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**Introduction**

This Inception Report is developed in response to the requirements outlined in the Terms of Reference (ToR) of International and National Consultants for Evaluation of the "Youth for Social Harmony in the Fergana Valley" Project (the Project).

The report outlines the main purpose of, approaches to, and key deliverables of the final evaluation exercise. It describes the methodology that will be employed for the measurement of main evaluation questions and objectives, which are built based on the OECD Development Assistance Committee evaluation criteria (such as **relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability, and ownership**), amended with Project and context-specific dimensions (such as **coherence and conflict-sensitivity catalytic, gender-responsive/gender-sensitive, risk-tolerance and innovation**). Specifically, below are listed the evaluation objectives as defined by the ToR:

* Assess the relevance and appropriateness of the Project in terms of 1) addressing key drivers of conflict and the most relevant peacebuilding issues; 2) whether the Project responded efficiently to the needs of the actual stakeholders and beneficiaries, the youth or the affected communities in the Fergana Valley; 3) whether the Project capitalized on the UN's added value in Uzbekistan, 4) the degree to which the Project addressed cross-cutting issues such as conflict and gender-sensitivity in Uzbekistan; 5) the extent of the Project financial and/or programmatic catalytic effects;
* Assess to what extent the PBF Project has made a concrete contribution to reducing a conflict factor in Uzbekistan. With respect to PBF's contribution, the evaluation may evaluate whether the Project helped advance the achievement of the SDGs, and in particular, SDG 16;
* Evaluate the Project's efficiency, including its implementation strategy, institutional arrangements as well as its management and operational systems, and value for money;
* Assess whether the support provided by the PBF has promoted the Women, Peace, and Security agenda (WPS), allowed a specific focus on women's participation in peacebuilding processes, and whether it was accountable for gender equality;
* Assess whether the Project has been implemented through a conflict-sensitive approach;
* Document good practices, innovations, and lessons emerging from the Project;
* Provide actionable recommendations for future programming.

According to the ToR, the evaluation exercise will look into both processes applied during the Project implementation and the project results. Such a comprehensive approach will allow drawing a critical opinion of the Theory of Change on the grounds of the Project structure, its objectives, and targets. It will allow analyzing if the conditionalities considered in the Project design have held and if the risks and assumptions identified at the design stage were accurate and if those were properly managed throughout the Project implementation process. Another product of this analysis will be a list of recommendations that might be useful for designing the next phases of similar programming in Uzbekistan and elsewhere.

To the extent possible, the evaluation exercise will try to analyze the level of "up-to-date" approaches utilized during the Project implementation, especially in the light of the unique imperatives of recent years, such as COVID-19.
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### Acronyms

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **AIQGO** | Academic Institution and Quasi-Governmental Organization |
| **CGP** | Central Government Partner |
| **COVID 19** | Coronavirus Disease 2019 |
| **EA** | Evaluation Assistant |
| **EC** | Evaluation Consultant |
| **ET** | Evaluation Team |
| **ETL** | Evaluation Team Leader |
| **KI** | Key Informant |
| **KII** | Key Informant Interview |
| **LG** | Local Government |
| **LGP** | Local Government Partner |
| **NAEMM** | National Association of Electronic Mass Media |
| **NGO** | Non-Governmental Organization |
| **OECD** | The Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development |
| **PIMS** | Project Information Management System |
| **Project** | "Youth for Social Harmony in the Fergana Valley" Project |
| **PT** | Project Team |
| **SDG** | Sustainable Development Goals |
| **SMG** | Small Medium Grant |
| **ToR** | Terms of Reference |
| **UN PBF** | The United Nations Peace Building Fund |
| **UNDP** | The United Nations Development Program |
| **UNESCO** | The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization |
| **UNODC** | The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime |

### Project Background

The Project aims to support communities to better adapt to the rapid reform process in Uzbekistan while enabling local service providers to deliver the reform agenda inclusively. The Project specifically targets young women and men in the Ferghana Valley. They disproportionately bear the brunt of Uzbekistan's socioeconomic challenges and may perceive that they are left behind in the ongoing transformation. The political and economic transformation comes against the backdrop of a significant demographic shift, with the number of young people below the age of 30 now comprising 56% of society.[[1]](#footnote-2) At the same time, young people in Uzbekistan experience differentiated levels of political, social, and economic inclusion, which is also impacted by the ongoing transformation.

The geographic choice of the Project is conditioned by the fact that young women and men in the Ferghana Valley face distinct political, social, and economic challenges that the transformation may impact. The fertile valley is shared between Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, and Kyrgyzstan, often featuring densely populated and multi-ethnic settlements. The valley has witnessed disputes across communities and countries[[2]](#footnote-3) and faced challenges emanating from violent extremist groups that emerged in the immediate post-independence period.[[3]](#footnote-4) Additionally, Fergana was ranked the fourth highest-ranking area regarding crimes per 100.000 people. Namangan and Andijan fared a little bit better in comparison. However, the three regions ranked in the top 5 in terms of the proportion of juvenile criminal offenses.[[4]](#footnote-5) Working-level consultations with counterparts, such as the Ministry of Public Education, revealed a concern with juvenile delinquency and anti-social behavior patterns, such as school bullying.

This initiative aligns with national priorities. The Government of Uzbekistan has recently adopted the decree on "On measures to implement the national goals and objectives in sustainable development for the period until 2030". The Five-Area Development Strategy for 2017-2021, noted to be largely in line with the SDGs, prioritizes a number of areas pertaining to the proposed PBF intervention, including Priority Area 5.1 on security, religious tolerance, and inter-ethnic harmony, Priority Area 4.5 on improving the state youth policy, Priority Area 4.2 on improving the social security system and health care, enhancing the socio-political activity of women, Priority Area 1.3 on improving the public management system, and Priority Area 2.4 on improving the system for fighting crime and crime prevention, which emphasizes the importance of improving the legal culture and legal awareness of the population, organizing effective cooperation between government bodies and civil society institutions, the mass media in this field, as well as priority areas 2.2 on providing guarantees to the protection of rights and freedoms of citizens, and 2.5 on strengthening the rule of law in the judicial system.

Major structural reforms touching all political, economic, and social spheres are being introduced for the first time after 27 years of tightly centralized governance. The public has welcomed the reform process. Diplomatic relations between Uzbekistan and its neighbors have improved positively, impacting interethnic relations in border areas. In the long run, these reforms can provide the bedrock for new job creation and national prosperity on the economic front and a more inclusive means of governance on the political front underpinned by the rule of law and equal access to justice.

In the short run, however, some of the forthcoming reforms may create socio-economic challenges, such as increasing prices of consumption goods and the inability to adapt to changing legal and regulatory frameworks, which might hamper the positive trajectory of the reform agenda. If members of the community, particularly young people, do not perceive that the reforms are producing equal opportunities for all, and if there are not sufficient mechanisms to ensure that communities can raise their concerns with local officials and engage in dialogue about decisions that influence their lives, then this may reduce their optimism towards the ongoing reform process. Similarly, if local service providers are not equipped with skills, approaches, and tools to ensure that reforms are delivered inclusive and with adherence to the rule of law, these challenges may be exacerbated further.

Recent reforms undertaken to liberalize the economy, modernize the banking system (including liberalization of the currency exchange rate), and attract foreign investment, have led to a significant devaluation of the Uzbek sum against the dollar,[[5]](#footnote-6) with a visible impact on people’s purchasing power.[[6]](#footnote-7) Consumer prices increased by 17.7% in 2018, and the inflation rate was marked at 13.2%, driven primarily by sharp increases in food prices as high as 20%.[[7]](#footnote-8)

While trust towards the reform agenda spearheaded by the Office of the President remains high, with upwards of 90% optimism across all socio-economic and urban/rural segments towards the country’s economic future and almost universal confidence that the country is on the right track on social, political, and economic issues according to World Bank findings,[[8]](#footnote-9) the economic challenges experienced over the last year have, nevertheless, resulted in sizeable portions of the population reporting worsening financial conditions, lack of optimism for the future and life dissatisfaction, with risks increasing at the bottom, especially among those that are poorer, receiving social benefits, worried about jobs and living in urban areas.[[9]](#footnote-10)

There is a risk that the pace and depth of reforms implemented by the government of Uzbekistan will not match the demographic change and expectations of young people, who make up 56% of the population. To absorb these cohorts of young people, the government needs to carry out qualitative change in the investment climate, business environment, and competitiveness of the economy on the global market. As the conditions of every community are different, some communities and regions may be in a better position to adapt to the changes brought by the reform process in a manner inclusive of the needs of young people, whereas others may not be able to experience the direct benefits of the reforms immediately. Especially if public services are not delivered inclusively and transparently, young people in these communities may experience a sense of injustice or believe that they do not have the opportunity to self-fulfillment and contribute to society.

Similarly, while the reforms create conditions for enhanced dialogue in the public space, combatting corruption and better human rights practices, it is important to provide support to decision-makers - particularly local administrations – to implement their functions in line with universal human rights standards and the rule of law. Important initiatives to change the working methods of the police have been launched. Those initiatives require further support to promote community policing rather than approaches that are not sensitive to the population's needs or not compliant with human rights standards and the rule of law.[[10]](#footnote-11) There are currently 3,900 registered lawyers in the country, mostly based in Tashkent. Lawyers outside of the capital may not have the adequate numbers and capacity to assist citizens with their issues,[[11]](#footnote-12) which may create additional challenges in light of rapidly changing legal and regulatory frameworks as part of the reform process. Improving access to justice and ensuring that the implementation of reforms is inclusive and responsive to the population's needs in its diversity would help strengthen the social cohesion and harmony of the country and improve trust and confidence in the reform process.

At a time when the reforms are creating visible socio-economic change in the short term, the country’s social protection system remains both fragmented and inefficient. Moreover, the state budget is experiencing increased pressure on the fulfillment of social obligations, such as a 20% increase in the number of recipients of social benefits in the 2019 fiscal year and a 4.5 fold increase in the number of social support allowances, financial assistance, and benefits, emanating from both the increasing number of recipients, the increase in the amount of child support assistance, as well as compensation for increases in flour and bread prices, in addition to further increasing expenditures on promoting employment, supporting youth and women.[[12]](#footnote-13)

As the reform process unfolds, the importance of and need for social protection and protection of human rights increases. While the “development of the social sphere” has been identified among the government’s priorities for 2017-2021, the country lacks an effective and responsive social service system and workforce. Welcome government initiatives to ensure citizen inclusion, engagement, and redress, such as public and virtual receptions established by the President as part of his Year of Dialogue with the People initiative, have resulted in an average of 100.000 inquiries per month.[[13]](#footnote-14) The current complaints system includes traditional paper-based as well as online applications for high-level public officials (including the President and Prime Minister). Ministries and agencies operate hotlines. There are many examples of positive decisions. However, the current system cannot effectively respond to a large number of applications due to a lack of capacity. This may result in solutions that do not fully satisfy the applicant's demands in a just and timely manner. The low level of legal literacy and awareness among segments of the population and particularly young people, also creates additional challenges, such as complaints addressed to the incorrect State bodies or without sufficient legal basis, which results in both people’s concerns not being resolved and create an additional burden on the legal system. Furthermore, there haven’t been sufficient communication and feedback mechanisms to enable young people to communicate better with law enforcement and ensure better access to justice.

This Project builds on the premise that in light of the government's political and economic reforms and increased willingness to engage with the international community a) supporting community resilience by empowering youth as actors of positive change, b) assisting the ability of the government to build and deliver reform and services inclusively, and c) creating platforms between youth and local administrations that allow meaningful participation in decision making at this critical juncture will help strengthen social cohesion and sustain peace through increasing horizontal and vertical trust. This will help ensure that no one is left behind in the reform processes in the long run by facilitating service delivery and development policy informed by local needs and priorities and implemented fairly and transparently.

