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# INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

This report summarizes the results of an evaluation mission undertaken in November-December 2010. The evaluation team was asked to evaluate the implementation progress and assess the quality and impact of products and activities carried out under the project “Increasing Capacities of Educational and Policy-Making Establishments for Applying the Human Development Approach” (2008-2011, project ID 61558).

*1.1. Organization of report*

This introductory chapter sets out briefly the mandate, subject, purpose and scope of the evaluation. The following chapter goes into more detail on the evaluation methodology, while chapter 3 provides a detailed description of the project, including its main objectives, planned outputs/, targets, and the activities envisaged to achieve these. The rest of the report presents the evaluation findings, grouping them according to three core evaluation criteria, namely relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency. However, in line with the TORs, additional tailor-made evaluation criteria have also been used, in order to reflect the specific nature and characteristics of this project. The findings draw on the results of interviews with key stakeholders, as well as findings from the analysis of project documents. The report ends with a final section on conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations for follow-up.

*I.2. Mandate of the evaluation*

The evaluation was carried out during the project implementation period (2008 – 2011), and should not therefore be considered an end of project evaluation.

Although the project began in 2008, the UNDP undertook a substantive revision of the project in 2009 in order to diversify the target groups and move beyond focusing exclusively on the teaching of human development, and towards mainstreaming the Human Development paradigm into all walks of life. In its new format (since 2009) the Human Development (HD) project aimed to provide improved services for developing the capacity of educational and policy establishments in teaching and operationalizing the HD approach.

The evaluation covers the 2005-2010 period for the production of National Human Development Reports (NHDR) and Policy Briefs (PB), and the period 2008 – 2010 for the project, and pays particular attention to the changes resulting after the implementation of adjustments in 2009. A range of activities were carried out under the two different phases of the HD project and involved various partners, including government representatives, research institutions, academia, journalists and members of NGOs/civil society organizations.

*I.3. Subject of the evaluation*

The project “**Developing Capacities of Educational and Policy-making Establishments for Applying the Human Development Approach”** is a capacity development project of the UNDP Uzbekistan country office, which aims to provide adequate services for developing capacities of educational and policy establishments in teaching and operationalizing the Human Development Approach. The project has two main objectives:

1. Introduce, systematically increase awareness and advocate the policy relevance of the Human Development (HD) paradigm as well as the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) to undergraduates, teachers and tutors of the leading academic institutions, journalists and decision makers of the Republic of Uzbekistan;
2. Develop national capacities for policy analysis; enhance the public dialogue about reforms leading to poverty reduction and sustainable human development.

These objectives are to be achieved through the development of research, educational-methodological and curriculum base to teach HD, training lecturers, developing in-service training schemes, etc. The project has attempted to capture best practices from UNDP programmes, especially regarding the production of National Human Development Reports and Policy Briefs, which represent a means of regular and ad hoc assessment of on-going reforms, and strengthening the national stakeholders’ capacities for MDG reporting, utilizing consolidated statistical data and analysis.

The project consists of three main components, or sets of activities. The first is concerned with collaboration with Higher Education institutions in the country in order to promote the use of human development approaches in research and teaching, and also to raise awareness of human development among the broader population. The second is concerned with supervising the drafting, discussion and publication of the latest National Human Development Report (NHDR); while the third is concerned with the production of Policy Briefs (short publications designed to contribute to the policy debate on topical development issues in the country).

*I.4. Evaluation process*

The objective of this evaluation is to assess the efficiency, effectiveness, relevance, and sustainability of the project’s implementation, and to document the results and impact of the project attained in relation to its overall objectives and expected results as defined in the project document.

The evaluation fieldwork was conducted in November and December of 2010. This evaluation is almost an end-of-cycle evaluation, since the programme officially ends in May 2011, and the project is therefore in its final months of implementation. The overall aim of this evaluation report is to provide an independent review of the project design and implementation progress; assess impact and sustainability, identify and document the lessons learned. With human development being mainstreamed in the UNDAF 2010-2015, and concrete targets and indicators defined in the UNDP CPAP for 2010-2015 in output 3.2.2,[[1]](#footnote-2) the evaluation of the project intervention will help assess partnership on human development between 2005-2010 and guide future strategies for HD initiatives.

# 2. PURPOSE, SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY OF THE EVALUATION

The evaluation was carried out by a team of two members, (Sheila Marnie[[2]](#footnote-3) and Thomas Otter[[3]](#footnote-4)), and was based on a desk review of project products and documents and other relevant literature, including the online web resources created by the project, training modules, and project publications. The quality of implementation and usefulness of the outputs were evaluated through semi-structured interviews with stakeholders[[4]](#footnote-5) conducted during a 15 day field trip to Tashkent, including interviews with partners in the Senate and government, teaching staff from academic institutes participating in the project, trainers, students, alumni, authors of policy briefs and National Human Development Reports, users of products, and representatives from other projects and donors with which the project has partnered. The evaluation also benefited from extensive consultations with UNDP management, and the project staff.

In particular**, for the HD teaching component,** interviews were held with HD Project counterparts at the University of World Economy and Diplomacy (UWED), the Academy of State and Social Construction (ASSC) and Tashkent Paediatric Medical Institute. A review of the HD training and advocacy materials produced under the project was undertaken, with the purpose of assessing the quality and content, as well as how successfully it has been adapted to the Uzbek context. Meetings with the Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education were also held to assess the strengths, limitations and potential of current and future partnerships. A roundtable discussion with alumni of the last HD summer course was also organized, in order to get direct feedback from users of teaching courses, materials and resources.

**For the NHDR and Policy Brief components** of the project, the evaluation undertook an assessment of the processes used to select writing teams to prepare the reports, peer review mechanisms, consultations with civil society, relevant government line ministries and statistical bodies. The evaluators also assessed the quality of the content, and looked at the dissemination processes for NHDRs since 2005, as well as communication methods used to promote key messages. The assessment also attempted to review the framework under which the human development reports are conceived and produced, and the ways in which key issues are mainstreamed, including the incentives, guidance and capacity to engender other human development interventions and products, and strengthen statistical capacity. To the extent possible, the evaluators tried to assess the influence of the NHDRs on policies and programmes of the Government of Uzbekistan and those of UNDP.

As indicated above, the project was initiated in 2008, but from 2005-2008 responsibility for supervising the drafting and publication processes of the NHDR and the Policy Briefs lay with an officer within the country office (CO) appointed as Human Development focal point, who coordinated the work of local consultants, and liaised with government partners[[5]](#footnote-6). Policy Briefs were produced under the Economic Governance Unit. However, since 2008, responsibility for both of these products has been with the project. The evaluators were asked to review the quality of the HD publications prepared by the CO since 2005, i.e. both those publications, which were prepared before, and those prepared after being placed under the responsibility of the current project.

The timeframe for the evaluation was 5 weeks, of which the evaluators spend 7 days to conduct a desk review of project literature, documentation, followed by a 14 day mission to Uzbekistan to conduct fieldwork in Tashkent, including interviews with key stakeholders and an initial debriefing and feedback with the UNDP CO. A further 14 days were spent on systematizing information and writing up the report.

The evaluators have attempted to adhere to the approaches and standards set out in the latest UNDP Evaluation Handbook[[6]](#footnote-7).The evaluation draws on the results and resources framework, as formulated in the project document.

Apart from the three core evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency, the TORs required that the evaluation team also addressed the following additional specific evaluation questions[[7]](#footnote-8):

**Relevance**:

* The project’s concept, design and strategy (review the problem addressed by the project, assessment of the appropriateness of the objectives).

**Effectiveness:**

* Evaluate the effectiveness of management, the quality and timeliness of monitoring and backstopping by all parties to the project.
* Evaluate the effectiveness of activities aimed at raising awareness and achieving greater integration of the human development approach into policy making and analysis, as well as into educational process for target audiences.
* Evaluate the quality, usability of and sustainable follow-up on NHDRs, textbook and teaching materials as well as other analytical products, including UNDP Uzbekistan Policy Briefs, in promoting integrated human development approach.

**Impact / degree of change:**

* Has awareness on Human Development in general and the personal capacities of national stakeholders to continue project activities in particular been built?
* Has the project contributed to the establishment of efficient national institutional frameworks for the promotion of human development?

**Implementation**:

* Judge the executing modality and managerial arrangements. Evaluate the Project team’s use of adaptive management techniques[[8]](#footnote-9) in project implementation.
* Evaluate whether the project and implementation design allowed for flexibility in responding to changes in the environment;

**Partnership strategy**

* Assess the extent to which the implementation of the project has been inclusive of relevant stakeholders and to which extent it has been able to create collaboration between different partners.
* Cementing of partnerships with educational establishments through Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) was appropriate and the approach was strategic and sound.
* Identification of stakeholders, target audience and beneficiary partners were done appropriately?
* The approach adopted for preparation of NHDRs, Policy Briefs, other relevant analytical studies and mainstreaming HD in teaching (incl. having government ownership) was sound?

The TORs for the evaluation, the list of stakeholders consulted, questions for the semi-structured interviews, and a list of the literature consulted are provided in the appendix.

# 3. PROJECT DESIGN

This section looks at the design of the Project, and in particular its relevance, logic, the choice of national partners, risks and assumptions and monitoring indicators. Drawing on the Project Document[[9]](#footnote-10), it provides some background information, a summary of the Project design, followed by comments.

