluation approach
   • Scope and methodology: principles of design and execution of the evaluation, evaluation approach and data collection methods, limitations to the final evaluation

5. Findings (max. 10 pages)
5.1 Project Strategy
   • Project Design
   • Results Framework/Logframe

25 The report length should not exceed 60 pages in total (not including annexes).
## 5.2 Progress Towards Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project strategy</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Baseline level</th>
<th>End-of-project target</th>
<th>Achievement rating</th>
<th>Traffic light indicator</th>
<th>Justification for rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### I. Unexploded Ordnance clearance rapid response (2020–2021)

**Objective:** Ensure a safe living environment and rehabilitation and reconstruction of physical infrastructure in the areas situated along the Line of Contact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output 1</th>
<th>Indicator 1.1a EOD clearance</th>
<th>Baseline level</th>
<th>End-of-project target</th>
<th>Achievement rating</th>
<th>Traffic light indicator</th>
<th>Justification for rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>558 million m²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator 1.1b UXO/mine</td>
<td>820,726</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator 1.2 Procurement of PPE and mine detectors</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indicator 1.3: Number of people who have received explosive ordnance risk education</td>
<td>130,826</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Output 1**

**Strengthening the Mine Action Programme in Azerbaijan and Promotion of ANAMA as an International Centre for Mine Action.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator 1.1</th>
<th>Baseline level</th>
<th>End-of-project target</th>
<th>Achievement rating</th>
<th>Traffic light indicator</th>
<th>Justification for rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 1.1</td>
<td>448 million m²</td>
<td>523 million m²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 1.2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 1.3</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table #: Progress Towards Results Matrix (achievement of outcomes against targets)

Notes:
1. Populate with data from the Logframe and scorecards.
2. Populate with data from the Project Document.
3. Use the 6-point Progress towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU.
4. Colour code this column only. Green=achieved; yellow=on target to be achieved; red= not on target to be achieved.

5.2 Progress towards results
• Progress towards outcomes analysis
• Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective

5.3 Project Implementation and Adaptive Management
• Management arrangements
• Work planning
• Finance and co-finance
• Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems
• Stakeholder engagement
• Reporting
• Communications

5.4 Sustainability
• Financial risks to sustainability
• Socio-economic to sustainability
• Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability
• Environmental risks to sustainability

6. Conclusions and Recommendations (3–5 pages)

6.1 Conclusions
• Comprehensive and balanced statements (i.e. evidence-based and connected to the evaluation findings), which highlight the project’s strengths, weaknesses and results.

6.2 Recommendations
• Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project
• Actions to follow-up or reinforce initial benefits from the project
• Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives.
• Specific recommendations that would promote efficiency and effectiveness of a possible follow-on project of two mobile EOD and marking teams operating over a 24-month period (see the ECHO Project Proposal).

The evaluator should make no more than a total of 15 recommendations.

7. Annexes

A. Project Evaluation Terms of Reference
B. Evaluative matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
C. Evaluation ratings
D. Signed UNEG Code of Conduct Form
E. Signed evaluation report clearance form
F. List of individuals or groups interviewed or consulted, and sites visited
G. List of supporting documents reviewed
### ANNEX A. Project Evaluation ToR

### ANNEX B. Evaluative Matrix Template

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluative Questions</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results?</td>
<td>(include evaluative question[s])</td>
<td>(i.e. relationships established, level of coherence between project design and implementation approach, specific activities conducted, quality of risk mitigation strategies, etc.)</td>
<td>(i.e. project documents, national policies or strategies, websites, project staff, project partners, data collected throughout the evaluation mission, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progress towards results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project implementation and adaptive management: Has the project been implemented efficiently, cost-effectively, and been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and project communications supporting the project’s implementation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ANNEX C. Evaluation Ratings

### Ratings for progress towards results: (one rating for each outcome and for the objective)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Highly Satisfactory (HS)</td>
<td>The objective/outcome is expected to achieve or exceed all its end-of-project targets, without major shortcomings. The progress towards the objective/outcome can be presented as ‘good practice’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Satisfactory (S)</td>
<td>The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets, with only minor shortcomings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</td>
<td>The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets but with significant shortcomings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Moderately Unsatisfactory (HU)</td>
<td>The objective/outcome is expected to achieve its end-of-project targets with major shortcomings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory (U)</td>
<td>The objective/outcome is expected not to achieve most of its end-of-project targets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)</td>
<td>The objective/outcome has failed to achieve its midterm targets, and is not expected to achieve any of its end-of-project targets.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ratings for project implementation and adaptive management: (one overall rating)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Highly Satisfactory (HS)</td>
<td>Implementation of all seven components – management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, and communications – is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management. The project can be presented as ‘good practice’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Satisfactory (S)</td>
<td>Implementation of most of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management except for only a few that are subject to remedial action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Moderately Satisfactory (MS)</td>
<td>Implementation of some of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management, with some components requiring remedial action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)</td>
<td>Implementation of some of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management, with most components requiring remedial action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory (U)</td>
<td>Implementation of most of the seven components is not leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)</td>
<td>Implementation of none of the seven components is leading to efficient and effective project implementation and adaptive management.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluators/Consultants:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.

2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.

3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people’s right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people’s right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.

4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.

5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs, and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that the evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders’ dignity and self-worth.

6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study limitations, findings and recommendations.

7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

---

**ANNEX D: UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants**

Evaluators/Consultants:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.

2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.

3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people’s right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people’s right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.

4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.

5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs, and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that the evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders’ dignity and self-worth.

6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study limitations, findings and recommendations.

7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

---

**Ratings for Sustainability: (one overall rating)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Likely (L)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes on track to be achieved by the project’s closure and expected to continue into the foreseeable future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Moderately Likely (ML)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained due to the progress towards results on outcomes at the Midterm Review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Moderately Unlikely (MU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Significant risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unlikely (U)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Severe risks that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluation Consultant Agreement Form
Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the United Nations System:

Name of Consultant: __________ Emil Hasanov ________________________________

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _______NA__________________________

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

Signed at _____Baku, The Republic of Azerbaijan_______(Place) on 29.04.2022

Signature: _________________________ Emil Hasanov

ANNEX E: Report Clearance Form

Final Evaluation Report Reviewed and Cleared By:

Commissioning Unit

Name: Charu Bist ____________________

Signature: ___________________________ Charu Bist _____________________ Date: 29.04.2022

UNDP Programme Adviser

Name: Shamil Rzayev ____________________

Signature: ___________________________ Shamil Rzayev _____________________ Date: 29.04.2022
<table>
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<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Name</th>
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</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Samira Khalilova</td>
<td>Finance Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nijat Karimov</td>
<td>Head of the Planning and International Relations Department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ramil Azizov</td>
<td>Head of the EORE Department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Murad Rahimov</td>
<td>Head of the Information Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shamil Yagizarov</td>
<td>Senior Information Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sabina Srkarova</td>
<td>Senior Press and Public Relations Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Idris Ismayilov</td>
<td>Head of the Survey and Clearance Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEPF</td>
<td>Umud Mirzayev</td>
<td>Chairman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan Campaign to Ban Landmines</td>
<td>Hafiz Safikhanov</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>