The Project builds on the following Theory of Change:

* **IF** young people from diverse backgrounds are equipped with key competencies and opportunities to constructively participate in community life and act as key agents of change;
* **IF** young people have increased access to skills and knowledge that foster their employability and entrepreneurship and positively influence attitudes to prevent anti-social behavior;
* **IF** cooperation platforms are created between young people and local administrations and inclusive public service delivery is improved;
* **AND IF d**uty bearers have the skills and approaches necessary to address the needs of vulnerable youth based on the rule of law and a fair and humane justice system;
* **THEN** cooperation and trust between young people and the national and local government are strengthened in support of the national reform agenda, and **THEN** youth will have an increased ability to influence their conditions, a sense of belonging to their communities, and confidence in the government/public services and **THEN** dialogue mechanisms at the community level will be enhanced allowing young people entry points to act as decision-makers in their communities and apply their skills to make their communities more resilient to conflict and sustain peace;
* **BECAUSE** the potential of youth for constructive engagement in political, economic, and social life will be harnessed, **and** young people will have the opportunity to act as positive change agents in a period of key societal and economic transformation, thereby strengthening social cohesion by leaving no one behind and ensuring a more equitable distribution of reform benefits.

This theory of change is then put into the logical framework/results chain, which outlines the main outcome and outputs that the Project intended to achieve as per the original design (see Annex 1).

### Evaluation Approach and Methodology

The Evaluation Team has defined several key elements of the evaluation approach.

### Utilization-focused approach

The evaluation will be based on a consultative and iterative approach, which aims to increase: a) Team's collaboration with UNDP to clarify the expectations and objectives of the evaluation; and b) the relevance and inclusion of recommendations by stakeholders.

Due consideration has been made for this in the choice of data collection methods and a sample of stakeholders in the evaluation.

### 

### Participatory approach

The evaluation will also be participatory and allow key stakeholders (UNDP, UNODC, UNESCO, and UN PBF) to provide input in the evaluation design and reflect and validate the findings emerging from the data collection. To achieve this, the Evaluation Team will consult UNDP and the Project Team throughout the process and present information clearly and concisely. The Evaluation Team will also ensure that it has understood the information imparted by participants through probing and additional questions if necessary and summarizing the points made during the interviews to validate the information. Participants in the evaluation will be invited to provide additional information as they feel relevant to the evaluation. Ensuring the participation of evaluation participants is not only a matter of ethics but also of utility, as it fosters the appropriation and buy-in of findings, conclusions, and recommendations among stakeholders.

### 

### Hybrid approach

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic and associated difficulties for international travel, the evaluation will be conducted using a hybrid approach. The inception and report writing stages will be delivered remotely, while during the KII stage, the Evaluation Team will be based in Uzbekistan. Stakeholders and beneficiaries to be interviewed will be divided among the Evaluation Team members.

### Combined approach

The methodology to be employed by the Evaluation Team combines methods of both primary and secondary data collection, review, and analysis. This will ensure comprehensive understanding and examination of the Project and allow multi-dimensional findings to the evaluation questions. In addition, qualitative and quantitative methods will be employed that will enable a more effective triangulation of data generated through various sources and informants.

### Methodology

The Evaluation Team has thoroughly analyzed the evaluation questions outlined in the ToR (see Annex 2) and the indicators set in the Results Framework. Based on this analysis, the evaluation methodology has been designed that reflects upon the Theory of Change and Results Framework and the key evaluation dimensions as per the OECD Development Assistance Committee guidelines.

For ease of analysis and reference in the final evaluation report, the evaluation questions are grouped into specific indicators as per the main dimensions of relevance, effectiveness (including indicators from the Results Framework), efficiency, sustainability and ownership, and coherence. The additional evaluation criteria outlined in the ToR, which are conflict-sensitivity, catalytic, gender-responsiveness/gender-sensitivity, risk tolerance, and innovation, are merged and inter-woven into the instruments designed for the main evaluation dimensions.

As for the effectiveness and efficiency indicators, the intentional focus will be drawn on the fact that the Project was implemented in the conditions of the COVID-19 pandemic, which greatly limited the mobility of the Project Team and activity. In that regard, the Evaluation Team intends to analyze the ad hoc systems and mechanisms employed to implement the Project successfully.

To ensure the quality of the evaluation process, the Evaluation Team developed an evaluation matrix, which provides a comprehensive and detailed outline of data sources and data collection methods for each evaluation question (see Annex 5). Data will be collected from secondary and primary data sources.

**Secondary data sources**

The secondary data sources include:

* Project design document,
* Programmatic reports,
* Financial reports,
* Research papers,
* UNDP country and regional reports,
* Government-approved country/sectoral development strategies,
* Reports developed by donor partners.

**Primary data sources**

The Project beneficiaries are conditionally divided into two main groups: direct (final) and indirect beneficiaries. Direct or final beneficiaries are the young men and women in Fergana Valley, who were directly targeted by the Project under Output 1.1 and Output 1.2. The young people constitute the backbone of communities in the Fergana Valley – the highest level and the most critical grouping of beneficiaries referenced in the expected project impact (as defined by ProDoc). In addition, the project outcome depicts the young people as the main actors of positive change with improved mechanisms to participate equally in the political, economic, and social life of their communities.

The Evaluation Team will reach the final beneficiaries with the survey instrument. Accordingly, a higher number of young men and women supported by the Project will be contacted to assess their opinion on the outputs and outcomes that the Project has generated. Also, this will allow evaluating of the end-of Project value of the Outcome level indicators designed to measure attitude and behavior changes that happened during the Project implementation. However, any attribution or contribution analysis will not be possible given the limited resources and lack of baseline information.

Local administrators, educators, and duty barriers supported/targeted by activities under Output 1.3 and Output 1.4 of the Project are categorized as indirect beneficiaries. These beneficiaries act as conduits for inclusive service delivery for the benefit of young people (final beneficiaries) and the engagement of youth (final beneficiaries) as changemakers, thereby building community resilience.

The indirect beneficiaries will be reached through qualitative methods, primarily through KII. This will enrich the evaluation findings with deeper information, insight, and perspective thinking of how this group of beneficiaries is and will be changing their practice for the benefit of the final beneficiaries.

The proposed data collection approach is also aligned with the availability of contact information for the referenced two groups of beneficiaries. Contact information for individual beneficiaries was made available, primarily for direct beneficiaries (Telegram groups). Meanwhile, the contact information for individuals from indirect beneficiary groups was scarce.

**Qualitative data collection and analysis: KII and direct observations**

Key Informant Interviews (KII) will be conducted with key stakeholders/counterparts of the Project, donor partners, and the UN agencies/Project Team. For that purpose, these actors are divided into respective groups of:

* Central government representatives,
* Local government representatives,
* Academic institutions and quasi-governmental organizations,
* Non-governmental organizations,
* Project Team and donors.

The Evaluation Team developed separate Questionnaires for each major stakeholder group (see Annex 7). First, the KII Questionnaires will be piloted with 4-5 stakeholders (and if needed, updated) to ensure that the questions the Evaluation Team asks are understood by key informants and serve the purpose of the evaluation. Tentatively, a total of 60 KII are planned to be conducted. See Annex 6 for detailed distribution of KII per group of stakeholders. The final number of KII will depend on the availability of KI for the interview. The Team Leader and Local Consultant will spend ten working days each in the field (cumulative level of effort of 20 working days) to ensure the highest possible number of planned KII is conducted, as well as the best quality of data collection, coding, cleaning and further analysis is maintained. The Team Leader will interview KII in Tashkent, primarily, while the Evaluation Consultant will interview the stakeholders in Ferghana[[14]](#footnote-15). Direct beneficiaries will be included in the group of key informants to provide additional nuance by engaging the final beneficiaries of the project in the structured interviewing process. The detailed field visit agendas of the Team Leader and the Evaluation Consultant are presented in Annex 4. Online interviews will be scheduled to accommodate the time requirements of the Key Informants, should some of KI not be reached during the period when the Team Leader and the Local Consultant are not in Uzbekistan for some outstanding reasons (e.g., unavailability of the Government officials during the period of the field stage),

A detailed description of qualitative data collection protocols during KII is outlined in Annex 8. To analyze the data/results of KII, the Evaluation Team will upload summarized interview transcripts in a Microsoft Excel file (see Annex 9), assign codes for major stakeholder groups (CGP, LGP, AIQGO, NGOs, and PT), host regions (Andijan, Namangan, or Ferghana), the scope of interventions (country or regional), data sources, etc. The Evaluation Team will use the codified data entries of KII responses for pattern analysis in the next step.

Direct observations of respective Project outputs will be another source of qualitative data with proper video/photo documentation[[15]](#footnote-16). The Evaluation Team will utilize the following protocols for collecting data during direct observations: taking detailed field notes that were recorded in Evaluators' field notebook; (although typically textual notes), taking photo/video recordings of outreach/awareness-raising documents, other beneficiary-provided documentation, visual confirmation of delivered activities, etc.; expanding those notes within 24 hours; transcribing them into the laptop and grouping them with the archive of written KII notes.

**Quantitative data collection and analysis: survey**

A survey will be conducted with direct beneficiaries of the Project, namely young men and women in the Fergana Valley. To ensure the gender-inclusive and gender-sensitive nature of collected information, special attention will be given to surveying beneficiaries involved in activities that target solely or primarily women. The survey participants will be offered an opportunity to mark their gender in the survey questionnaire, thus enabling the Evaluation Team to embed the gender disaggregation into the survey results.

The survey sample size is a function of the number of direct beneficiaries targeted by respective Project activities. At the moment of finalizing this inception report, the Evaluation Team received incomplete information about the total number of beneficiaries and the availability of contact information for those beneficiaries.

As of April 1, 2022, the Evaluation Team did not have access to the contact information of several beneficiary groups involved in the following activities delivered by the Project: Training for life skill programs, Seven youth initiatives in Fergana Valley, Volunteers, Dialogue with young woman, and Training of Youth Union representatives (see Annex 13). Fragmented and/or incomplete contact information was made available for beneficiaries involved in the other five activities. Due to contact information limitations, the Evaluation Team will utilize the convenience sampling approach during the survey. In inconvenience sampling, the prime consider­ation is accessibility. Only those easily reached by interviewers will be included in the sample.

The survey questionnaire consists of close-ended questions pertaining to the Project's relevance, effectiveness, and sustainability (see Annex 11). The questionnaire will be tested with five beneficiaries in the initial stage to ensure that the surveyees understand the questions and contribute to the evaluation results. The survey questionnaire will be translated into Uzbek and Russian languages to avoid language bias or ensure the engagement of all potential respondents.

Data collection will be conducted via Kobo[[16]](#footnote-17), an open-source data collection platform, by distributing the web link for the questionnaire primarily through Telegram channels/groups emails. The Evaluation Team will upload raw data to a Microsoft Excel file and/or KoBo to analyze the survey data to further analyze and integrate findings into the evaluation report. A detailed description of data collection protocols during the survey is outlined in Annex 10.

**Data triangulation**

To summarize the findings of the primary and secondary data (both qualitative and quantitative) analysis activities, the Evaluation Team will complement key findings of KII questions (complemented by direct observations) with the records of survey and desk review findings (see Annex 12). Triangulation of data generated from both secondary and primary data sources, including KII and survey, will be the final exercise of data analysis. It will be reflected in the evaluation report to illustrate how various data do support or vary within a range of responses.

**Confidentiality and Personal Data Protection**

Once the Project Team provides the contacts of the survey participants, those will immediately be coded as separate entries into an Excel file. The file will then be used to enter the survey results and analysis.

The confidentiality of survey subjects will be protected in full, including the protection of identifying information.