* 1. ***Background***

Human development reporting in Uzbekistan began a few years after the first Global Human Development Report was launched in 1990. UNDP in cooperation with the Government of Uzbekistan pioneered the preparation of NHDRs, and launched the first Report in 1995. Over the past 15 years UNDP has applied different modalities of producing NHDRs. The NHDR 2005 was produced using an open tender procedure and was outsourced for production by the Centre for Economic Research[[10]](#footnote-11). Since 2006 NHDRs have been produced by independent consultants, researchers and experts and coordinated by UNDP Country Office in Uzbekistan. The Human Development Coordinator post was established in the office in 2005 to facilitate preparation of NHDRs and provide oversight for other HD interventions generated by the office. Since 2008, the officer in charge of the current project has assumed this post.

Given the increasing interest of national and international partners in issues related to human development, the concepts behind it and research and analysis based on it, an HD project on teaching this concept in educational establishments was launched in 2008 (project 61558), through which support is provided to academic educational entities in piloting HD as a teaching discipline. A number of other knowledge products, including UNDP CO Policy Briefs have also been generated under this project.

However during the first year of implementation of the project it became clear that in order to attract more attention to the merits of a people-centred approach, the HD project strategy had to broaden its scope of activities in applying the Human Development concept into analysis and policy-making. The CO decided that it was important to raise awareness amongst academia, civil servants, the business community and young people at large of the significance of the HD concept and how it can be translated into practical contributions to the implementation of welfare improvement. There was a need to provide timely and relevant policy advice to decision-makers, to develop national capacities for policy analysis and to strengthen the quality of the public debate on reforms leading to improvement of living standards and sustainable human development.

In order to diversify the target groups and move beyond teaching of human development towards mainstreaming the Human Development paradigm into daily life, the UNDP undertook a substantive revision of the existing project in 2009. In its new format the HD project aims to provide improved services for developing the capacity of educational and policy establishments in teaching and operationalizing the Human Development approach.

The project is being implemented through the development of research, educational-methodological and curriculum bases to teach HD, training of lecturers, developing in-service training schemes, etc. In designing these activities, attempts have been made to draw on best practices from other UNDP programmes, producing National Human Development Reports and the UNDP CO flagship publication - Policy Briefs[[11]](#footnote-12) - and to strengthen national stakeholders’ capacities for MDG reporting, utilizing consolidated statistical data and analysis. A range of activities were carried out under the two phases of HD project and involved a range of partners - government representatives, research institutions, academia, journalists and members of NGOs/civil society organizations.

* 1. ***Project Logic/ Design***

The project was designed to contribute to UNDP’s Country Programme (CP) for 2010-2015, in particular to the outcome: “Enhanced capacity of the central and local authorities to develop and implement economic and social security policies aimed at welfare improvement of vulnerable groups”.

The project has two objectives:

* To introduce, systematically increase awareness of, and advocate the policy relevance of the Human Development (HD) paradigm, as well as the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), to undergraduates, teachers and tutors of leading academic institutions, journalist and decision makers of the Republic of Uzbekistan
* Develop national capacities for policy analysis; enhance public dialogue on reforms leading to poverty reduction and sustainable human development

The Project Document formulates the overall output of the project as: “Capacities of Educational and Policy-making Establishments in Promoting and Applying the Human Development Concept Increased”.

To achieve this output, the project undertook the following groups of activities:

**Activity 1**: Introducing and advancing the potential of educational establishments for teaching HD

* Introduction of a “Human Development” Course to the University of World Economy and Diplomacy (UWED) and the Academy for State and Social Construction under the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan, as well astoother educational institutions;
* Establishment of a “Human Development” Resource Centre in order to address the deficit in understanding and promote further application of the HD approach in scientific research;
* Strengthening collaboration between a range of higher educational centers and governmental structures on activities with explicit policy focus;
* Design and implementan e-course on human development, MDGs national development strategies (including the National Poverty Reduction Strategy or “WIS”) for members of educational establishments, and also for the broader population, with a specific outreach to youth

**Activity 2**: Producing NHDRs to provide in-depth analysis of issues of a particular relevance for Uzbekistan development priorities

* NHDR published at least every two years
* Public fora promoted to enhance the national policy dialogue around the specific focus of the NHDR, in the form of workshops, conferences, round tables designed to promote a participatory approach to policy making. These will be open to the representatives of the government, civil society and the private sector with the aim of raising awareness of on-going policy debates, and building institutional capacity for assimilating policy advice

**Activity 3**: Producing Policy Briefs and other publications for development aimed at providing adequate and relevant policy advice to decision makers of Uzbekistan, developing national capacities for policy analysis and enhancing the public dialogue on reforms aimed at improving welfare and sustainability of human development

* Occasional Policy Briefs[[12]](#footnote-13) and other publications will be prepared and published in cooperation with national think tanks, government and NGOs, with the aim of providing more focus to the analysis of topical policy issues, and to contribute to the debate on specific development issues (e.g. laws to be passed in the parliament, aspects of socio-economic policies, living standards analysis, regional development, threats to human security, etc.).
* Creation of a consolidated system of information collection and analysis to meet the needs of UN agencies for up-to-date statistical data. A dataset containing all available regionally-disaggregated official statistical data, from both primary and secondary sources,will be created and made available using theDevInfo software.

In order to be able to achieve these results the following targets (with baselines and monitoring indicators) were defined:

* **Target# 1:** HD curriculum and HD teaching kit adopted by # of higher educational institutions
  + **Baseline# 1:**No precedents of teaching HD concept in educational establishments of Uzbekistan: Methodological base for teaching HD concept is non-existent
  + **Success indicator # 1:**The teaching of HD by educational establishments introduced and advanced
* **Target# 2**: 1/3 of target group respondents (random sampling, national representation) are aware of HD concept, satisfied with HD visibility materials and are able to describe what HD is about in simple words
  + **Baseline# 2:** The baseline for the penetration of HD concept at central and regional levels unknown/not established
  + **Success indicator # 2:** Awareness level and quality of HD awareness, visibility materials available for public, HD literacy increased
* **Target# 3:** # of produced NHDRs and Policy Briefs providing in-depth analysis, practical policy recommendations leading to improvement of welfare and sustainability of human development
  + **Baseline# 3:**The baseline for the impact of NHDRs and Policy Briefs on policy making is not established/not known[[13]](#footnote-14)
  + **Success indicator # 3:** At least 1 external independent assessment with findings and recommendations) of policy recommendations at central and regional level conducted

***3.3 Organization and funding of the project***

The project has been implemented in Direct Implementation Mode (DIM), which means in practice that there is no official counterpart in a high ranking government institution which signs the project together with UNDP and is in a sense co-responsible for the implementation. Due to this management arrangement the project is funded exclusively by UNDP. Beneficiary government institutions such as UWED or other teaching institutions do not contribute financially, but, when possible, provide other in-kind inputs for the project, such as the physical space required for the HD resource centre in UWED (276 sqm) or required telephone lines.

The evaluators found no problem with the implementation mode adopted.

Tables 1, 2 and 3 in Appendix 2, set out the annual objectives, targets and activities for each project component.

* 1. ***Summary and Comments on the Project Design***

**3.4.1 Relevance**: Human Development is a crosscutting topic, relevant to the UNDP mandate as a whole. Moreover, Human Development Reports are a flagship publication of the organization, andinfluencing policy debate and analysis relevant to achievement of MDG goals is a prime objective of the organization. The overall relevance of the project and its alignment with UNDP mandate is indisputable. However, the decision to put (i) activities related to work with educational institutes on human development courses, awareness raising etc., together with (ii) activities related to the production of NHDRs and Policy Briefs may make sense in design logic, but in practice the links between them were not or could not always be exploited. This raises the question about whether they should be de-linked in the future, or whether in a next stage of the project, it would be possible to achieve better integration in practice.

**3.4.2 Stakeholder ownership and alignment with national priorities**: Human development, together with national MDGs, provides the framework for national priorities, and is completely compatible with them. In the case of Activity I, stakeholder ownership and involvement within the educational institutes working to advance teaching, research and advocacy of HD approach, are tangible. Activities II and III are concerned with UNDP products which contribute to national policy debate, and therefore to priorities. Here ownership lies with the UNDP, although in the case of the NHDR, the product should be the result of a discussion process with stakeholders, including government partners. While attempts have been made to involve government and other partners in discussion processes during drafting stages of previous NHDRs, interviews suggested that there has been a decline in the government participation and the sense of co-ownership in the latest draft NHDR. While less government ownership may be desirable in some policy briefs, in order to retain independent opinion in a context where debate and differences of opinions are not encouraged, it would be desirable to achieve greater partnership with the government in the NHDR process, from the design stage onwards.

**3.4.3 Alignment with UNDP mandate and link to other donor activities**: as noted, the HD project is integral to the UNDP mandate, and relevant to the work of all other donors working towards improving policy debate, identifying priorities for achieving sustainable human development and national MDGs. There is a potential in all activities to increase links to the work of other UN agencies, and this is a possible focus for a future project. Officers and materials from other agencies could also be used for the educational courses; UN agencies could be involved as co-authors of HD reports, and also to contribute to Policy Briefs.

**3.4.4 Project Logic**: The project logic is coherent. But while there is a logical link between the three different activities, this is not always achieved in practice. This is discussed further in the next section.

**3.4.5: Partners**: The partners for the teaching component are Ministry of Higher Education, Institutes of Higher Education. These are appropriate. The partner for HD production since 2008/9 has been the Senate, which is appropriate, and has enabled discussion at regional levels. However, this partnership has proven inappropriate to ensure government ownership of the latest NHDR, since the partner does not feel technically qualified to provide approval of the content or able to “sign-off” the product.

**3.4.6: Risks and Assumptions/Indicators:** no problems were found with the risks and assumptions or indicators for the project in general. More detailed comments on assumptions and the achievement of indicators are provided in Chapter 4.