### Evaluation Timeline

The following timeline is suggested as part of this Inception Report (see the table below). The detailed evaluation work plan is presented in Annex 3, while the tentative field visit agenda of the Evaluation Team members – in Annex 4.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Deliverable** | **Timing** | **Responsibilities** |
| 1 | Draft Inception Report | March 28, 2022 | Evaluation Team |
| 2 | Commentary to the Draft Evaluation report | April 4, 2022 | UNDP |
| 3 | Final Evaluation Report | April 11, 2022 | Evaluation Team |
| 4 | Presentation/validation of preliminary findings to relevant in-country stakeholders and PBF | May 23, 2022 | Evaluation Team |
| 5 | Draft Evaluation Report | June 20, 2022 | Evaluation Team |
| 6 | Commentary to the Draft Evaluation report | July 4, 2022 | UNDP |
| 7 | Final Evaluation Report | July 18, 2022 | Evaluation Team |
| 8 | Audit Trail | August 5, 2022 | UNDP, Evaluation Team |

### Limitations

Several limitations should be documented as part of this Inception Report. These limitations should be taken into account to set the right scope of expectations both during the evaluation by the Evaluation Team and after the evaluation – by the client. The main limitations identified at this point are:

* There is no baseline value set at the start of the Project, particularly for the two indicators at the Outcome level, which are formulated to demonstrate perception and attitude change. This fact limits the Evaluation Team's ability to conduct a comparative analysis to demonstrate the pre-and post-intervention situation. However, the evaluation tools (particularly the survey questionnaire) are designed to enable some of this analysis.
* At the time of submission of this report, limited (incomplete amount of) contact information of potential Key Informants (KI) and survey participants was made available to the Evaluation Team.

### Final Evaluation Report Structure

As stipulated by the ToR, the content of the Evaluation Report will include:

1. Title page

* Title of UNDP-supported PBF-financed Project
* UNDP PIMS ID and PBF ID
* Evaluation timeframe and date of final evaluation report
* Region and countries included in the Project
* PBF Focal Area/Strategic Program
* Executing Agency, Implementing partner and other Project partners
* Evaluation Team members

1. Acknowledgments
2. Table of Contents
3. Acronyms and Abbreviations
4. Executive Summary (3-4 pages)

* Project Information Table
* Project Description (brief)
* Evaluation Rating Table
* Concise Summary of findings, conclusions, and lessons learned
* Recommendations' summary table

1. Introduction (2-3 pages)

* Purpose and objective of the evaluation
* Scope
* Methodology
* Data Collection & Analysis
* Ethics
* Limitations to the evaluation
* Structure of the evaluation report

1. Project Description (3-5 pages)

* Project start and duration, including milestones
* Development context: environmental, socioeconomic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the Project objective and scope
* Problems that the Project sought to address, threats and barriers targeted
* Immediate and development objectives of the Project
* Expected results
* Main stakeholders: summary list
* Theory of Change

1. Findings

(in addition to a descriptive assessment, all criteria marked with must be given a rating[[17]](#footnote-18))

4.1 Project Design/Formulation

* Analysis of Results Framework: Project logic and strategy, indicators
* Assumptions and Risks
* Lessons from other relevant Projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into Project design
* Planned stakeholder participation
* Linkages between Project and other interventions within the sector
  1. Project Implementation
* Adaptive management (changes to the Project design and Project outputs during implementation)
* Actual stakeholder participation and partnership arrangements
* Project Finance and Co-finance
* Evaluation: design at entry, implementation, and overall assessment of evaluation
* UNDP implementation/oversight and Implementing Partner execution, overall Project implementation/execution, coordination, and operational issues
* Risk Management, including Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)
  1. Project Results and Impacts
* Progress towards objective and expected outcomes
* Relevance
* Effectiveness
* Efficiency
* Overall Outcome
* Sustainability: financial, socioeconomic, institutional framework and governance, environmental, and overall likelihood
* Country ownership
* Gender equality and women's empowerment
* Cross-cutting Issues
* PBF Additionality
* Catalytic/Replication Effect
* Progress to Impact

1. Main Findings, Conclusions, Recommendations & Lessons

* Main Findings
* Conclusions
* Recommendations
* Lessons Learned

1. Annexes

* Evaluation ToR (excluding ToR annexes)
* Evaluation Mission itinerary, including Summary of field visits
* List of persons interviewed
* List of documents reviewed
* Evaluation Question Matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology)
* The questionnaire used and Summary of results
* Co-financing tables (if not included in the body of the report)
* Evaluation Rating scales
* Signed Evaluation Consultant Agreement form
* Signed UNEG Code of Conduct form
* Annexed in a separate file: Evaluation Audit Trail

### Annex 1. Logical Framework/Results Chain

At the impact level, the Project has defined the following goal: **The reform agenda is able to benefit the communities in the Fergana Valley in an inclusive manner, which improves community resilience and harmony and the ability of the population to benefit from the reforms.** The below objectives were designed to contribute to the impact level change:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcomes and Outputs** | **Performance Indicators** | **Indicator Baseline** | **Targets and Milestones (initial as per Project Document)** |
| **Outcome 1:** Young people can act as actors of positive change and have the mechanisms to ensure inclusive service delivery to build community resilience in a period of political and economic transformation | **Indicator 1.1:** Rate of young people expressing confidence in their self-efficacy, agency, community participation, socioeconomic inclusion and sense of belonging. Share of youth (women and men) considering themselves as citizens who are capable to positively influence the policy of local administrations and responsible for community resilience. | N/A | At least 25% of Project beneficiaries display improvements in attitudes and perceptions 65%. |
| **Indicator 1.2:** Number of official decisions, resolutions of the Fergana region administrations adopted based on proposals of Fergana youth initiatives. | N/A | At least 2 decisions/resolutions of one of the khokimiyats from Fergana region, including 1 based on young women initiative. |
| **Indicator 1.3:** Number of youth initiatives focusing on civic engagement and community development initiated through the Project and sustained beyond the Project lifecycle. The proportion of citizens satisfied by the work, attitude and ethics of public servants of knokimiyats and social protection divisions of three districts of Fergana valley. | N/A | 15 initiatives, at least 5 that are led by young women, are sustained 6 months after the Project termination through local state budgets or other sources of funding. Increment of satisfaction rate increased by 25 percentage points during the Project implementation period. |
| **Indicator 1.4:** Number of meetings/community dialogues/town hall discussions/consultations held between youth and duty bearers without the direct intervention of the Project. | N/A | The Project has created the demand within the community and duty bearers to sustain and utilize dialogue platforms created by the Project without the direct involvement of RUNO engagement. |
| **Output 1.1:** Young people are equipped with capacities and knowledge that foster their civic participation and socioeconomic inclusion | **Indicator 1.1:** Number of public initiatives and Projects regarding most urgent needs of regional development at local level, proposed and promoted by youth for public discussions in mass media. | N/A | 20 initiatives announced or exposed for public discussion. |
| **Indicator 1.1.1:** Number of young women and men who have successfully completed the trainings.  Number of young women and men who have participated in summer camps. | N/A | - 35 young women and 65 young men have successfully completed the trainings.  - Quarterly reports.  - Participant's registry records.  - Photo and video footage of completion event. |
| **Indicator 1.1.2:** Number of youth union representatives who have successfully completed the trainings. | N/A | - 45 women and 75 men from youth unions have successfully completed the trainings.  - Quarterly reports.  - Participants register records.  - Photo and video footage of the completion event. |
| **Indicator 1.1.3:** Number of youth union representatives who have successfully completed the trainings. | N/A | 50 young women and 50 young men have successfully completed the trainings. |
| **Indicator 1.1.4:** Number of small grant Projects received the funding. | N/A | - 10 SM Projects received the funding, including 3 proposed by women.  - 20 SM Projects successfully are accomplished, or launched / provided outputs, including 8 proposed by women. |
| **Indicator 1.1.6:** Endorsed and reproduced Guide for the School leavers "Getting a Job in Uzbekistan and Globally" [GUIDE] (title is subject to change). | N/A | 1. Developed and endorsed GUIDE in Uzbek and Russian languages;  2. Online version of the Guide in Uzbek and Russian languages is functional and hosted by the MoPE; Print versions in Uzbek-5,000 (1 copy per school); and in Russian-1,000. |
| **Indicator 1.1.7:** Number of assessments conducted in Andijan, Fergana and Namangan regions. | 0 | Assessment with 2100 conducted in Andijan, Fergana and Namangan regions. 5 Capacity Building workshops on MIL in Fergana Valley. |
| **Output 1.2:** Young people are provided with opportunities to constructively participate in decision making, socio-political life and act as key agents of change | **Indicator 1.2**: Number of initiatives discussed with local administrations and officials on the round tables organized by local youth activists.  Number of initiatives, discussed via tv or online broadcasted round tables. | N/A | 10 initiatives are discussed on round tables. 5 initiatives are discussed via online or tv broadcasted round tables. |
| **Indicator 1.2.1:** Number of hubs established and operational.  Average monthly number of visitors. | N/A | 3 hubs are established and operational till July 1, 2021. 150 monthly visitors, on average for each hub. |
| **Indicator 1.2.2:** Number of public awareness raising campaigns held on the occasion of UN days. | N/A | At least 6 campaigns held by July 1, 2021. |
| **Indicator 1.2.3:** Number of small grant infrastructural Projects initiated by youth. | N/A | - 60 SMG youth infrastructural Projects received the funding, including 20 proposed by women.  - 60 SMG youth infrastructural Projects successfully are accomplished, or launched / provided outputs, including 20 proposed by women. |
| **Indicator 1.2.4:** Number of civic engagement initiatives initiated by youth. | N/A | At least 20 initiatives, including 30% proposed by women. |
| **Indicator 1.2.5:** Volunteerism is provided with a legal base.  Number of television and online broadcasted round tables and open discussions conducted.  Number of regional volunteer organizations established. | N/A | - Draft legal acts enabling formal launch of volunteers' organizations are prepared and submitted for the attention of national partners.  - Mass-media promotion strategy on volunteerism is developed and adopted by national partners.  - At least 4 television and online broadcasted round tables and open discussions conducted.  - At least 4 promo-video footage is prepared.  - At least 1 regional volunteer organization established. |
| **Output 1.3:** The capacity of local administrators and educators to implement government policies and ensure inclusive public service delivery is improved | **Indicator 1.3:** The rate of successful completion of the trainings delivered to public servants at three districts of Fergana valley. | N/A | Above 75% of training participants-public servants from three districts of Fergana region have successfully completed each of the training courses. |
| **Indicator 1.3.1:** Analytical report elaborated.  Number of surveys, consultations and discussions conducted. | N/A | - Conflict analysis is prepared.  - At least 3 rounds of consultations and expert discussions are conducted.  - At least 2 surveys are conducted (e.g., victimization survey, corruption risk assessment). |
| **Indicator 1.3.2:** Number of schools apply new competency-based school curricula. | N/A | 18 pilot schools. |
| **Indicator 1.3.3:** Number of guides and course materials developed. | N/A | 300 set of teacher training consisting of course materials in digital and hard copies. |
| **Indicator 1.3.4:** Number of policy makers, teachers and educators trained in Andijan, Fergana and Namangan. | N/A | - Andijan – 100;  - Namangan – 100;  - Fergana – 100. |
| **Indicator 1.3.5:** Number of civil servants covered.  Number of government agencies delegated servants for trainings.  Successful training completion rate. | N/A | - At least 300 civil servants are trained.  - At least 20 government agencies delegated servants for training. Over 70% of trainees have successfully completed training programs. All training modules are available online for registered public servants. |
| **Indicator 1.3.6:** Number of young women and men reached by life skills programs. | N/A | At least 450, including 50% young women and girls. |
| **Indicator 1.3.7:** Number of policy papers elaborated.  Number of consultations and discussions conducted.  Whether a draft national plan of action on alignment of public service protocols to human rights standards is developed. | N/A | - At least 1 policy paper elaborated on conflict analysis is prepared.  - At least 3 rounds of consultations and expert discussions are conducted.  - Draft national plan of action is developed. |
| **Output 1.4:** Duty bearers have the skills and approaches necessary to address the needs of vulnerable youth on the basis of rule of law and a fair and humane justice system | **Indicator 1.4.:** Number of participatory and inclusive youth prevention plans developed and implemented. | N/A | At least 6 in 6 pilot municipalities in 3 provinces of Fergana Valley. |
| **Indicator 1.4.1:** Number of participatory consultations held. | N/A | At least 12 in 6 pilot municipalities. |
| **Indicator 1.4.2:** Number of police officers trained. | N/A | Number of police officers trained. |
| **Indicator 1.4.3:** Number of communication and feedback mechanisms targeting youth created. | N/A | At least 2. |
| **Indicator 1.4.4:** Number of lawyers trained to provide legal support to young women and men. | N/A | At least 60 from 3 provinces of Fergana Valley. |
| **Indicator 1.4.5:** Number of information materials disseminated. | N/A | At least 3000 copies of brochures and leaflets disseminated. |
| **Indicator 1.4.6:** Number of prosecutors trained to strengthen their communication skills, effectiveness and transparency in handling complaints and grievances of young women and men in targeted areas. | N/A | At least 60 from 3 provinces of Fergana Valley. |
| **Indicator 1.4.7 (1):** October 1, 2020 Training program developed January 1, 2021 Training conducted. | N/A | At least 12 initiatives (2 per plan in 6 municipalities and/or broader policy level initiatives on human rights and anti-corruption in the Fergana Valley). |
| **Indicator 1.4.7 (2)**: Number of practical guides developed on preventing corruption in the education system of Fergana valley (continuum of indicator 1.3.1.2. | 0 | 1 guide in Uzbek language. |
| **Indicator 1.4.7 (3)**: UNESCO- number of trained key stakeholders on anti-corruption policies and practices in the education system of Fergana valley (continuum of indicator 1.3.1(2)). | 0 | - 30 persons (key stakeholders). |

### Annex 2. Evaluation Questions as per the ToR

The evaluation will take into account criteria such as **relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, sustainability and ownership, coherence, conflict-sensitivity, catalytic, gender-responsive/gender-sensitive, risk-tolerance and innovation** to review the final results and progress of the Project. The list of evaluation questions referenced in the TOR is presented below.