## Project Results: Main Findings

This section reports on the findings of the evaluation for each of the project’s three components. It draws on the results of structured interviews held during the evaluators’ mission to Tashkent, which were carried out following roughly the sequencing of questions listed in Appendix 1. It also draws on the review of the publications and materials undertaken by the evaluators. The findings for each component are reported under the following headings:

1. effectiveness and efficiency: some of main achievements, extent of national ownership, and effectiveness of management arrangements, and
2. impact and sustainability: extent to which the component has made a contribution to longer term development

*(sustainability in the sense of the ability of national partners to take over activities independently is also discussed where relevant. But this is obviously not relevant for activities 2 and 3, which are concerned with the production of UNDP publications)*

Relevance is not highlighted here, as it has been discussed in the previous section.

***4.1 Overall Implementation Progress***

For a summary of implementation progress, see Appendix 2, table 1. This table shows that for Activity 1 (teaching HD) for the period 2008 – 2010, 37 output (activity) indicators have been defined, in order to monitor successful delivery of products and services. Seven out of these 34 indicators have not or not fully been achieved. Regarding Activity 2 (NHDR) 9 indicators have been defined 5 out of which have not or have not fully been achieved. And regarding Activity 3 (policy briefs), two indicators had been defined both of which have been achieved.

In general the implementation capacity of the project is very high for all activities, which are completely under control of UNDP. The partial or lack of implementation of certain activities (which led to the non achievements of the defined indicators) are mainly related to issues which are not fully under the control of UNDP, such as lack of responsiveness or low level of interest of government institutions in the NHDR process.

It should be noted that the HD textbook has not been translated into English (as envisaged) due to the fact that the most recent GHDR introduced new indices and data calculations. Although the textbook was ready in September 2010, publication was delayed so as to allow revision of the chapters based on the latest data and methodology.

However a possible weakness of the project design may be overoptimistic assumptions and a visible imbalance between the character and the number of indicators defined for the different project components.

***4.2 Activity 1: Training in HD***

Under Component 1, an optional course in “human development” for graduate students has been developed and introduced in the University of World Economy and Diplomacy (UWED), at Tashkent State University (Economics Facility), the Tashkent Pediatric Medical Institute, as well as at the Academy for State and Social Construction (ASSR) under the Office of the President. (The latter is a college where civil servants undergo periodic training and refresher courses.)

Under this component a Human Development Resource Centre has also been established within the premises of the University of World Economy and Diplomacy, in order to provide access to resources for professionals from various walks of life. Materials are available for advocacy, training, and applying the concept of sustainable human development in various fields of professional life, and also for scientific research purposes, to encourage the use of the HD approach among graduate and post-graduate students of the various Higher Education institutions in the country.

The Resource Centre is also responsible for an online training course, and provision of on-line access to materials (electronic library).This has been particularly important in reaching out to young people. Regional workshops on human development have been designed and carried out, and there has been outreach to parliament and mass media, in orderto ensure further understanding and use of the HD approach. For a full list of implemented activities, see Appendix 2, Table 1.

1. *effectiveness and efficiency*

At meetings with high-level officials from both the Ministry of Higher and Secondary Education and Ministry of Health (for the Pediatric Medical Institute), it was found that representatives were both familiar with the course and keen for it to be continued. Representatives from the academic institutions involved, as well as alumni of the HD courses, were uniformly enthusiastic about the courses, with the former thinking creatively about how to extend and improve courses, and the latter thinking of how to apply their knowledge in professional lives.

Links between partners and the project management were found to be regular and productive.

1. *Impact and Sustainability*

This initiative has taken a significantamount of effort and investment to get started, and should not end, since there is satisfaction with both the content and quality of training, and a clear demand and interest in/ enthusiasm for it. The full fruits of this initial investment have also still to be gained. The quality of the training products and resources, including those online, were found to be satisfactory by the evaluation team. There is a clear need to continue with teacher training, in order to compensate for staff turnover, and a potential for up-scaling in a second phase of the project.

Due to the lack of flexibility in the highly centralized system of budget allocations, and curriculum setting, academic institutions are for the moment not capable of taking over the training and carrying out themselves, without further support from the project. But this fact should not detract from the possible positive long-term impact of the project work.

In a country where open policy debate on development issues is not encouraged or possible, the human development framework offers a valuable and needed opportunity to create forums where civil society, especially professionals, can participate and contribute to debate, and use the knowledge in their working and personal lives to the extent permitted by the current political context.

While at meetings with the evaluators, representatives of the Ministry of Higher and Secondary Education were positive about, and well-informed on the project activities, it was also noted by project staff that Ministry of Education representatives regularly fail to attend meetings of the project steering committee, which sends out negative signals to UNDP management regarding their commitment to the work of the project and its sustainability. Neither has the Ministry of Education taken any responsibility or initiative for unifying the content of training courses, or certification. While understanding the constraints under which representatives of the Ministry work, and the notable work burden which they already carry, if they are chosen as a partner in a second phase of the project,there will be a need for persistent lobbying to make the Ministry officials understand that they will have to be more open and visible in their support and commitment to the project. One option may be to change the project implementation mode to NIM for at least this set of activities, with the Ministry being the official partner. This would give the Minister clear responsibilities and may improve ownership.

While it is useful to continue to teach the basics of human development concept and approach, there is also a need for project staff to start thinking about new angles, deepening arguments, etc. This could be usefully connected to future NHDR production and WIS II discussion processes (if and when the latter get underway).

It would also be of value to keep the alumni of courses involved and benefit from their expertise by involving them in peer reviews of HD publications, and where relevant and capacity is strong enough, in the production or discussion of policy briefs.

***4.2 Activity 2: Production of National Human Development Reports***

The evaluation team was asked to consider the quality and production processes used to produce National Human Development Reports (NHDR) since 2005, namely the 2006 NHDR on health, the 2008 NHDR on Education, and the current draft NHDR on regional differences.

The question was also raised by UNDP management, as to whether it is worth continuing with NHDRs if there is no or little government ownership/demand, especially given the considerable human and financial resources required to produce it.

1. *Effectiveness and Efficiency*

*NHDR as a product*

At no interview was the opinion expressed that the NHDR was not worthwhile product. Indeed, all interviewees expressed appreciation of the product. The product is respected and valued because it is seen as filling an information gap and making a contribution to policy debate, in a context where there are few alternative options. The product is respected also because it guarantees regular updates on statistical reporting, even with (often dubious) official statistics, since it can be difficult for the non-government readers to access these. The State Statistical Committee (SSC) does not yet offer online access to basic socio-economic statistics, (although there is ongoing work with the MDG Statistics Project and UNICEF to address this), and statistical handbooks are sometimes inconsistent or not readily available.

However, there was some criticism of the fact that the NHDRs have become more “general”, and in some ways predictable. Some interviewees were of the opinion that there are no clear messages, and some signs of self-censorship. On the other hand, specialists within the fields of health and education also reported that key reform issues within these sectors were addressed, and had been useful in achieving some steps forward in reform implementation.

There was also criticism on more than one occasion regarding the quality of translation into Russian, and especially into Uzbek.

In reviewing the NHDRs produced over the past 5 years, the evaluation team found that the products were of sound quality. The problem of NHDRs becoming general or predictable is not unique to Uzbekistan, and is in some ways symptomatic of the global debate on the current and future focus of HDRs. However, the evaluators feel that it is necessary to stress that the NHDR production process can be as important as the quality of the final product, and that this is particularly the case in Uzbekistan. (see below).

Regarding the most recent NHDR on regional development, which is in the final stages of drafting, the authors found that the topic was highly relevant to the current policy debate given the slow and complex process towards decentralization, and evidence of regional differentiation in development opportunities and challenges, and the need to provide local governments with more capacity and authority to address these. At its inception, it also coincided with the year, which the President declared to be the “Year of Rural Development”. However, the evaluators are of the opinion that the product still requires one final and major edit, in order to bring out messages, and achieve a crisp and readable publication. Given that this NHDR will not have government ownership (for reasons outlined below), it is important that it stands as a clear and valuable UNDP contribution to the policy debate.

*The NHDR production process*

As with the document NHDR itself, the process is generally valued highly as filling a gap, in that it creates an important space for debate. The debate takes place in the various roundtable meetings held during the writing process, to which representatives from government, non-government organizations, academic world, international organizations etc. are invited. Debates are reported to be participatory and lively.

This participatory process has been in some ways expanded during the process of drafting the latest NHDR, by involving the Senate and the State Academy for State and Social Construction and organizing regional level discussions with representatives of local government and civil society. This has been a very positive development, and has provided a fruitful link between Project Activity 1 and 2. On the other hand, however, the process has suffered from losing the hands-on support from government officials, which has occurred largely due to the decision to change the procedures used for the production.

From 1995 until 2005 the NHDR was outsourced through a tender process, won by the Centre for Economic Research (CER), who took responsibility for the production process and guiding the content. The CER involved government officials as authors of drafts. This formula allowed access to official data, ensured active involvement of government officials in the discussion process, and also ensured that the lead author on the government side was prepared to take responsibility on the part of the government for content, “to sign off” and guarantee government ownership. In 2006-2008, (the reports on health and education), the UNDP took overall responsibility (i.e. did not outsource), but still worked with the same government lead author to ensure government ownership. The UNDP staff-member, who was the focal point for the NHDR within the UNDP, was not part of a project.

For the latest report (still in draft form, but in its final stages), responsibility was transferred to the HD project, which was asked to hire a team of authors from the non-governmental sphere/ local research institutes. The official government partner for this part of the project is a member of the Senate, but – unlike the case with previous NHDRs, when government partners were directly involved in the writing process - he is not an author.