**Relevance:**

* Was the Project relevant in addressing issues of unemployment among youth and gender inequality that were identified as driving factors of tensions in a conflict analysis? Were there any substantial background changes that impacted the relevance of Project goals and approach?
* Did the Project meet the needs of the stakeholders and beneficiaries and was it relevant to national priorities set in the sphere of youth policy?
* Was the Project appropriate and strategic to assist the government in mitigating the socioeconomic challenges that the young women and men may face during the reforms? Did relevance continue throughout implementation?
* How were stakeholders involved in the Project's design and implementation?
* Was the Project relevant to the UN's peacebuilding mandate and the SDGs, in particular to which the Project was expected to contribute: SDGs 5, 8, 10, 16??
* Was the Project relevant to the needs and priorities of the young women and men, girls and boys residing in the Fergana Valley? Were they consulted during design and implementation of the Project?
* Was the Project well-timed to address a conflict factor or capitalize on a specific window of opportunity?
* Did the Project's theory of change clearly articulate assumptions about why the Project approach is expected to produce the desired change? Was the theory of change grounded in evidence?
* Did the pandemic create new tensions or exacerbate existing drivers of conflict and if so, how well did the Project adapt?

**Efficiency:**

* How efficient was the overall staffing, planning and coordination within the Project (including among RUNOs, implementing agencies and with stakeholders)? Have Project funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner?
* How efficient and successful was the Project's implementation approach, including procurement, number of implementing partners and other activities?
* How efficiently did the Project use the Project board?
* Were there any significant factors that led to delays in Project implementation?
* How well did the Project team communicate with implementing partners, stakeholders and Project beneficiaries on its progress?
* Overall, did the PBF Project provide value for money? Have resources been used efficiently?
* To what extent did the PBF Project ensure synergies within different programs of UN agencies and other implementing organizations and donor with the same portfolio?

**Effectiveness:**

* To what extent did the PBF Project achieve its intended objectives and contribute to the Project's strategic vision?
* To what extent did the PBF Project substantively mainstream a gender and support gender-responsive peacebuilding?
* How appropriate and clear was the PBF Project's targeting strategy in terms of geographic and beneficiary targeting?
* To what extent has the Project contributed to gender equality, the empowerment of women and the realization of human rights?

**Sustainability and Ownership:**

* Did the PBF Project contribute to the broader strategic outcomes identified in national youth policy, legislative agendas and policies?
* Did the intervention design include an appropriate sustainability and exit strategy (including promoting national/local ownership, use of national capacity etc.) to support positive changes in peacebuilding after the end of the Project?
* How strong is the commitment of the government and other stakeholders to sustaining the results of PBF support and continuing initiatives, especially women's participation in decision making processes, supported under PBF Project?
* How has the Project enhanced and contributed to the development of national capacity in order to ensure suitability of efforts and benefits?

**Coherence:**

* To what extent did the PBF Project complement work among different entities, especially with government and World Bank?

**Conflict-sensitivity:**

* Did the PBF Project have an explicit approach to conflict-sensitivity?
* Were RUNOs and NUNOs' internal capacities adequate for ensuring an ongoing conflict-sensitive approach?
* Was the Project responsible for any unintended negative impacts?
* Was an ongoing process of context monitoring and a monitoring system that allows for monitoring of unintended impacts established?

**Important Note to evaluation managers:** within the structure of the report, the below criteria may either be reflected separately or integrated into the above evaluation criteria. Regardless, the evaluation must identify specific evaluation questions on the below criteria.

**Catalytic:**

* Was the Project financially and/or programmatically catalytic?
* Has PBF funding been used to scale-up other peacebuilding work and/or has it helped to create broader platforms for peacebuilding?

**Gender-responsive/Gender-sensitive:**

* Did the Project consider the different challenges, opportunities, constraints and capacities of women, men, girls and boys in Project design (including within the conflict analysis, outcome statements and results frameworks) and implementation?
* Were the commitments made in the Project proposal to gender-responsive peacebuilding, particularly with respect to the budget, realized throughout implementation?

**Risk-tolerance and Innovation:**

* Were the risks of the PBF Project properly estimated at the design stage and were there any changes during implementation?
* Did the Project take suitable risks mitigation actions while implementing the interventions?
* How novel or innovative was the Project approach? Can lessons be drawn to inform similar approaches elsewhere?

### Annex 3. Detailed Workplan



### Annex 4. Tentative field visit agenda[[18]](#footnote-19)

**Team Leader**

| **Time** | **Stakeholder** | | | **Partner Agency in the UN System** | **Contact info** | | **Meeting organizer** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Organization** | | **Key Informant (name, position)** |
| **Day 1 in Tashkent: Monday, 19 April 2022** | | | | | | | |
| 13:00-13:45 | Reserve | |  |  |  | |  |
| 14:15-15:00 | Reserve | |  |  |  | |  |
| 15:30-16:15 | Reserve | |  |  |  | |  |
| **Day 2 in Tashkent: Tuesday, 19 April 2022** | | | | | | | |
| 09:00-09:45 | UNDP | | Sherzodbek Sharipov, Programme Associate | UNDP | (90) 984-34-85 | | EA |
| 10:00-10:45 | UN | | Missing | UN |  | | EA |
| 11:15-12:00 | UNESCO | | Missing | UNESCO | (91) 501-00-99 | | EA |
| 12:30-13:00 | UNODC | | Missing | UNODC |  | | EA |
| 13:00-14:00 | Lunch | | | | | | |
| 14:00-18:00 | Expanding, coding, and structuring interview notes | | | | | | |
| **Day 3 in Tashkent: Wednesday, 20 April 2022** | | | | | | | |
| 09:00-09:45 | Presidential Administration | | Missing | Missing | Missing | | Missing |
| 10:15-11:00 | Youth Affairs Agency | | Islombek Okhunov, Position? | UNODC | (99) 808-33-77 | | UNDP |
| 11:15-12:00 | Youth Affairs Agency | | Ilyos Matlabov, Position? | UNESCO | (94) 676-96-41 | | UNDP |
| 12:00-13:00 | Lunch | | | | | | |
| 13:00-17:00 | Expanding, coding, and structuring interview notes | | | | | | |
| 17:00-18:00 | UN PBF (online meeting) |  | |  | |  | UN |
| **Day 4 in Tashkent: Thursday, 21 April 2022** | | | | | | | |
| 09:00-09:45 | Ministry of Employment and Labor Relations | | Missing | Missing | Missing | | Missing |
| 10:15-11:00 | Ministry of Economy | | Missing | Missing | Missing | | Missing |
| 11:30-12:30 | General Prosecutor’s office | | Nosirjon Askarov, Position? | UNODC | (93) 410-26-10 | | EA |
| 13:00-13:45 | Academy for Public Administration | | Alexandra Nam,  Head of the International Relations Department of the APA | UNDP | (97) 080-71-11 | | UNDP |
| 13:45-14:45 | Lunch | | | | | | |
| 14:45-18:00 | Expanding, coding, and structuring interview notes | | | | | | |
| **Day 5 in Tashkent: Friday, 22 April 2022** | | | | | | | |
| 09:00-09:45 | National Association of Volunteers | | Shirin Abidova,  Head of NAV | UNDP | (90) 908-08-11 | | UNDP |
| 10:15-11:00 | Academy for Prosecutors | | Bakhodir Ismailov, Head of the Anti-corruption department of the AGPO | UNDP | (94) 079-00-65 | | UNDP |
| 11:15-12:00 | Academy for Prosecutors | | Sadulla Inoyatullayev, Researcher from the Academy of GPO | UNESCO | (94) 190-00-07 | | EA |
| 12:30-13:00 | ITSM, MoPE | | Davron Aripov, Position? | UNESCO | (94) 603-65-83 | | EA |
| 13:00-14:00 | Lunch | | | | | | |
| 14:00-18:00 | Expanding, coding, and structuring interview notes | | | | | | |
| **Day 8 in Tashkent: Monday, 25 April 2022** | | | | | | | |
| 09:00-09:45 | Republican Education Center of MoPE | | Javlonbek Meliboyev, Position? | UNESCO | (93) 250-01-93 | | EA |
| 10:15-11:00 | Tashxis Republican Diagnosis Center of MoPE | | Durdona Hodjabekova, Position? | UNESCO | (90) 908-08-11 | | EA |
| 11:30-12:15 | Ministry of Public Education | | Missing | UNESCO | Missing | | UNODC and UNDP |
| 12:30-13:00 | Ministry of Public Education | | Akbar Tagaev, Head of Deptartment | UNODC | (90) 121-38-77 | | EA |
| 13:00-14:00 | Lunch | | | | | | |
| 14:00-18:00 | Expanding, coding, and structuring interview notes | | | | | | |
| **Day 9 in Tashkent: Tuesday, 26 April 2022** | | | | | | | |
| 09:00-09:45 | Tashkent State University of Law | | Otabek Narziev, Trainer | UNODC | (97) 830-07-37 | | EA |
| 10:00-10:45 | Ministry of Justice | | Missing | Missing | Missing | | Missing |
| 11:00-11:45 | Ministry of the Support to Mahalla | | Missing | Missing | Missing | | Missing |
| 12:15-13:00 | Anticorruption Agency | | Missing | Missing | Missing | | Missing |
| 13:00-14:00 | Lunch | | | | | | |
| 14:00-18:00 | Expanding, coding, and structuring interview notes | | | | | | |
| **Day 10 in Tashkent: Wednesday, 27 April 2022** | | | | | | | |
| 09:00-09:45 | Development Strategy Center | | Missing | Missing | Missing | | Missing |
| 10:15-11:00 | Probation services | | Missing | Missing | Missing | | Missing |
| 11:30-12:15 | NGO “Yuksalish” | | Missing | Missing | Missing | | Missing |
| 12:45-13:30 | National Association of Electronic Mass Media (NAEMM) | | Missing | Missing | Missing | | Missing |
| 13:30-14:30 | Lunch | | | | | | |
| 14:30-18:00 | Expanding, coding, and structuring interview notes | | | | | | |
| **Day 11 in Tashkent: Thursday, 28 April 2022** | | | | | | | |
| 09:00-09:45 | State TV and Radio Company | | Missing | Missing | Missing | | Missing |
| 10:15-11:00 | Chamber of Advocates | | Missing | Missing | Missing | | Missing |
| 11:30-12:15 | USAID | | Missing | Missing | Missing | | Missing |
| 12:45-13:30 | The World Bank | | Missing | Missing | Missing | | Missing |
| 13:30-14:30 | Lunch | | | | | | |
| 14:30-18:00 | Expanding, coding, and structuring interview notes | | | | | | |
| **Day 12 in Tashkent: Friday, 29 April 2022** | | | | | | | |
| 09:00-09:45 | ILO | | Missing | Missing | Missing | | Name and the contact of the KII |
| 10:15-11:00 | JICA | | Missing | Missing | Missing | | Name and the contact of the KII |
| 11:30-12:15 | Reserve | |  |  |  | |  |
| 12:15-13:00 | Lunch | | | | | | |
| 13:00-18:00 | Expanding, coding, and structuring interview notes | | | | | | |
| **Reserve day** | | | | | | | |

**Evaluation Consultant**

| **Time** | **Stakeholder** | | **Partner Agency in the UN System** | **Contact info** | **Meeting organizer** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Organization** | **Key Informant (name, position)** |
| **Day 1 in Andijan: Sunday, 10 April 2022 – Arrival** | | | | | |
| **Day 2 in Andijan: Monday, 11 April 2022** | | | | | |
| 13:00-13:45 | Youth Hub | Farruhbek Karimov, Focal point for Hub | UNDP | (97) 991-99-91 | Local Consultants |
| 14:15-15:00 | Youth Union | Missing | Missing | Missing | UNDP, Youth Affairs Agency |
| 15:30-16:15 | Local government/khokimiyat | Missing | Missing | Missing | Local Consultants |
| **Day 3 in Andijan: Tuesday, 12 April 2022** | | | | | |
| 09:00-09:45 | Regional office of prosecutors | Missing | Missing | Missing | Local Consultants |
| 10:15-11:00 | Local police departments | Missing | Missing | Missing | Local Consultants |
| 11:30-12:15 | Partner schools | Missing | Missing | Missing | Local Consultants |
| 12:15-13:15 | Lunch | | | | |
| 13:15-18:00 | Expanding, coding, and structuring interview notes | | | | |
| **Day 4 in Andijan: Wednesday, 13 April 2022** | | | | | |
| 09:00-09:45 | SMG recipients | Missing | Missing | Missing | Local Consultants |
| Travel to Namangan | | | | | |
| **Day 1 in Namangan: Thursday, 14 April 2022** | | | | | |
| 09:00-09:45 | Youth Hub | Missing | UNDP | Missing | Local Consultants |
| 10:15-11:00 | Youth Union | Missing | UNDP | Missing | UNDP, Youth Affairs Agency |
| 11:30-12:15 | Local government/khokimiyat | Missing | Missing | Missing | Local Consultants |
| 12:15-13:15 | Lunch | | | | |
| 13:15-18:00 | Expanding, coding, and structuring interview notes | | | | |
| **Day 2 in Namangan: Friday, 15 April 2022** | | | | | |
| 09:00-09:45 | Regional office of prosecutors |  |  | (93) 250-01-93 | Local Consultants |
| 10:15-11:00 | Makhalla | Missing | UNODC | Missing | Local Consultants |
| 11:30-12:15 | Local police departments | Missing | Missing | Missing | Local Consultants |
| 12:15-13:15 | Lunch | | | | |
| 13:15-18:00 | Expanding, coding, and structuring interview notes | | | | |
| **Day 5 in Namangan: Monday, 18 April 2022** | | | | | |
| 09:00-09:45 | Partner schools | Missing | Missing | Missing | Local Consultants |
| 10:15-11:00 | Legal Clinic of Namangan State University | Missing | Missing | Missing | Local Consultants |
| 11:30-12:15 | SMG recipients | Missing | Missing | Missing | Local Consultants |
| 12:15-13:15 | Lunch | | | | |
| 13:15-18:00 | Expanding, coding, and structuring interview notes | | | | |
| **Day 6 in Namangan: Tuesday, 19 April 2022 – Travel to Ferghana** | | | | | |
| **Day 1 in Ferghana: Wednesday, 20 April 2022** | | | | | |
| 09:00-09:45 | Youth Hub | Missing | UNDP | Missing | Local Consultants |
| 10:15-11:00 | Youth Union | Missing | UNDP | Missing | UNDP, Youth Affairs Agency |
| 11:30-12:15 | Media Hub | Missing | UNODC | Missing | Local Consultants |
| 12:15-13:15 | Lunch | | | | |
| 13:15-18:00 | Expanding, coding, and structuring interview notes | | | | |
| **Day 2 in Ferghana: Thursday, 21 April 2022** | | | | | |
| 09:00-09:45 | Regional office of prosecutors | Missing | Missing | Missing | Local Consultants |
| 10:15-11:00 | Local police departments | Missing | Missing | Missing | Local Consultants |
| 11:30-12:15 | Partner schools | Missing | Missing | Missing | Local Consultants |
| 12:15-13:15 | Lunch | | | | |
| 13:15-18:00 | Expanding, coding, and structuring interview notes | | | | |
| **Day 3 in Ferghana: Friday, 22 April 2022** | | | | | |
| 09:00-09:45 | SMG recipients | Missing | Missing | Missing | Local Consultants |
| 10:15-11:00 | Local government/khokimiyat | Missing | Missing | Missing | Local Consultants |
| Departure | | | | | |

### Annex 5. Evaluation Matrix

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Key Dimensions** | **Indicators** | **Evaluation questions** | **Data Source/Mean of Verification** | **Data collection methods** |
| Relevance | Extent to which the Project was relevant to the local priorities;  Extent to which the Project was relevant to the national priorities, including international commitments. | Was the Project relevant in addressing issues of unemployment among youth and gender inequality that were identified as driving factors of tensions in a conflict analysis? Were there any substantial background changes that impacted relevance of Project goals and approach? | * Secondary data: progress and monitoring reports; * Primary data. | * Desk review; * KII with Central Govt, LG, NGOs, Academia, Project team; * Survey with youth. |
| Did the Project meet the needs of the stakeholders and beneficiaries and was it relevant to national priorities set in the sphere of youth policy? | * Secondary data: progress and monitoring reports; * Primary data. | * Desk review; * KII with Central Govt, LG, NGOs, Academia, Project team; * Survey with youth. |
| Was the Project appropriate and strategic to assist the government in mitigating the socioeconomic challenges that the young women and men may face during the reforms? Did relevance continue throughout implementation? | * Secondary data: progress and monitoring reports; * Primary data. | * Desk review; * KII Central Govt, LG, NGOs, Academia, Project team. |
| How were stakeholders involved in the Project's design and implementation? | * Secondary data: Project design document; * Primary data. | * Desk review; * KII with Central Govt, LG, NGOs, Academia. |
| Was the Project relevant to the UN's peacebuilding mandate and the SDGs, in particular to which the Project was expected to contribute: SDGs 5, 8, 10, 16? | * Secondary data: progress and monitoring reports; * Primary data. | * Desk review; * KII with Central Govt, Project team. |
| Was the Project relevant to the needs and priorities of the young women and men, girls and boys residing in the Fergana Valley? Were they consulted during design and implementation of the Project? | * Secondary data: Project design document, progress and monitoring reports; * Primary data. | * Desk review; * KII with Central Govt, LG, NGOs, Academia, Project team; * Survey with youth. |
| Was the Project well-timed to address a conflict factor or capitalize on a specific window of opportunity? | * Secondary data: progress and monitoring reports; * Primary data. | * Desk review; * KII with Central Govt, LG, NGOs, Academia, Project team; * Survey with youth. |
| Did the Project's theory of change clearly articulate assumptions about why the Project approach is expected to produce the desired change? Was the theory of change grounded in evidence? | * Secondary data: Project design document; * Primary data. | * Desk review; * KII with the Project team. |
| Did the pandemic create new tensions or exacerbate existing drivers of conflict and if so, how well did the Project adapt? | * Secondary data: progress and monitoring reports; * Primary data. | * Desk review; * KII with Central Govt, LG, NGOs, Academia, Project team. |
| Effectiveness | Extent to which the Project achieved its targets  Extent to which the Project managed the risks, both those identified at the design stage and those that emerged during the implementation;  Extent to which the Project mainstreamed gender-responsive or gender-sensitive approaches. | To what extent did the PBF Project achieve its intended objectives and contribute to the Project's strategic vision? | * Secondary data: progress and monitoring reports; * Primary data. | * Desk review; * KII with Central Govt, LG, NGOs, Academia, Project team; * Survey with youth. |
| To what extent did the PBF Project substantively mainstream a gender and support gender-responsive peacebuilding? | * Secondary data: Project design document, progress and monitoring reports; * Primary data. | * Desk review; * KII with LG, NGOs, Project team; * Survey with youth. |
| How appropriate and clear was the PBF Project's targeting strategy in terms of geographic and beneficiary targeting? | * Secondary data: progress and monitoring reports; * Primary data. | * Desk review; * KII with Central Govt, LG, NGOs, Academia, Project team; |
| To what extent has the Project contributed to gender equality, the empowerment of women and the realization of human rights? | * Secondary data: progress and monitoring reports; * Primary data. | * Desk review; * KII with Central Govt, LG, NGOs, Academia, Project team. |
| Catalytic: Was the Project financially and/or programmatically catalytic? | * Secondary data: progress and monitoring reports; * Primary data. | * Desk review; * KII with Central Govt, LG, NGOs, Project team. |
| Catalytic: Has PBF funding been used to scale-up other peacebuilding work and/or has it helped to create broader platforms for peacebuilding? | * Secondary data: progress and monitoring reports; * Primary data. | * Desk review; * KII with Central Govt, LG, NGOs, Project team. |
| Gender-responsive/gender-sensitive: Did the Project consider the different challenges, opportunities, constraints and capacities of women, men, girls and boys in Project design (including within the conflict analysis, outcome statements and results frameworks) and implementation? | * Secondary data: Project design document, progress and monitoring reports. | Desk review. |
| Gender-responsive/gender-sensitive: Were the commitments made in the Project proposal to gender-responsive peacebuilding, particularly with respect to the budget, realized throughout implementation? | * Secondary data: Project design document, progress and monitoring reports. | * Desk review. |
| Risk tolerance and Innovation: Were the risks of the PBF Project properly estimated at the design stage and were there any changes during implementation? | * Secondary data: Project design document, progress and monitoring reports; * Primary data. | * Desk review; * KII with LG, NGOs, Project team. |
| Risk tolerance and Innovation: Did the Project take suitable risks mitigation actions while implementing the interventions? | * Secondary data: progress and monitoring reports; * Primary data. | * Desk review; * KII with the Project team. |
| Risk tolerance and Innovation: How novel or innovative was the Project approach? | * Secondary data: progress and monitoring reports; * Primary data. | * Desk review; * KII with Central Govt, LG, NGOs, Project team. |
| Risk tolerance and Innovation: Can lessons be drawn to inform similar approaches elsewhere? | * Secondary data: progress and monitoring reports; * Primary data. | * Desk review; * KII with Central Govt, LG, NGOs, Project team; * Survey with youth. |
| Efficiency | Extent to which the Project resources were utilized to their maximum capacity;  Extent to which the Project management consulted the governing board;  Extent to which the Project management was informed through the participation of stakeholders and partners. | How efficient was the overall staffing, planning and coordination within the Project (including among RUNOs, implementing agencies and with stakeholders)? Have Project funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner? | * Secondary data: procurement, HR, financial and monitoring reports; * Primary data. | * Desk review; * KII with the Project team. |
| How efficient and successful was the Project's implementation approach, including procurement, number of implementing partners, and other activities? | * Secondary data: procurement, HR, financial and monitoring reports; * Primary data. | * Desk review; * KII with the Project team. |
| How efficiently did the Project use the Project board? | * Secondary data: progress and monitoring reports; * Primary data. | * Desk review; * KII with Central Govt, LG, NGOs, Academia, Project team. |
| Were there any significant factors that led to delays in Project implementation? | * Secondary data: progress and monitoring reports; * Primary data. | * Desk review; * KII with Central Govt, LG, NGOs, Academia, Project team. |
| How well did the Project team communicate with implementing partners, stakeholders, and Project beneficiaries on its progress? | * Secondary data: progress and monitoring reports; * Primary data. | * Desk review; * KII with Central Govt, LG, NGOs, Academia, Project team; * Survey with youth. |
| Overall, did the PBF Project provide value for money? Have resources been used efficiently? | * Secondary data: financial and monitoring reports; * Primary data. | * Desk review; * KII with the Project team. |
| To what extent did the PBF Project ensure synergies within different programs of UN agencies and other implementing organizations and donor with the same portfolio? | * Secondary data: progress and monitoring reports; * Primary data. | * Desk review; * KII with Central Govt and Project team. |
| Sustainability and Ownership | Did the Project produce outcomes that will sustain after the Project close-out? | Did the PBF Project contribute to the broader strategic outcomes identified in national youth policy, legislative agendas and policies? | * Secondary data: progress and monitoring reports; * Primary data. | * Desk review; * KII with Central Govt, Project team. |
| Did the intervention design include an appropriate sustainability and exit strategy (including promoting national/local ownership, use of national capacity etc.) to support positive changes in peacebuilding after the end of the Project? | * Secondary data: progress and monitoring reports; * Primary data. | * Desk review; * KII with Central Govt, LG, NGOs, Project team ; * Survey with youth. |
| How strong is the commitment of the government and other stakeholders to sustaining the results of PBF support and continuing initiatives, especially women's participation in decision making processes, supported under PBF Project? | * Secondary data: progress and monitoring reports; * Primary data. | * Desk review; * KII with Central Govt, LG, NGOs, Project team. |
| How has the Project enhanced and contributed to the development of national capacity in order to ensure suitability of efforts and benefits? | * Secondary data: progress and monitoring reports; * Primary data. | * Desk review; * KII with Central Govt, LG, NGOs, Project team . |
| Coherence | How well was the Project synergized with other actors? | To what extent did the PBF Project complement work among different entities, especially with government and World Bank? | * Secondary data: progress and monitoring reports; * Primary data. | * Desk review; * KII with Central Govt, Project team . |
| Conflict Sensitivity | Did the PBF Project have an explicit approach to conflict sensitivity?  Extent to which the "Do No Harm" principles were respected by the Project . | Did the PBF Project have an explicit approach to conflict-sensitivity? | * Secondary data: progress and monitoring reports; * Primary data. | * Desk review; * KII with Central Govt, LG, NGOs, Project team. |
| Were RUNOs and NUNOs' internal capacities adequate for ensuring an ongoing conflict-sensitive approach? | * Secondary data: progress and monitoring reports; * Primary data. | * Desk review; * KII with the Project team. |
| Was the Project responsible for any unintended negative impacts? | * Secondary data: progress and monitoring reports; * Primary data. | * Desk review; * KII with Central Govt, LG, NGOs, Academia, Project team; * Survey. |
| Was an ongoing process of context monitoring and a monitoring system that allows for monitoring of unintended impacts established? | * Secondary data: progress and monitoring reports; * Primary data. | * Desk review; * KII with the Project team. |