The team of consultants hired to draft the reporthas carried out an open process, held regular discussions, organized peer reviews of drafts etc. However, what is missing - and blocking finalization and publication - is the lack of government ownership, and lack of a government partner willing to take responsibility for the text and data in the report. The member of the Senate who is the official government partner is not prepared to take responsibility without government specialists explicitly approving the draft. The team of consultants has also suffered large delays and difficulties in accessing official data due to the lack of government authorship. Whilethe UNDP may take responsibility and publish the NHDR without explicit government approval, this may reduce the impact of the publication as an input to policy debate, and also reduce its authority within the country. However, this seems the only option at the moment, and it is important – as outlined above – that efforts are made to ensure a shorter quality document is produced on the basis of the current draft.

*Impact and sustainability*

There is a clear demand for the NHDR: it has a good “brand” name, and the evaluators strongly recommend that it should continue to be produced periodically, not necessarily annually, but possibly every 3 years.

The evaluators were asked to assess the policy impact of the NHDRs since 2005. It was not possible within the framework of this evaluation to make a systematic list of policy recommendations or changes, which reflect recommendations or arguments made in the NHDRs. However, on the basis of interviews conducted, the evaluators gained the impression that the prospects for continued and increased impact and sustainability are high, provided that (i) efforts are made to re-connect with the government in the production process; (ii) efforts are continued to ensure that the focus of the NHDRs are relevant to national priorities, and (iii) a participatory production process is used, possibly involving to a greater extent other UN agencies and educational institutes involved in Activity 1 as well as alumni from various HD courses.

Regarding (i): the government has shown a recent interest in MDGs.[[14]](#footnote-15) This could be exploited in order to involve government in the production of a future NHDR, which can double as an MDG report. If it is not possible to involve the government officials as authors (due to valid constraints set by UN procedures/ rules), it is essential that they be involved at minimum in steering committees.

Regarding the mode of production: the NHDR is the “flagship” publication of the UNDP, and as suchit may not be the best solution to have it positioned under a project: i.e. it should not be seen as a project document, but rather as a product of the CO as a whole (in partnership with the government), and ideally the RCor DRR should lead a steering committee, which includes representatives not only from the government, but sister agencies, and the education institutes which are working with the project under Activity 1. (If the next NHDR doubles as an MDG report, then sister agencies would definitely be involved, and the RC would lead the steering committee. In the case of “normal” NHDRs, the steering committee could be led by the DRR).

The possibility should also be explored of returning to the mode of working with research institutes to help manage production. This should not necessarily be CER, as in the past, but could be done through research institutes currently being promoted by the Government, namely the Institute for Social Research (ISR) and the Institute for Macroeconomic Forecasting. The former in particular seems an appropriate partner for the NHDR, although a lot of initial capacity building/ training would be required. (This however, is available through the current HD project.) Working through this Institute – which is seen as a trusted partner for the government - could facilitate access to government structures, and especially to information and data, which would ease the production process, and also improve quality and usefulness of the reports.

As stated above, the latest NHDR produced under the project has reached an impasse because no government institution has been involved in the writing process, and none therefore want to get officially involved or take responsibility for content at this advanced stage of the draft. Suggestions to avoid this situation in the future have been provided in the previous paragraphs. However, in the short term, a way has to be found not to waste the considerable amount of effort, which has been put into producing a draft on a topic, which is relevant to many aspects of the policy debate, and development challenges of the country, namely local/ regional development.

The current draft needs to be shortened and made crisper. One option – which would take a few more months to implement, but which would help ensure that the content is technically sound - is to involve BRC experts/ advisors in drafting a shorter version, and to review the final draft. Since regional development and decentralization is relevant to the mandate and programmes of other agencies in the UNCT, they could also be asked to review the document, paving the way for future closer involvement of sister agencies in the production of these reports, in line with efforts to move towards “one UN” at the country level.

Finally translation remains a problem when it comes to terminology. There is clearly scope for doing more checks and devoting more resources to improving the quality of translation. This is vital for ensuring that the HD messages are well understood and received by government and other partners in the country.

***4.3 Activity 3: Policy Briefs***

The CO has produced Policy Briefs since 2005. Prior to the project they were produced under the management and supervision of the Economic and Governance Unit. A total of 16 policy briefs have been produced between 2005 and 2010, on topics, which are relevant to policy debate, and to the work of UNDP projects

Under this Activity, the project has also built up a database, which contains regionally disaggregated data on a range of indicators related to human development.

*Effectiveness and Efficiency*

As with the NHDR, policy briefs were almost universally welcomed as filling an information gap, and contributing to the policy debate.Although there was some criticism of the content of individual policy briefs, this is to some extent to be expected, in that their purpose is to contribute to and even provoke debate[[15]](#footnote-16).

As in the case of NHDRs, the evaluators found that the overall quality of the products was satisfactory, but have some doubts as to whether it is appropriate for them to continue to be produced under the project framework, where they risk to be seen as project documents, including by fellow UN staff members from different practices or projects.

If produced under the project in the future, there is a need for a full-time officer to work on the production, who can provide dedicated intellectual guidance and supervision, and work in close contact with other UNDP practices and possibly other UN agencies to identify topics and authors, and work with peer reviewers to ensure quality control and smooth production process.

Implementation progress for this Activity is summarized in Appendix 2, Table 3.

*Impact and Sustainability*

As with the NHDR, there is a clear demand for these products, partly due to the lack of alternative forums and information sources. Whether or not recommendations are implemented, they clearly are read and have some influence on policy makers.

There is somepotential for increasing the number produced (budget resources permitting) and for diversifying them. Regarding the latter, they may be used to publish the results of studies carried out within UNDP projects, also drawing on in-house expertise. Others may be used to summarise key issues/challenges and policy recommendations connected with forthcoming WIS II discussions (if and when these get underway). They could even provide examples of text, which can be used or adapted by government authors to speed up the formulation process[[16]](#footnote-17). Some could be forward looking, and be devoted to development challenges, which the international community feels that the government is not yet aware of or not facing up to.

Policy Briefs are clearly UNDP documents (whereas the NHDR is more ambivalent, since it is ideally produced in partnership with the government). They have built up a brand name – to a lesser extent than the NHDR, but this is understandable, since they are geared to a narrower audience, primarily government technical level staff, and local research institutes. Among this audience they are known and read. However, although they are UNDP documents, it would be good to improve government involvement, for at least some of the briefs, in order to increase their policy impact and use. It may be possible to increase government involvement – as in the case of the NHDR - by working with one of the research institutes being promoted by the government, in this case the Institute of Macro Forecasting. In this way the UNDP can contribute directly to building capacity in local research institutes, and also achieve greater impact and access to policy makers.

Regarding the database created under this Activity, the evaluators found no fault with the structure or quality. However, there is some concern regarding duplication with other databases, for example that which has been created under the previously UNDP-supported MDG statistics project (which reached completion at the end of 2010). UNDP should consult with former staff members of this project to ensure that one optimal version is selected and used for this project, but also for other practices in the CO.

In interviews with the MDG statistics project staff, it was also reported that there are changes occurring within the State Statistical Committee (SSC), due to change in chairman, and a new generation of staff. SSC staff members have expressed a clear desire to understand better international standards for key social indicators. There is now an opportunity to support this, and engage in a “learning by doing” process by reaching out to involve the SSC staff in future HD productions, especially if the proposal of a combined NHDR/ MDG report is pursued. This could be discussed further with those from the former staff of the MDG statistics project who worked with the SSC on the creation of an Uzbek version of Devinfo.

***4.4 Comments Relevant to the Project as a Whole***

Table 1 (below) shows the extent to which resources have been used, and on what they have been used. Table 1 shows clearly that budget execution levels in 2008 and 2009 are high, which indicates a high capacity for delivery. Only in 2009 execution levels are lower. Table 1 shows furthermore that HD teaching is the main activity of the programme, with almost 60% of overall expenditure, against 25% for HD reporting and 15% for Policy Briefs. However it should also be noted that all project staff are paid out of component 1, as well as maintenance/ running costs of the project premises.

**Table 1: Budget amounts and distribution(USD)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **2008** | **2009** | **2010** | **Total** |
| Approved budget | 100,000 | 268,505 | 262,200 | 630,705 |
| ACTIVITY1 Teaching HD | 18,657 | 95,728 | 197,196 | 311,581 |
| ACTIVITY2 HD Reports | 33,625 | 56,853 | 49,215 | 139,694 |
| ACTIVITY3 Policy Briefs | 38,451 | 33,743 | 12,150 | 84,345 |
| Total | 90,734 | 186,324 | 258,562 | 535,619 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent of total budget execution | 90.7 | 69.4 | 98.6 | 84.9 |
| % - ACTIVITY1 Teaching HD | 20.6 | 51.4 | 76.3 | 58.2 |
| % - ACTIVITY2 HD Reports | 37.1 | 30.5 | 19.0 | 26.1 |
| % - ACTIVITY3 Policy Briefs | 42.4 | 18.1 | 4.7 | 15.7 |

Source: Authors’ calculations based on annual project budget balances

The budget amount dedicated to the formulation process of the NHDR is clearly below that which COs normally spend on this activity. On the other hand, the Policy Brief budget share looks reasonable. These two parts of the project’s budget show clearly a high cost efficiency. In comparison to them, the budget allocated to teaching activities looks high. This is partly because it includes project management costs, as indicated above, and also because teaching and training are the project’s main activities. Important amounts of resources were spent on the acquisition of equipment, such as for the resource center in the UWED. In a sense initial investment is needed, in order to create the necessary conditions for achieving the project’s final goals. It is this initial investment, which creates the impression that the cost-effectiveness at a teaching level is (still) not high enough. Many of the future results/ benefits of this activity have still to materialize. However, there is an important amount of complementary value/resources for the project provided by partner institutions, for example in the form of teaching hours the cost of which is covered by the institutions themselves. A consolidated project balance, which quantifies UNDP’s monetary expenditure, as well as the monetary value of complementary services delivered from partner institutions, could help to provide a more balanced picture of the cost-effectiveness of the teaching activity in the future.

1. **Evaluation Scores**

In order to give a clearer understanding of the level and the quality of results achieved by the project, evaluation criteria have been formulated, and a rating system[[17]](#footnote-18)established. The rating reflects the informed judgment of the evaluators, based on qualitatively or quantitatively captured indicator(s). Ratings for non-quantifiable indicators require that qualitative assessments be made. These were done through the review of data and analysis of the interviews carried out in the course of the evaluation mission. The criteria for these assessments were established using a regular likert scale rating. The rating system for this report was established by the authors and does not necessarily represent official UNDP policy. This rating system is based on a qualitative standard scale, and results can therefore be considered an indicative evaluation of compliance regarding what had been established in the project documents, taking into account the performance of implemented activities and the quality of achieved results.[[18]](#footnote-19) These ratings should however be used in conjunction with the qualitative analysis of the evaluation provided in the previous section.

***General Evaluation Criteria***

In an expanded approach to the basic evaluation criteria of OECD/DAC, this section used the following general criteria to evaluate the project:

* + - **Relevance.** The degree to which the project is justified in relation to the needs of the beneficiaries and the policy environment of the project.
    - **Coherence/Complementarity** between the project and other policies, which impact HD.
    - **Progress:** The progress towards the project purpose and the overall objective. Example: whether the beneficiaries have access, are using, and are satisfied with the project services.
    - **Effectiveness.** The extent to which the project purpose has been achieved as a result of the project.
    - **Efficiency.** The cost/time effectiveness of transforming the means into results.
    - **Impact/Degree of Change.** The intended and unintended impacts of the project, changes brought about by the Project intervention?
    - **Sustainability.** The extent to which the positive effects of the project would continue after the external assistance has come to an end. Will the positive change in the development situation endure/continue in future?
* **Assumptions.** The likelihood of assumptions to materialize.
* **Implementation:** achievement of planned results, compliance with budget, availability of baseline data and use of indicators.

Rating is carried out using the following grades:

* **Highly Satisfactory**: in compliance with the Project Document (expected accomplishments) and with high standards of performance.
* **Satisfactory**: generally in compliance with the project document.
* **Unsatisfactory**: partly in compliance but with weaknesses in some parts.
* **Highly Unsatisfactory**: not in compliance.

**Table 2: HD evaluation at a glance – overall evaluation**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Highly unsatisfactory** | **Unsatisfactory** | **Satisfactory** | **Highly satisfactory** |
| Relevance |  |  | **X** |  |
| Coherence |  |  | **X** |  |
| Progress |  |  | **X** |  |
| Effectiveness |  |  | **X** |  |
| Efficiency |  |  | **X** |  |
| Impact / Degree of Change |  |  | **X** |  |
| Sustainability |  | **X** |  |  |
| Assumptions |  | **X** |  |  |
| Implementation |  |  | **X** |  |
| Partnership |  |  | **X** |  |

Source: Authors’ elaboration.

**Table 3 Intervention Profile /Performance Summary – HD teaching**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Highly unsatisfactory** | **Unsatisfactory** | **Satisfactory** | **Highly satisfactory** |
| **RELEVANCE** |  |  | **X** |  |
| Correspondence with beneficiaries´ priority needs | Expanding knowledge regarding HD as an input for Uzbek development is a UNDP priority. The HD concept can provide a valuable complement to the GoU idea of the “Uzbek way” of development. So from a conceptual point of view the project is highly relevant and can be used as an umbrella for policy debates, in a situation where there are not many alternative spaces for debate. Nevertheless the HD approach is still not used for policy formulations and in this sense the project lacks some practical relevance. | | | |
| Project’s concept, design and strategy | The project’s concept (basic HD training), design (teaching courses, online courses, different levels of complexity) was adequate for this first stage of teaching experience. The strategy of creating demand through a bottom-up process, (stimulating demand in universities and other institutions in order to later engage with higher ranked institutions (ministries)), is also appropriate for the country context. | | | |
| **COHERENCE** |  |  | **X** |  |
| Coherence between the project and other policies which impact HD | The HD approach is compatible with a lot of the government’s self-declared (at least theoretical) approach to development. The HD concept can offer important support to taking forward policy debates if steered and used well. But this could be exploited more, through more interaction with other practices and projects within the CO. | | | |
| **PROGRESS** |  |  | **X** |  |
| The progress towards the project purpose and the overall objective. | The project’s progress (HD training) is satisfactory in the sense that almost all planned activities have been implemented, and awareness of HD has increased across various sections of the population, and in different regions | | | |
| **EFFECTIVENESS** |  |  | **X** |  |
| The extent to which the project purpose has been achieved as a result of the project. |  |  |  | **X** |
| The purpose of expanding knowledge on HD throughout teaching activities has clearly been achieved. Scope of teaching and the number of involved institutions goes beyond planned benchmarks. Without the project these results would not have been achieved. | | | |
| Effectiveness of management; quality and timeliness of monitoring and backstopping. |  |  | **X** |  |
| The teaching and learning process on HD, through partner institutions (universities) and online courses, has been managed properly from the UNDP side. Nevertheless there have been delays, which were not always under control of UNDP. For example the resource center in UWED became fully operational only in the second half of 2010 | | | |
| Effectiveness at raising awareness and integration of HD approach for policy making. |  | **X** |  |  |
| Awareness of the HD approach has been raised outside rather than inside in government. The principle vehicles for inserting HD ideas into the policy making process, the policy briefs and the NHDR, have not been used as widely and intensively as expected. Policy briefs have been produced at a lower periodicity and to some extent at a lower quality level than in the past, and the government currently less owns the NDHR formulation process. UNDP has clearly been looking for more independence in the whole process of the production of HD products, facing a trade-off between independence and the possibility to influence policymaking. This is not a fault of the project as such, but a logical consequence of a political decision taken inside UNDP. Nevertheless, regarding the project’s achievements for this result has to be considered as not satisfactory. | | | |
| Quality, usability, sustainable follow-up on NHDRs, textbook and teaching materialsand Policy Briefs, for promoting HD approach. |  |  | **X** |  |
| From an academic/research point of view the quality of the NHDR draft is high and closes important data gaps. The quality of Policy Briefs shows a wider variation. The HD textbook and other teaching materials are of a high standard. Nevertheless it seems that they are quite technical and in a sense are not able to promote a convincing message to a broad audience on why and how HD should be considered as an important complement to the context of the Uzbek development process. | | | |
| **EFFICIENCY** |  |  | **X** |  |
| Cost-effectiveness of converting means into results | The budget amount dedicated to the formulation process of the NHDR is clearly below that which other COs usually spend on this. Compared to the NHDR budget, the Policy Brief budget share looks reasonable. These two parts of the project’s budget show a high degree of cost efficiency. In comparison to them, the budget allocated to teaching activities looks high. This can be expected, since teaching and training is the project’s main activity. Important amounts of resources are spent in the acquisition of equipment such as for the resource center in the UWED. In a sense a pre-investment in order to create necessary conditions for achieving the projects final goals are financed with an important share of resources. It is especially this fact, which creates the impression that the cost-effectiveness at a teaching level is (still) not high enough. Of course, many of the future results of this activity did still not materialize. However, there is a significant amount of complementary value/resources for the project provided by partner institutions, for example in the form of teaching hours whose cost is covered by the institutions themselves. A consolidated project balance which quantifies UNDP’s monetary expenditure and as well the monetary value of complementary services delivered from partner institutions could help to balance the impression of cost-effectiveness of the teaching activity in the future. | | | |
| **IMPACT / DEGREE OF CHANGE** |  |  | **X** |  |
| The intended and unintended impacts of the project, changes brought about by the Project intervention? |  |  | **X** |  |
| Regarding teaching activities, in the opinion of the evaluators, the biggest achieved impact is the unexpected demand from teaching institutions to get involved in HD teaching and be supported by the project. This per se is still not a change regarding the use of HD concepts in policy making itself, but it creates conditions, which increase the possibility that such a change might happen in the future. The recent interest of GoU in MDGs and the need for a deeper understanding of MDGs in a development context (MDGs as a roadmap to HD) create an important opportunity for a wider and deeper use of knowledge already created in teaching institutions and regarding awareness of the HD concept. | | | |
| Degree of generation of awareness on HD in general and personal capacities of stakeholders to continue project activities |  |  | **X** |  |
| Teaching institutions have sufficient awareness and desire to continue teaching activities regarding HD, but their current capacities do not allow them to keep teaching based on a existing infrastructure and didactic materials. This evaluation does not consider them as sufficiently committed, interested and provided with necessary resources, to expand their teaching activities. The process of awareness and demand generation for HD training was clearly a bottom up process, which in the future should be linked with a top down approach in order to make the project’s activities sustainable.  NHDR and PB activities clearly will always have to be driven by UNDP, since GoU will not implement such kind of activities on its own behalf. | | | |
| Project’s contribution in the establishment of efficient national institutional frameworks for promotion HD. |  | **X** |  |  |
| Until now the teaching activity has been approached from a bottom up perspective, so no institutional framework been established at the central government level. Even if strategically this seems to have been the correct decision – it can be seen that the increased interest at the level of teaching institutions is leading to an increased interest at the central government level, but the process of constructing an institutional framework has still not been initiated. | | | |
| **SUSTAINABILITY** |  | **X** |  |  |
| Correspondence with local policies |  | **X** |  |  |
| As outlined before, the correspondence with local policies exists at a theoretical level, but not always in practice | | | |
| Development of local institutional capacity |  | **X** |  |  |
| Capacity levels of public institutions to take over the whole range of the project activities (for the teaching component) do still not exist. | | | |
| Strengthening of local human resources |  |  | **X** |  |
| Human resources (teaching staff) have been trained at a high quality level. Sustainability of this component should be much easier, since training of trainers has been implemented widely. | | | |
| Participation of local stakeholders |  | **X** |  |  |
| The project managed to achieve mainly the participation of stakeholders with a low level of decision-making power/ influence. This is not enough to ensure sustainability. | | | |
| Appropriateness of technology |  |  | **X** |  |
| The technology used for teaching is appropriate and sustainable for the foreseeable period of time (until this technology becomes outdated) | | | |
| **ASSUMPTIONS** |  | **X** |  |  |
| Likelihood of assumptions to materialize | The project is based on the assumption that its three components would create a kind of synergy, which then leads to a bottom up force to expand awareness of HD, including in GoU, which would lead to its use for policy making. These assumptions (even if expressed in other words) may in fact materialize in the future, but they could not materialize during the project’s period of implementation due to the reasons set out in this report, including insufficient links between the three activities, and the lack of a top-down approach in central government which could engage with the bottom up process which has been initiated by the project. | | | |
| **IMPLEMENTATION** |  |  | **X** |  |
| Achievement of planned results |  |  | **X** |  |
| The achievement of the overall results is satisfactory. In the teaching activity the demand side results have been higher then expected and now some more attention should be paid to create conditions to ensure sustainability. Policy Briefs have gained independence, but did not lose their audience due to this fact, and even if the NHDR process is below expectations at the moment, it still cannot be considered as unsatisfactory. | | | |
| Compliance with budget |  |  |  | **X** |
| An important number of activities have been implemented at a lower cost than expected and budget lines have never been exceeded. Cash flow and level of activities are according to usual project cycles. | | | |
| Availability of baseline data |  |  |  |  |
| This evaluation considers that due to the nature of the project’s activities, there is no need to work with baseline data. No evaluation applicable for this point. | | | |
| Use of indicators |  |  | **X** |  |
| The use of indicators for follow up of the project is reasonable. Nevertheless, as mentioned above, there is an imbalance in the number defined indicators for each component. All indicators are activity indicators, which is adequate for being the first project stage. Nevertheless for a future project stage, the use of results/outcome indicators should be considered as well as the establishment of a baseline, which should reflect results achieved by this first project period. | | | |
| Executing modality and managerial arrangements. |  |  | **X** |  |
| The executing modality (DIM) and managerial arrangements (HD office and its staff characteristics) have been perfectly adequate for the implementation of the teaching component for this first project period. Nevertheless, for a possible next period, a joint implementation together with a government institution should be envisaged.  The DIM modality seems to have been adequate as well for this period, considering the internal UNDP desire to gain more independence for production of NHDR and PB. The managerial arrangements to handle these processes in house, as a project, seems not to be a problem. Nevertheless, the technical and professional characteristics of a UNDP team, which should manage a teaching process, are quite different from the characteristics required to manage a PB or NHDR process which requires the reconciliation of two different objectives, namely independence and government ownership. In other words, for the current project period, the executing modalities and managerial arrangements have been satisfactory, but will not be so in any future project period. At least some changes regarding managerial arrangements will be required. | | | |
| Use of adaptive management techniquesin project implementation. |  |  | **X** |  |
| The teaching component has been sufficiently adaptive to respond to different and unforeseen types/ levels of demand for and response to this component. | | | |
| Project’s implementation design allowed for flexibility in responding to a changing environment. |  | **X** |  |  |
| If we take implementation design to mean DIM project, then this design did help to create flexibility inside UNDP, but this flexibility was not met with a corresponding flexibility in response from the governmentside. As a result, flexibility was achieved but did not lead to the expected results. | | | |
| **PARTNERSHIPSTRATEGY** |  |  | **X** |  |
| Project’s implementation included relevant stakeholders. |  | **X** |  |  |
| The project’s implementation included relevant stakeholders for the bottom up approach in the teaching process given the initial phase of activities but has not managed to engage sufficiently with other stakeholder which can ensure the continuity and sustainability of activities. The same is true for the NHDR and PB component. Stakeholders might be relevant but they are not sufficiently compromised, involved, interested in order to sustain these activities as well from their side | | | |
| Collaboration between stakeholders has been achieved. |  |  | **X** |  |
| Collaboration was achieved at the teaching level, but not at the NHDR and PB component. | | | |
| MOUs were appropriate for cementing institutional partnerships. |  | **X** |  |  |
| MOUs were appropriate for initiating the project’s activities, but they are not appropriate for ensuring continuity. | | | |
| Identification of stakeholders, target audience and beneficiary partners. |  |  | **X** |  |
| Potential stakeholders seem to have been addressed properly within UNDP. The problem is not so much identifying them but obtaining and maintaining their interest and support for the project. | | | |
| Approach for preparation of NHDRs, Policy Briefs and HD teaching was sound. |  |  | **X** |  |
| Approaches were appropriate for a bottom up strategy for teaching, and for gaining independence for NHDR and PB, but at the cost of visibility and government ownership for these last two components. | | | |