### Annex 6. Tentative List of Key Informants

| **Stakeholders** | **# of KII** | **Relevant Output** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Stakeholders' Group 1 - Central Govt** |  |  |
| Presidential Administration | 1 | 1 |
| Ministry of Justice | 1 | 1,4 |
| Ministry of Public Education | 1 | 1,3 |
| Ministry of Employment and Labor Relations | 1 | 1 |
| Ministry of Economy | 1 | 1 |
| Ministry of Support to Makhalla and Family | 1 | 2,3 |
| General Prosecutor’s Office | 1 | 3 |
| Ministry of Interior (regional representative) | 1 | 4 |
| Anticorruption agency | 1 | 4 |
| Youth Affairs Agency | 2 | 1,2 |
|  |  |  |
| **Stakeholders' Group 2 - Local Govt** |  |  |
| Local government/Khokimiyats (Andijan, Fergana, Namangan) | 3 | 1,3 |
| Regional offices of prosecutors | 3 | 4 |
| Local police departments | 3 | 4 |
| Probation services | 1 | 4 |
| Mahalla "Bunyodkor" (Namangan) | 1 | 4 |
|  |  |  |
| **Stakeholders' Group 3 - Academic institutions and quasi-governmental organizations** |  |  |
| Academy for Public Administration | 1 | 3 |
| Academy for Prosecutors | 2 | 3 |
| Legal Clinic, Namangan State University | 1 | 4 |
| Tashkent State University | 1 | 4 |
| Partner schools | 3 | 4 |
| State TV and Radio Company | 1 | 2 |
| Chamber of Advocates | 1 | 4 |
|  |  |  |
| **Stakeholders' Group 4 - NGOs,** |  |  |
| Youth Union | 3 | 1 |
| National Association of Volunteer | 1 | 2 |
| Youth Hub: Namangan, Andijan, Fergana | 3 | 2 |
| Media Hub | 1 | 2 |
| SMG recipients (start-up Projects) | 3 | 1 |
| Development Strategy Center | 1 | 2 |
| NGO “Yuksalish” | 1 | 2 |
| National Association of Electronic Mass Media (NAEMM) | 1 | 2 |
|  |  |  |
| **Stakeholders' Group 5 - Project Team** |  |  |
| Project management | 1 |  |
| UNDP | 3 |  |
| UNODC | 1 |  |
| UNESCO | 1 |  |
| PBF | 1 |  |
| Aga Khan Foundation | 1 |  |
| USAID | 1 |  |
| EU Delegation | 1 |  |
| The World Bank | 1 |  |
|  |  |  |
| **Total Number of KII:** | **60** |  |

### Annex 7. KII Questionnaires for Major Stakeholder Groups

# 

**KII QUESTIONNAIRE: CENTRAL GOVERNMENT**

| **N** | **Question** | |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RELEVANCE** | | | |
|  | | Was the Project relevant in addressing unemployment issues among youth and gender inequality that were identified as driving factors of tensions in a conflict analysis? |  |
|  | | Were there any substantial background changes that impacted the relevance or timeliness of Project goals and approach? (This might include any context change, e.g., COVID-19) |  |
|  | | Did the Project meet the needs of the local stakeholders and beneficiaries, and was it relevant to the national priorities for youth policy? Were you as a stakeholder involved in the Project's design and implementation? |  |
|  | | Was the Project appropriate and strategic to assist the government in mitigating the socioeconomic challenges that the young women and men may face during the reforms? Did relevance continue throughout implementation? |  |
|  | | Was the Project relevant to the SDGs, in particular, to which the Project was expected to contribute: SDGs 5, 8, 10, 16? |  |
| **EFFECTIVENESS** | | | |
|  | | To what extent did the PBF Project achieve its intended objectives and contribute to the Project's strategic vision, as communicated to the government at the emergence of the Project? |  |
|  | | To what extent did the PBF Project substantively mainstream a gender and support gender-responsive peacebuilding? Is it in line with the national development targets? |  |
|  | | How appropriate and clear was the PBF Project's targeting strategy in terms of geographic and beneficiary targeting? |  |
| **EFFICIENCY** | | | |
|  | | How efficiently did the Project use the Project board? |  |
|  | | Were there any significant factors that led to delays in Project implementation? |  |
|  | | How well did the Project team communicate with implementing partners, stakeholders, and Project beneficiaries on its progress? |  |
|  | | To what extent did the PBF Project ensure synergies with other implementing organizations in your region? |  |
| **SUSTAINABILITY** | | | |
|  | | Did the PBF Project contribute to the broader strategic outcomes identified in national youth policy, legislative agendas, and policies? |  |
|  | | Did the intervention design include appropriate sustainability and exit strategy (including promoting local ownership, etc.) to support positive peacebuilding changes after the Project's end? |  |
|  | | How strong is the commitment of the national government and other stakeholders to sustaining the results of PBF support and continuing initiatives, especially women's participation in decision-making processes, supported under the PBF Project? |  |
|  | | How has the Project enhanced and contributed to developing national capacity to ensure the suitability of efforts and benefits? |  |
| **COHERENCE** | | | |
|  | | To what extent did the PBF Project complement work among different entities, especially with government and World Bank? |  |
| **CONFLICT-SENSITIVITY** | | | |
|  | | Was the Project responsible for any unintended negative impacts? |  |
| **CATALYTIC** | | | |
|  | | Has PBF funding been used to scale-up other peacebuilding work, and/or has it helped to create broader platforms for peacebuilding? |  |
| **RISK TOLERANCE AND INNOVATION** | | | |
|  | | How novel or innovative was the Project approach? Can lessons be drawn to inform similar approaches elsewhere? |  |
| **FINAL REMARKS** | | | |
|  | | Are there any DON'T DO's that you would recommend considering in future programming? |  |

**KII QUESTIONNAIRE: LOCAL GOVERNMENTS**

| **N** | **Question** | |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RELEVANCE** | | | |
| 1. | | Was the Project relevant in addressing unemployment issues among youth and gender inequality that were identified as driving factors of tensions in a conflict analysis? |  |
| 2. | | Were there any substantial background changes that impacted the relevance or timeliness of Project goals and approach? (This might include any context change, e.g., COVID-19) |  |
| 3. | | Did the Project meet the needs of the local stakeholders and beneficiaries, and was it relevant to the local priorities for youth? Were they consulted during the design and implementation of the Project? |  |
| 4. | | Was the Project appropriate and strategic to assist the local government in mitigating the socioeconomic challenges that the young women and men may face during the reforms? |  |
| 5. | | Were you as a stakeholder involved in the Project's design and implementation? |  |
| **EFFECTIVENESS** | | | |
| 6. | | To what extent did the PBF Project achieve its intended objectives and contribute to the Project's strategic vision, as communicated to the local government at the emergence of the Project? |  |
| 7. | | To what extent did the PBF Project substantively mainstream a gender and support gender-responsive peacebuilding? Is it in line with the LG development targets? |  |
| 8. | | How appropriate and clear was the PBF Project's targeting strategy in terms of geographic and beneficiary targeting? |  |
| **EFFICIENCY** | | | |
| 9. | | How efficiently did the Project use the Project board? |  |
| 10. | | Were there any significant factors that led to delays in Project implementation? |  |
| 11. | | How well did the Project team communicate with implementing partners, stakeholders, and Project beneficiaries on its progress? |  |
| 12. | | To what extent did the PBF Project ensure synergies with other implementing organizations in your region? |  |
| **SUSTAINABILITY** | | | |
| 13. | | Did the intervention design include appropriate sustainability and exit strategy (including promoting local ownership, etc.) to support positive peacebuilding changes after the Project's end? |  |
| 14. | | How strong is the commitment of the local government and other stakeholders to sustaining the results of PBF support and continuing initiatives, especially women's participation in decision-making processes, supported under the PBF Project? |  |
| **CONFLICT-SENSITIVITY** | | | |
| 15. | | Did the PBF Project have a straightforward approach to conflict sensitivity? |  |
| 16. | | Was the Project responsible for any unintended negative impacts? |  |
| **CATALYTIC** | | | |
| 17. | | Has PBF funding been used to scale-up other peacebuilding work, and/or has it helped to create broader platforms for peacebuilding? |  |
| **GENDER-RESPONSIVE/GENDER-SENSITIVE** | | | |
| 18. | | Did the Project consider the different challenges, opportunities, constraints, and capacities of women, men, girls, and boys in Project design (including within the conflict analysis, outcome statements, and results frameworks) and implementation? |  |
| **RISK TOLERANCE AND INNOVATION** | | | |
| 19. | | How novel or innovative was the Project approach? Can lessons be drawn to inform similar approaches elsewhere? |  |
| **FINAL REMARKS** | | | |
| 20. | | What are the main recommendations that you have drawn from the PBF Project for your agency or others? |  |
| 21. | | Are there any DON'T DO's that you would recommend considering in future programming? |  |