Source: Authors’ elaboration.

1. **Summary of Results, Lessons Learned and Recommendations for Future Interventions**

This final section summarises the results of the evaluation, and makes recommendations for future interventions.

Overall it is recommended that a second stage of the project is designed and launched, but continuing only with HD training and PBs (Activities 1 and 3) under project modality. The training component could be a project with NIM modality, which would potentially require and lead to more direct involvement of the Ministry of Education and other partners. A project manager would be hired, and the current project manager would remain in the CO to provide oversight to the project, and coordinate production of the NHDR, while alsodevoting more attention to ensuring mainstreaming of HD into UNDP programmatic work, as well as promoting follow-up on NHDR and PB recommendations.

It is recommended also to continue with the two types of HD products, but that the NHDR should not necessarily be produced under project modality (see below).

***6.1 Activity 1: HD Training***

Teaching and training activities should continue, in order to gain full returns and impact from the considerable investment, which has been made to date. This investment is clearly appreciated and demanded by educational institutes, journalists and alumni. Educational institutes are not capable of carrying on these activities without project support, but given the centralized nature of decision-making, this is not surprising. Given UNDP’s clear mandate in promoting the human development approach, and the useful umbrella it provides for debate in Uzbekistan, activities should be continued. Efforts will however have to be continued to ensure that the Ministry of Higher Education is informed and – to the extent possible - actively supporting the activities. (As noted above, this could be addressed by adopting NIM for this set of activities). In particular, it will be important to work together with the Ministry in ensuring unification of training content, certification, and quality levels for the HD courses offered at different institutes.The training activities in the future could usefully be supplemented in a future project by offering the possibilities for meetings between HD teachers from different institutions to facilitate exchange of experience. Efforts should also be made in the future to provide for exchange of experience between teachers from the different educational institutes involved in the project. Furthermore, it is recommended that a follow-on project also goes beyond basic introductory courses, and starts to envisage training on more sophisticated aspects of HD, including on the calculation of the new HDI for statisticians from the SSC. (This is particularly relevant given the concern and perplexity about the new indicator encountered by the evaluation team in interviews with various government partners).

Future training activities and topics may also be usefully linked to the topics selected for future NHDRs. Teachers and alumni should - to the extent possible - be involved in peer review of draft NHDRs in the future.

On-line activities have proved popular and an increasingly effective way of outreach, although will have to continue to be complemented by other means and opportunities, given the limited internet connection possibilities for those living in rural areas outside of Tashkent and other main urban centers.

The project has logistical difficulties in purchasing books related to HD teaching and research, and UNDP’s Bratislava Regional Centre could be approached in order to help with practical assistance in overcoming these barriers.

The evaluators found that there was little sign of cross-fertilization between the HD project and other projects and units within the CO. This is a matter of concern, given the crosscutting nature of HD across the UNDP mandate. It is suggested that senior management take measures to ensure greater interaction. This could include provision of HD training by the project for other units or projects, and active seeking out of links between and possible use of the work and materials produced and other projects and HD products.

***6.2 Activity 2: NHDR***

NHDRs are appreciated, and have impact. Although there has been criticism regarding the content in recent years, this is partly a reflection of the difficulty experienced elsewhere in the world in the production of NHDRs, and indeed global HDRs. There are ongoing debates on how to find new ways of applying the HD approach, and the fact that the NHDR is sometimes criticized for becoming more general in recent years is not necessarily a bad thing. Within the health and education sectors it was also recognized that the past two reports drew attention to certain anomalies in the provision of these services, which were topical in the narrower sector policy debate.

Given the time, effort, and resources required to produce a good report, it is recommended that the CO aim to produce a NHDR once every three years. It may be possible to discuss future topics with other sister agencies, within the UNCT, to identify possible synergies, and it may also be possible to combine the next NHDR with work with the government on a national MDG report. This could help improve understanding on how human development and MDGs are not separate topics, and that HD can provide a structure for approaching development as a whole. As suggested in section 4, the next NHDR could double as a MDG report, given the recent interest in this expressed by the government. It should in any case (whatever the next topic) build on the work done by the MDG statistics project to train the SSC in the use and adaptation of Devinfo to report on MDG indicators, and to improve understanding on how to bring national statistical reporting on key indicators (e.g. income poverty, infant mortality) more in line with international standards.

The current draft NHDR on regional development represents requires editing and shortening before being published, with particular attention being made to articulating more clearly the HD messages. It is recommended that the CO does not lose the opportunity to publish a report on this important theme, and to allow readers access to regional level data, which has been compiled. However, it is also recommended that outside advisors from BRC or elsewhere be brought in to finalize and produce a crisper document.

The quality of the process of producing NHDRs is as important as the quality of the final product, and efforts should continued to be made to make the process as participatory as possible. The process used to produce the latest draft NHDR on regional development has not been successful, in that it has failed to ensure government ownership of the product. A new modality has to be created to ensure the involvement of government specialists in the process, if not as authors, then as reviewers, commentators, and members of the steering committee. The latter should be formed, and headed by either the RC (if – in the spirit of “one UN” - other agencies are involved in the production), or by the DRR, and should include representatives from government (not technical level, but with a high enough rank to sign off on content), sister agencies, and educational institutes which provide HD training. As outlined in section 4, it is recommended to pursue the possibility of engaging the Institute of Social Research (ISR) to coordinate the discussion and writing process, under the overall supervision of an UNDP officer. This modality would also help ensure government ownership, and open up a way of obtaining government approval. It would however have to be accompanied by provision of significant capacity building for the ISR.

Overall, it is not recommended to continue placing responsibility for NHDR production with an HD project. This flagship publication should be clearly seen as a product owned by the CO as a whole, in partnership with the government and civil society.

Future publications will have to pay more attention to ensuring good quality translation in Russian and Uzbek, and the project should be in a position to provide important inputs in this, especially for the translation of specific HD terminology.

***6.3Activity 3: Policy Briefs***

Policy Briefs are also in demand, and can make important contributions to policy debates. However, they may be better suited to the project modality, in order to ensure that the HD approach is mainstreamed in all briefs. Moreover, they should be managed by someone with a sound grounding in and understanding of socio-economic issues in the country. They should continue to be produced, but may not necessarily need to conform to a standard format. All briefs, however, should be kept short (maximum 10 pages, preferably shorter), with clear messages. In the future the production process for some briefs could be managed through the Institute of Macro Forecasting, in order to ensure greater impact among government officials. This would be particularly relevant if the WIS II formulation process finally takes off. Other briefs should draw on materials being produced within UNDP projects, or can be forward looking, and prepare the ground for projects which are being discussed or are in the pipeline.

***6.4 Overall Conclusions***

The project as a whole managed to achieve its main de facto objectives (not all of which are clearly formulated in the project document). Regarding the teaching component the objective was expanding awareness and teaching by using a bottom-up approach[[19]](#footnote-20), which then should lead to a wider interest from government side. The first part of this two step process was very successfullyimplemented, achieving a higher demand than expected, delivering high quality products under an efficient executing and managerial arrangement,and benefiting from a team of qualified human resources which facilitated the process.

Nevertheless, the results of this process, achieved so far, will not be sustainable on their own. They represent a very valuable achievement, which should be built on in the future, but one which should be complemented by a top-down strategy. This strategy would have the aim of engaging central governments institutions and line ministries to promote Human Development as the guiding concept for MDGs, and as a perfect complement for the Uzbek way of development, and indeed one which can help this path of development to perform better. Both NHDRs and PBs can be valuable and complementary products in this promotion process.

**Reference Materials**

NHDRs (2005 – 2010) - <http://www.undp.uz/en/publications/?publication_type=8>

UNDP Uzbekistan Policy Briefs (2005-2010) - <http://www.undp.uz/en/publications/?publication_type=10>

HD project “Increasing Capacities of Educational and Policy-making Establishments in Promoting and Applying the Human Development Concept” - <http://www.undp.uz/en/projects/project.php?id=135>

Human Development in Uzbekistan website – [www.humandevelopment.uz](http://www.humandevelopment.uz)

United Nations Development Assistance Framework 2010 – 2015 (UNDAF 2010 - 2015), M&E framework - <http://www.undp.uz/en/publications/publication.php?id=232>

UNDP Country Programme Action Plan 2010 – 2015 (CPAP 2010 – 2015) - <http://www.undp.uz/en/publications/publication.php?id=237>

Human Development in Uzbekistan website – [www.humandevelopment.uz](http://www.humandevelopment.uz)

APPENDIX 1: QUESTIONS FOR SEMI-STRUCTURED INTERVIEWS

(Contains a mix of general evaluation questions, and also some questions which are specific to the project, and which are based on the tasks outlined in the TORs for the evaluation team).

**I. Project Design: Relevance of project, and extent to which original objectives remain valid**

* 1. *Does the project address a relevant need? How was the baseline condition established at the beginning of the project? Was a needs analysis carried out at the beginning of the project to assess the needs of different stakeholders?*
  2. *Did stakeholders take ownership of the project concept and approach? Was the projected aligned with and supportive of the national development plan, as well as the priorities of the national partners?*
  3. *How well was the project aligned with the overall UNDP mandate, and did it complement other projects in the country? How well did the project complement and link to the activities of other donors, and fit within the broader donor context?*
  4. *Is the project logic coherent and realistic? Does the output link to the intended outcome, which is in turn linked to a broader impact or development objective? Are they based on a plausible causal analysis? Do the strategic components link logically to the planned objectives?*
  5. *Who are the partners and how strategic are they in terms of mandate, influence and capacity?*
  6. *On which risks and assumptions does the project logic build? How realistic are they?*
  7. *How appropriate and useful are the indicators described in the project document in assessing the project’s progress? Are they gender sensitive?*

**II. Project effectiveness and efficiency**

The main questions addressed to assess effectiveness and efficiency of the project were as follows:

1. *Has the project achieved its planned objectives?*
2. *Has the quantity and quality of the activities been satisfactory, and do the benefits accrue equally to men and women?*
3. *Are the project partners using the outputs?*
4. *How have the stakeholders been involved in project implementation? How effective has the project been in establishing national ownership?*
5. *Has the project been responsive to the needs of national partners and changing partner priorities?*
6. *Has the project been responsive to changes in the project environment?*
7. *In which areas does the project have the greatest achievements? Why is this, and what have been the supporting factors? How can these be built on?*
8. *In which areas does the project have least achievements? What have been the constraining factors?*
9. *How effective are the activities aimed at raising awareness and integrating the human development approach into policy making and analysis? Also these aimed at integrating the human development approach into the education process?*
10. *Is the quality of NHDRs, text book and teaching materials, Policy Briefs sound, and are they used by target audiences?*

**III. Efficiency of Resource Use and Effectiveness of Management Arrangements.**

1. *Have resources (funds, human resources, time, expertise) been allocated strategically to achieve the project output?*
2. *Were resources used efficiently? Were activities supporting the strategy cost-effective? Did the results achieved justify the costs?*
3. *Were project funds and activities delivered in a timely manner?*
4. *Were management capacities adequate to facilitate good results and efficient delivery?*
5. *Did the project receive adequate support from its national partners?*
6. *Did the project receive adequate support from the UNDP CO?*
7. *How effectively did project management monitor project performance and results? Was relevant information and data systematically collected?*
8. *Did the project make strategic use of coordination and collaboration with other UNDP projects and donors in the countries to increase its effectiveness and impact?*
9. *Was the use of Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) an appropriate and strategic modality for formalizing partnerships with education establishments?*

**IV. Impact and Sustainability**

1. *How far has the project made a significant contribution to broader and longer term development impact? What are the realistic long term effects of the project?*
2. *Can the project be scaled up?*
3. *Can the project gradually be handed over to national partners, and will they be able to continue the project activities and take them forward? Are national partners willing and able to continue with the project?*
4. *Has awareness of human development in general improved, and has capacity among national institutional frameworks for promoting human development been increased?*