**KII QUESTIONNAIRE: ACADEMIC INSTITUTIONS AND QUASI-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS**

| **N** | **Question** | |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RELEVANCE** | | | |
| 1. | | Was the Project relevant in addressing unemployment issues among youth and gender inequality that were identified as driving factors of tensions in a conflict analysis? |  |
| 2. | | Were there any substantial background changes that impacted the relevance or timeliness of Project goals and approach? (This might include any context change, e.g., COVID-19) |  |
| 3. | | Did the Project meet the needs of the local stakeholders and beneficiaries, and was it relevant to the national priorities for youth policy? Were you as a stakeholder involved in the Project's design and implementation? |  |
| **EFFECTIVENESS** | | | |
| 4. | | To what extent did the PBF Project achieve its intended objectives and contribute to the Project's strategic vision, as communicated to the government at the emergence of the Project? |  |
| 5. | | To what extent did the PBF Project substantively mainstream a gender and support gender-responsive peacebuilding? Is it in line with the national development targets? |  |
| 6. | | To what extent has the Project contributed to gender equality, women's empowerment, and the realization of human rights? |  |
| **EFFICIENCY** | | | |
| 7. | | How efficiently did the Project use the Project board? |  |
| 8. | | How well did the Project team communicate with implementing partners, stakeholders, and Project beneficiaries on its progress? |  |
| 9. | | To what extent did the PBF Project ensure synergies with other implementing organizations in your area of operations? |  |
| **SUSTAINABILITY** | | | |
| 10. | | Did the PBF Project contribute to the broader strategic outcomes identified in national youth policy, legislative agendas, and policies? |  |
| 11. | | Did the intervention design include appropriate sustainability and exit strategy (including promoting local ownership, etc.) to support positive peacebuilding changes after the Project's end? |  |
| 12. | | How strong is the commitment of the stakeholders to sustaining the results of PBF support and continuing initiatives, especially women's participation in decision-making processes, supported under the PBF Project? |  |
| 13. | | How has the Project enhanced and contributed to developing the national capacity to ensure the suitability of efforts and benefits? |  |
| **CONFLICT-SENSITIVITY** | | | |
| 14. | | Was the Project responsible for any unintended negative impacts? |  |
| **CATALYTIC** | | | |
| 15. | | Has PBF funding been used to scale-up other peacebuilding work, and/or has it helped to create broader platforms for peacebuilding? |  |
| **RISK TOLERANCE AND INNOVATION** | | | |
| 16. | | How novel or innovative was the Project approach? Can lessons be drawn to inform similar approaches elsewhere? |  |
| **FINAL REMARKS** | | | |
| 17. | | Are there any DON'T DO's that you would recommend considering in future programming? |  |

**KII QUESTIONNAIRE: NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS**

| **N** | **Question** | |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RELEVANCE** | | | |
| 1. | | Was the Project relevant in addressing unemployment issues among youth and gender inequality that were identified as driving factors of tensions in a conflict analysis? |  |
| 2. | | Were there any substantial background changes that impacted the relevance or timeliness of Project goals and approach? (This might include any context change, e.g., COVID-19) |  |
| 3. | | Did the Project meet the needs of the local stakeholders and beneficiaries, and was it relevant to the national priorities for youth policy? Were you as a stakeholder involved in the Project's design and implementation? |  |
| 4. | | Was the Project relevant to the needs and priorities of the young women and men, girls and boys residing in the Fergana Valley? Were they consulted during the design and implementation of the Project? |  |
| **EFFECTIVENESS** | | | |
| 5. | | To what extent did the PBF Project achieve its intended objectives and contribute to the Project's strategic vision, as communicated to the government at the emergence of the Project? |  |
| 6. | | To what extent did the PBF Project substantively mainstream a gender and support gender-responsive peacebuilding? Is it in line with the national development targets? |  |
| 7. | | How appropriate and clear was the PBF Project's targeting strategy in terms of geographic and beneficiary targeting? |  |
| 8. | | To what extent has the Project contributed to gender equality, women's empowerment, and the realization of human rights? |  |
| **EFFICIENCY** | | | |
| 9. | | How efficiently did the Project use the Project board? |  |
| 10. | | How well did the Project team communicate with implementing partners, stakeholders, and Project beneficiaries on its progress? |  |
| 11. | | To what extent did the PBF Project ensure synergies with other implementing organizations in your area of operations? |  |
| **SUSTAINABILITY** | | | |
| 12. | | Did the PBF Project contribute to the broader strategic outcomes identified in national youth policy, legislative agendas, and policies? |  |
| 13. | | Did the intervention design include appropriate sustainability and exit strategy (including promoting local ownership, etc.) to support positive peacebuilding changes after the Project's end? |  |
| 14. | | How strong is the commitment of the stakeholders to sustaining the results of PBF support and continuing initiatives, especially women's participation in decision-making processes, supported under the PBF Project? |  |
| 15. | | How has the Project enhanced and contributed to developing the national capacity to ensure the suitability of efforts and benefits? |  |
| **CONFLICT-SENSITIVITY** | | | |
| 16. | | Was the Project responsible for any unintended negative impacts? |  |
| **CATALYTIC** | | | |
| 17. | | Has PBF funding been used to scale-up other peacebuilding work, and/or has it helped to create broader platforms for peacebuilding? |  |
| **RISK TOLERANCE AND INNOVATION** | | | |
| 18. | | How novel or innovative was the Project approach? Can lessons be drawn to inform similar approaches elsewhere? |  |
| **FINAL REMARKS** | | | |
| 19. | | Are there any DON'T DO's that you would recommend considering in future programming? |  |

**KII QUESTIONNAIRE: PROJECT TEAM**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **N** | **Question** | |  |
| **RELEVANCE** | | | |
| 1. | | Was the Project relevant in addressing unemployment issues among youth and gender inequality that were identified as driving factors of tensions in a conflict analysis? |  |
| 2. | | Were there any substantial background changes that impacted the relevance or timeliness of Project goals and approach? (This might include any context change, e.g., COVID-19) |  |
| 3. | | Did the Project meet the needs of the local stakeholders and beneficiaries, and was it relevant to the national priorities for youth policy? Were you as a stakeholder involved in the Project's design and implementation? |  |
| 4. | | Was the Project relevant to the needs and priorities of the young women and men, girls and boys residing in the Fergana Valley? Were they consulted during the design and implementation of the Project? |  |
| 5. | | Was the Project appropriate and strategic to assist the government in mitigating the socioeconomic challenges that the young women and men may face during the reforms? Did relevance continue throughout implementation? |  |
| 6. | | How were stakeholders involved in the Project's design and implementation? |  |
| 7. | | Was the Project relevant to the UN's peacebuilding mandate and the SDGs, in particular to which the Project was expected to contribute: SDGs 5, 8, 10, 16? |  |
| 8. | | Did the Project's theory of change articulate assumptions about why the Project approach is expected to produce the desired change? Was the theory of change grounded in evidence? |  |
| EFFECTIVENESS | | | |
| 9. | | To what extent did the PBF Project achieve its intended objectives and contribute to the Project's strategic vision, as communicated to the government at the emergence of the Project? |  |
| 10. | | To what extent did the PBF Project substantively mainstream a gender and support gender-responsive peacebuilding? Is it in line with the national development targets? |  |
| 11. | | How appropriate and clear was the PBF Project's targeting strategy in terms of geographic and beneficiary targeting? |  |
| 12. | | To what extent has the Project contributed to gender equality, women's empowerment, and the realization of human rights? |  |
| **EFFICIENCY** | | | |
| 13. | | How efficient was the overall staffing, planning, and coordination within the Project (including among RUNOs, implementing agencies, and stakeholders)? Have Project funds and activities been delivered in a timely manner? |  |
| 14. | | How efficiently did the Project use the Project board? |  |
| 15. | | How efficient and successful was the Project's implementation approach, including procurement, number of implementing partners, and other activities? |  |
| 16. | | How well did the Project team communicate with implementing partners, stakeholders, and Project beneficiaries on its progress? |  |
| 17. | | Were there any significant factors that led to delays in Project implementation? |  |
| 18. | | To what extent did the PBF Project ensure synergies with other implementing organizations? To what extent did the PBF Project ensure synergies within different programs of UN agencies and other implementing organizations and donors with the same portfolio? |  |
| 19. | | Overall, did the PBF Project provide value for money? Have resources been used efficiently? |  |
| **SUSTAINABILITY** | | | |
| 20. | | Did the PBF Project contribute to the broader strategic outcomes identified in national youth policy, legislative agendas, and policies? |  |
| 21. | | Did the intervention design include appropriate sustainability and exit strategy (including promoting local ownership, etc.) to support positive peacebuilding changes after the Project's end? |  |
| 22. | | How strong is the commitment of the stakeholders to sustaining the results of PBF support and continuing initiatives, especially women's participation in decision-making processes, supported under the PBF Project? |  |
| 23. | | How has the Project enhanced and contributed to developing national capacity to ensure the suitability of efforts and benefits? |  |
| **CONFLICT-SENSITIVITY** | | | |
| 24. | | Was the Project responsible for any unintended negative impacts? |  |
| **CATALYTIC** | | | |
| 25. | | Has PBF funding been used to scale-up other peacebuilding work, and/or has it helped to create broader platforms for peacebuilding? |  |
| **RISK TOLERANCE AND INNOVATION** | | | |
| 26. | | How novel or innovative was the Project approach? Can lessons be drawn to inform similar approaches elsewhere? |  |
| **FINAL REMARKS** | | | |
| 27. | | Are there any DON'T DO's that you would recommend considering in future programming? |  |

### Annex 8. KII Protocols

The Evaluation Team will use the following qualitative data collection protocols during KII:

| TASK | STEP | STEP OWNER |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Task 1  Developing questionnaires | 1.1. Develop open-ended interview questions for each major stakeholder group. | ETL[[19]](#footnote-20) & EC[[20]](#footnote-21) |
| 1.2. Review, select and link each interview question with the corresponding evaluation question. | ETL |
| 1.4. Test draft evaluation questionnaire with 3-4 KI representing different stakeholder groups. | ETL & EC |
| 1.5. Update and finalize the questionnaires. | ETL & EC |
| Task 2  Selecting KI | 2.1. Present to UNDP the purposive sampling as a proposed sampling approach for KI and define the following preselection criteria:   * type of stakeholders: government stakeholders vs. academic institutions and quasi-governmental organizations vs. NGOs vs. donor partners, * location: stakeholders located in the capital city vs. stakeholders located in regions, * type of government stakeholders: central government stakeholders vs. local government stakeholders, * type of support institutions: academic institutions vs. quasi-governmental organizations vs. NGOs, * type of Project partner: higher-level academic institutions vs. youth centers (hubs) vs. public schools, * gender criteria: stakeholders engaged in women-targeted initiatives vs. stakeholders engaged in other Project activities. | ETL |
| 2.2. Present to UNDP the proposed sample size:   * 10-12 KI in each region, * 20-25 KI in the capital city and 30-35 KI in regions, * 12-14 central and local government stakeholders, * 10-12 NGOs, * 9-10 Academic institutions and quasi-governmental organizations, * 7 Project Team, including at least one representative of each donor * At least 3 KI meeting the gender criteria, * other recommendations. | ETL |
| 2.3. Develop the list of prospective KI based on the preselected criteria and sample referenced above. | EC & EA[[21]](#footnote-22) |
| 2.4. Review and approve (in consultations with EC) the final list of KI. | ETL |
| 2.5. Set up interviews a week before ETL's and EC's field trip commencement date. | EA |
| Task 3  Conducting interviews | 3.1. Adhere to the following guidelines during the interview:   * + present yourself,   + explain to the KI the meeting purpose,   + outline the confidentiality rules,   + conduct interviews for 40-50 minutes,   + ask a question at a time, avoid leading questions, and clarify ambiguous answers,   + allow the KI to ask questions,   + thank the KI. | ETL & EC |
| 3.2. ETL may invite an EA to participate in the interview if the KI is not fluent in English or Russian. | ETL & EA |
| 3.3. If the client representative elects to participate in an interview, discuss the rationale of that request with the client representative and, potentially, invite them to join the interviews[[22]](#footnote-23). | ETL |
| Task 4  Documenting interviews | 4.1. Document the interview, taking written notes and upon KI's concurrence using an audio recording. | ETL, EC & EA |
| 4.2. Transcribe the audio files into computer-stored text records (doc files). | EC & EA |
| 4.3. Expand written notes within 24 hours and upload them to shared Google Drive. | EC & EA |
| 4.4. Upload extracts from the written notes to an excel file. | ETL, EC & EA |
| 4.5. Set the responses up for pattern analysis. | ETL & EC |

### Annex 9. The Architecture of the Coded MS Excel file[[23]](#footnote-24)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Category 3 |  | KII QUESTIONS | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Category 1 | Category 2 | Category 4 | RELEVANCE | | | | | EFFECTIVENESS | | | EFFICIENCY | | | |  |
|  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |
| Stakeholder group | Host region Andijan, Namangan, Ferghana | Scope of intervention | Project output linkage | Was the Project relevant in addressing unemployment issues among youth and gender inequality that were identified as driving factors of tensions in a conflict analysis? | Were there any substantial background changes that impacted the relevance or timeliness of Project goals and approach? (This might include any context change, e.g., COVID-19) | Did the Project meet the needs of the local stakeholders and beneficiaries, and was it relevant to the local priorities for youth? Were they consulted during the design and implementation of the Project? | Was the Project appropriate and strategic to assist the local government in mitigating the socioeconomic challenges that the young women and men may face during the reforms? | Were you as a stakeholder involved in the Project's design and implementation? | To what extent did the PBF Project achieve its intended objectives and contribute to the Project's strategic vision, as communicated to the local government at the emergence of the Project? | To what extent did the PBF Project substantively mainstream a gender and support gender-responsive peacebuilding? Is it in line with the LG development targets? | How appropriate and clear was the PBF Project's targeting strategy in terms of geographic and beneficiary targeting? | How efficiently did the Project use the Project board? | Were there any significant factors that led to delays in project implementation? | How well did the Project team communicate with implementing partners, stakeholders, and Project beneficiaries on its progress? | To what extent did the PBF Project ensure synergies with other implementing organizations in your region? | Did the intervention design include appropriate sustainability and exit strategy (including promoting local ownership, etc.) to support positive peacebuilding changes after the Project's end? |
|  |  |
| CGP, LGP, AIQGO, NGOs, PT | Country or local level |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

### Annex 10. Survey Protocols

| TASK | STEP | STEP OWNER |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Task 1  Developing questionnaires | 1.1. Develop closed survey questions for beneficiaries. | EC |
| 1.2. Review, select and link each survey question with the corresponding evaluation question. | ETL & EC |
| 1.4. Test draft evaluation questionnaire with 5-6 beneficiaries. | EA |
| 1.5. Update and finalize the questionnaires. | ETL & EC |
| Task 2  Selecting number of beneficiaries | 2.1. Present to UNDP the convenience sampling as a proposed sampling approach for the survey and define the following preselection criteria:   * young people, aged between 18-30, who participated in any components of the Project, * beneficiaries participated in Summer camp, * beneficiaries participated in Just Start start-up accelerator, * beneficiaries of Small grants for start-ups, * beneficiaries of Technovation girls, * beneficiaries of Youth hubs, * beneficiaries of Volunteers' Association, * beneficiaries of Youth Discussions – Y-Fikri, * beneficiaries of Small grants for infrastructural projects, * beneficiaries of civil servants' capacity building, * beneficiaries of Rule of Law Training, * beneficiaries of Fergana Valley Model UN Conference, * gender criteria: male and female participants of the Project's initiatives, * Activity' 's reported share in expenditures of the Project, * other recommendations. | ETL |
| 2.2. Participate in the training on online data collection platform – Kobo, organized by UNDP. | EC & EA |
| general youth 2.4. Review and approve (in consultations with EC) the final list of beneficiaries. | ETL |
| 2.5. Notify surveyees about the upcoming survey. | EA |
| Task 3  Conducting surveys | 3.1. Adhere to the following guidelines during the survey process:   * + transfer the survey questionnaire into the Excel file and upload it on an online data collection platform,   + generate separate survey links for every category of beneficiaries,   + send the link to the survey to beneficiaries through Telegram channel/group or via email,   + explain to the beneficiaries the survey purpose by contacting them over the phone or through messages,   + outline the confidentiality rules,   + provide guides on filling the survey for beneficiaries if necessary. | EA |
| 3.2. EA might use the service of translators to get survey questionnaires translated into Russian and Uzbek languages in order to ensure the accuracy of the data collection. | EA |
| Task 4  Data analysis | 4.1. Upload extracts from the responses to questionnaires to an excel file and/or KoBo platform. | EA |
| 4.2. Provide analysis of the data using excel and/or KoBo platform. | EC |
| 4.3. Integrate the analysis into the evaluation report. | ETL & EC |

### Annex 11. Survey Questionnaire

| **N** | **Question** | **Answer** | **Relevant EQs** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | General Profile of the Respondent | * Gender * Age * Region * Occupation |  |
| **Relevance** | | |  |
|  | In which type of the events/activities organized by this Project have you participated approximately? | * Activity 1 * Activity 2 * … |  |
|  | How did you first hear about this respective event or activity? | * Advertising or Media (Print/Electronic/Internet) * Word of mouth/previous participants * Public authority (Government Agency/Khokimiat/Youth Agency) * UNDP/UNODC/UNESCO * NGO/Partner | * 2.5 |
|  | To what extent do you feel that the Project was aligned with your needs and addressed them? | * High degree of alignment and address * Medium degree of alignment and address * Minimal alignment and address * Not aligned at all and address | * 1.2 * 1.6 |
|  | Overall, how would you rate the effectiveness of Youth for Social Harmony in the Fergana Valley? | * Excellent * Good * Fair * Difficult to say (No opinion) | * 3 |
| **Effectiveness** | | |  |
|  | On a 5 point scale, where 1 is no impact, and 5 is a significant impact, what impact do you believe your overall participation in the Project's respective activity/event has had on you in terms of:   * Increasing your knowledge and skills * Increasing your opportunities to participate in decision making and socio-political life * Attitude and capacity of local administrations and educators * Approaches of duty bearers to youth |  | * 3.1 * 3.2 |
|  | How well were the activities/events of the Project managed? | * Excellent * Good * Fair * Difficult to say (No opinion) | * 2.1 |
|  | To what extent do you think it was the right time to implement this Project? | * To a great extent * Sufficiently * Very little * Not at all * Don't know | * 1.7 |
|  | To what extent have you noted advocation for gender equality and women's participation in the Project's activities? | * To a great extent * Sufficiently * Very little * Not at all * Don't know | * 3.2 |
|  | To what extent have the Project activities positively impacted your livelihoods and those who live with you? | * To a great extent * Sufficiently * Very little * Not at all * Don't know | * 3.1 * 3.3 * 4.1 |
|  | To what extent has participation in the Project's activities/events positively changed your plans? | * To a great extent * Sufficiently * Very little * Not at all * Don't know | * 4.1 * 7.1 * 8.1 |
|  | To what extent have you faced any challenges because of participating in the Project's activities or events (with/within you family, friends, or community)? | * To a great extent * Sufficiently * Very little * Not at all * Don't know | * 4.1 * 6.1 * 6.3 * 9.1 * 8.1 |
|  | Do you think the Project's activities led to a decrease in conflict potential within your community (mahalla/district/village/city)? | * To a great extent * Sufficiently * Very little * Not at all * Don't know |  |
|  | To what extent did you have an opportunity to give your feedback on an activity or event? | * To a great extent * Sufficiently * Very little * Not at all * Don't know | * 2.5 * 1.6 |
| **Sustainability** | | |  |
|  | To what extent are the material, services, and equipment support likely to continue after the Project has finished? | * To a great extent * Sufficiently * Very little * Not at all * Don't know | * 4.2 * 7.1 * 7.2 |
|  | To what extent do you think there is a need to have more of those types of Projects? | * To a great extent * Sufficiently * Very little * Not at all * Don't know | * 7.1 |
|  | To what extent are you willing to continue to communicate/collaborate with the new network of people resulting from the Project? | * To a great extent * Sufficiently * Very little * Not at all * Don't know | * 7.1 |

### Annex 12. Summarized Primary and Secondary Data Transcription Sample[[24]](#footnote-25)

|  | Responses on interview question 8 in Region XYZ (criteria of effectiveness):   * To what extent did the PBF Project achieve its intended objectives and contribute to the Project's strategic vision, as communicated to the government at the emergence of the Project? | |
| --- | --- | --- |
| KII | Respondent 1 | * 9 out N statistical forms have been eliminated thanks to the electronic information collection; * response to the pandemic by guiding youth. |
| Respondent 2 | * Capacity building of the local authorities; * Youth needs assessment helped to see clearer challenges. |
| Respondent 3 | * Supporting institutions such as Youth hubs. |
| Respondent 4 | * Helped to build up a sense of ownership for own communities. |
| Respondent 5 | * An opportunity for young people to communicate with government authorities. |
| Respondent 6 | * Capacity building broadened tools to develop further steps for the Concept for developing state youth policy in Uzbekistan until 2025. |
| Respondent 7 | * Helped to decrease conflict potential among direct beneficiaries and generate positive externalities on a local level. |
| Direct observations | | * Awareness-raising materials. |
| Survey | | * Helped youth to find new and higher-paid jobs (number and/or percentage). * Developed important institutions for Youth in IT (number and/or percentage). |
| Desk review | | * The Just Start accelerator created a spillover effect involving quasi-governmental organizations to support and provide more opportunities for youth. |

### Annex 13. Survey Participants[[25]](#footnote-26)

| **Activity** | **Number of beneficiaries** | **Output(s)** | **UN Agency** | **Covered by the survey** | **Contact information availability** | **Additional Information** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Small Grants for start-uppers | 10 | 1 | UNDP | Yes | The Project team will provide |  |
| Voice of Girls network | 20 | 1 | UNDP | Yes | The Project team will provide | Only women |
| Training of Youth Union representatives | 83 | 1 | UNDP | Yes | Missing |  |
| Summer Camp | 84 | 1 | UNDP, UNODC | Yes | Available  Telegram Group with 74 members |  |
| Technovation Girls | 100 | 1 | UNDP | Yes | Partially available  Telegram channel with 62 subscribers | Only women |
| Just Start\_Start-Up Accelerator | 332 | 1 | UNDP | Yes | Partially available  Telegram channel with 120 subscribers |  |
| Dialogs with young women | 47 | 2 | UNODC | Yes | Missing | Only women |
| Volunteers | 120 | 2 | UNDP | Yes | Missing |  |
| Youth-led platform - Fergana Valley Model United Nations Conference | 150 | 2 | UNODC | Yes | Partially available  The Project team will provide |  |
| Seven youth initiatives in Fergana Valley | 300 | 2 | UNODC | Yes | Missing |  |
| Youth Hubs | 300 | 2 | UNDP, UNODC | Yes | Partially available  The Project team will provide |  |
| Y-Fikri\_TED talks type Youth Discussions | 301 | 2 | UNDP, UNODC | Yes | Partial availability  Telegram channel with 15 subscribers |  |
| Small grants for infrastructural projects |  | 2 | UNDP | Yes | No activity was delivered under this component |  |
| Civil Servants' Capacity building\_APA\_AGPO | 400 | 3 | UNDP | No | N/A |  |
| TOTs on Rule of Law | 104 educators and more than 9000 school students | 3 | UNODC | No | N/A |  |
| Training for life skill programs | 418 | 3 | UNODC | Partially, only youth | Missing |  |
| Key stakeholders trained | 30 | 4 | UNESCO/UNODC | No | N/A |  |
| Police officers trained | 80 | 4 | UNODC | No | N/A |  |
| Anticorruption training programs | 100 | 4 | UNESCO/UNODC | No | N/A | Schools |
| Training young lawyers and students of Law faculties | 65 | 4 | UNODC | Partially, only youth | Partial availability  Telegram group with training participants, 41 members |  |
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