**Appendix 2: Summary of Project Objectives, Activities, Outputs, as well as Implementation Progress**

**Table 1: Activity 1 – Introducing and advancing the teaching potential of educations establishments for teaching HD**

| **Target** | **Year** | **Output** | **Activity and indicators** | **Implemented[[20]](#footnote-21)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Target# 1:** HD curriculum and HD teaching kit adopted by # of higher educational institutions | 2008 | Methodological base for teaching HD created, curriculum for MA level students developed; | **Indicator # 1.1:** Advanced copy of HD textbook produced and disseminated to target groups in # of copies | **Yes** |
| **Indicator # 1.2**.: # of Training for trainers (beginning and intermediate level) conducted, # of people trained (at least 30% women) | **Yes** |
| **Indicator # 1.3**: # of graduate students trained (at least 30% women) and % certified as a result of 1 semester long HD course | **Yes** |
| **Indicator # 1.4:** # of study tours abroad to familiarize representatives of target groups with best in class international practices of HD conducted. Upon return # of Intensive follow up actions secured by the participants. | **N/A** |
| 2009 | HD course curricula piloted in at least 1 educational institution under MoU with UNDP | **Indicator # 1.1**. # of MA level students trained (at least 30% women) and % certified as a result of 1 semester long HD course | **Yes** |
| **Indicator # 1.2**.: # of Training for trainers (intermediate & advanced level) conducted ( 30% women trained), # of people certified | **Yes** |
| **Indicator # 1.3.:** HD teaching kit comprising of lecture texts, presentations, sample exam questions and case studies developed | **Yes** |
| **Indicator # 1.4:** Video laboratory for introducing innovative teaching methods established | **Yes** |
| 2010 | Enabling conditions for HD teaching at sub-regional level created | **Indicator # 1.1.:** hard and electronic HD teaching kit and 1st edition of HD textbook in Uzbek, English, Russian produced and # of copies disseminated | **Yes[[21]](#footnote-22)** |
| **Indicator # 1.2:** At least 1 summer school at sub-regional level (on-line and off-line teaching Modules) conducted. (at least 30% women participated) | **Yes** |
| **Indicator # 1.3:** # of HD articles and abstracts published in HDRC bulletin | **N/A** |
| **Indicator # 1.4**.: # of training for Trainers (beginning, intermediate and advanced level) conducted (at least 30% women trained), % of people certified | **Yes** |
| **Indicator # 1.5**.: # graduate students trained (at least 30% women) and % certified | **Yes** |
| **Indicator # 1.6:** HD course curricula piloted in # of educational institution under MoU with UNDP; | **Yes** |
| **Indicator # 1.7**: Association of teachers and students established (disaggregated by gender) | **Yes** |
| **Indicator # 1.8.**: # of teaching courses developed by the means of Video laboratory | **Yes** |
| **Indicator # 1.9.** The HD textbook for the Academy of State and Social construction developed in Russian and Uzbek | **No** |
| 2011 (exit strategy and sustainability assurance) | HD concept is continuously promoted through the self-sustained HD courses by educational establishments for various targeted audiences | **Indicator # 1.1.:** # of educational establishments in the regions of Uzbekistan teaching HD | **n/a** |
| **Indicator # 1.2:** At least 1 summer school at sub-regional level (on-line and off-line teaching Modules) conducted (at least 30% women participated) | **n/a** |
| **Indicator # 1.3:** # of HD articles and abstracts from Uzbekistan published in international academic papers | **n/a** |
| **Indicator # 1.4**.: # of training for Trainers (beginning, intermediate and advanced level) conducted (at least 30% women trained), % of people certified | **n/a** |
| **Indicator # 1.5**.: # of graduate and undergraduate students and ASCC listeners trained (at least 30% women) and % certified | **n/a** |
| **Indicator # 1.6:** the MHSSE supported the HD course by official recommendation t o include it into the HE curricula | **n/a** |
| **Indicator # 1.7**: Network of teachers and students promoted throughout the HD website (measured by regular exchange of information and feedback across & between students and teachers) | **n/a** |
| **Indicator # 1.8.**: # of teaching courses developed by the means of Video laboratory | **n/a** |
| **Indicator # 1.9.** Information on HD teaching transferred to the third parties | **n/a** |
| **Target# 2**: 1/3 of target group respondents (random sampling, national representation) are aware of HD concept, satisfied with HD visibility materials and are able to describe what HD is about in simple words | 2009 | The baseline for the penetration of HD concept at central and regional levels established | **Indicator # 2.1:** Survey at the sub regional level conducted (establishing the baseline for HD/MDG literacy by public) | **Yes** |
| **Indicator # 2.2:** HD Resource Center is up and running; | **Yes** |
| **Indicator # 2.3:** HD website launched and registered in # of search engines worldwide | **Yes** |
| **Indicator # 2.4:** # of learning seminars/HD workshops conducted at sub-regional level and covered by both national& local media | **Yes** |
| **Indicator 2.5:** # of study tours abroad to familiarize representatives of target groups with best in class international practices of HD conducted. Upon return # of Intensive follow up actions secured by the participants. | **N/A** |
| **Indicator 2.6 #** of HD events by topic organized under the auspices of HDRC | **Yes** |
| 2010 | Visibility of HD interventions enhanced, level of HD literacy improved | **Indicator # 2.1.** HD PR kit developed in Uzbek and disseminated regionally | **Yes** |
| **Indicator # 2.2**. # of downloads from HD website at www.humandevelopment.uz by topic, by # of unique visitors at regional level | **Yes** |
| **Indicator # 2.3.** # of extensive mass media mentions | **Yes** |
| **Indicator # 2.4.** % of active HDRC clients out of total registered disaggregated by gender (level of activity is measured by # of borrowed/used materials) | **Yes** |
| **Indicator # 2.5** # of learning trips abroad to seek best HD experiences conducted. Upon return # of Intensive follow up actions secured by the participants. | **N/A** |
| **Indicator # 2.6** # of HD events by topic organized under the auspices of HD Resource Center | **Yes** |
| **Indicator # 2.7.** The HD guidelines for parliamentarians produced in Russian and Uzbek and widely disseminated | **Yes** |
| 2011 (exit strategy and sustainability assurance) | General public is aware of HD concept, satisfied with HD visibility materials and able to describe what HD is about in simple words | **Indicator # 2.1.** # of downloads from HD website by topic, by # of unique visitors at regional level | **n/a** |
| **Indicator # 2.2.** # of extensive mass media mentions on HD | **n/a** |
| **Indicator # 2.3.** % of active HDRC clients out of total registered disaggregated by gender (level of activity is measured by # of borrowed/used/copied materials) | **n/a** |
| **Indicator # 2.4** # of study tours abroad to familiarize representatives of target groups with best in class international practices of HD conducted. Upon return # of Intensive follow up actions secured by the participants. | **n/a** |
| **Indicator # 2.5** # of HD events by topic organized under the auspices of HD Resource Center | **n/a** |
| **Indicator # 2.6.** A nationwide survey to assess HD literacy among target groups conducted | **n/a** |

Source: Authors elaboration based on Prodoc 09/25/09.

**Table 2: Activity 2 - Producing NHDRs to provide in-depth analysis of issues of a particular relevance for Uzbekistan development priorities**

| **Target** | **Year** | **Output** | | **Activity and indicators** | **Implemented[[22]](#footnote-23)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Target# 3:** # of produced NHDRs and Policy Briefs provide in-depth analysis, practical policy recommendations leading to improvement of welfare and sustainability of human development | 2008 | not defined | **Indicator # 3.1.** The writing team for NHDR 2009/2010 on regional disparities fully staffed | | **Yes** |
| **Indicator # 3.2.** NHDR 2009/2010 outline produced upon consultations with national counterparts | | **Yes** |
| 2009 | Analytical papers are formulated/produced in a participatory manner with main stakeholders | **Indicator # 3.1:** At least 500 people of sub-regional HD workshops attended regional round tables (at least 30% women) # of round tables and in-depth interviews conducted | | **Yes** |
| **Indicator # 3.2:** The report writing team for the Country Report on Social Inclusion is fully stuffed | | **Yes** |
| **Indicator # 3.3.** The sociological survey on social inclusion conducted (3000 respondents, national representation) | | **Yes** |
| 2010 | NHDRs and Policy Briefs address most challenging development topics in its research, analysis and recommendation dimensions | **Indicator # 3.1** The baseline for the impact of NHDRs and Policy Briefs on policy making established through the HD assessment mission | | **No** |
| **Indicator # 3.2** NHDR 2009/2010 on regional disparities launched centrally and # of sub-regional launchings | | **No** |
| **Indicator # 3.3** The Country Report on social inclusion produced | | **No** |
| **Indicator # 3.4**. A DevIfo disaggregated data storage system applied in connection to at least 2 major UNDP/UN publications (NHDR and MDG Reports) | | **Yes** |

Source: Authors elaboration based on Prodoc 09/25

**Table 3: Activity 3 -Producing Policy Briefs and other publications for development aimed at providing adequate and relevant policy services to decision-makers of Uzbekistan develop national capacities for policy analysis and enhance the public dialogue about reforms leading to improvement of welfare and sustainability of human development**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Target** | **Year** | **Output** | **Activity and indicators** | **Implemented[[23]](#footnote-24)** |
| **Target# 3:** # of produced Policy Briefs provide in-depth analysis, practical policy recommendations leading to improvement of welfare and sustainability of human development | 2009 | Policy Briefs address most challenging development topics in its research, analysis and recommendation dimensions | **Indicator # 3.3**: At least 2 Policy Brief round tables conducted and 2 consultations with the stakeholders held to ensure active participation and ownership by local partners, # of Policy Briefs produced | **Yes** |
| 2010 | **Indicator # 3.5.** At least 2 Policy Brief round tables conducted and 2 consultations with the stakeholders held to ensure active participation and ownership by local partners, # of Policy Briefs produced | **Yes** |
| 2011 | **Indicator # 3.5.** At least 2 Policy Brief round tables conducted and 2 consultations with the stakeholders held to ensure active participation and ownership by local partners, # of Policy Briefs produced | **n/a** |

Source: Authors elaboration based on Prodoc 09/25/09.

**Terms of Reference**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **I. POSITION INFORMATION** | |
| Position Title:  Evaluation title:  Contract type:  Project Title/Department:  Location:  Period covered  Duration of the service:  Reports to:  Direct supervision:  Overall supervision by: | Expert/consultant with expertise in process and advocacy project implementation methodologies (effectiveness and efficiency component)  **Evaluation of UNDP Interventions on Human Development (HD) in Uzbekistan (including recommendations for future work)**  Special Service Agreement, International  Increasing Capacities of Educational and Policy-making Establishments in Promoting and Applying the Human Development Concept, United Nations Development Programme in Uzbekistan  Home based and in-residence stay in Tashkent , Uzbekistan with possible field visit to a region of Uzbekistan  2005 - 2010 (National Human Development Reports) production;  2005 – 2010 (UNDP Uzbekistan Policy Brief s’ production); and  2008–2010 (implementation of UNDP project #00061558 “Increasing Capacities of Educational and Policy-making Establishments in Promoting and Applying the Human Development Concept, hereinafter “HD project”)  November – December 2010 (14 full working days mission to Uzbekistan and 20 full working days of desk job )  Team Leader of the Looking Forward assessment mission (Expert/consultant on Influence of the HD Interventions)  Assistant Resident Representative, UNDP in Uzbekistan  Assistant Resident Representative, UNDP in Uzbekistan |

|  |
| --- |
| **II. BACKGROUND** |
| This looking forward assessment mission is initiated by UNDP Uzbekistan and aims to assess UNDP Interventions on Human Development (HD) in Uzbekistan carried out under the HD project, including provision of recommendations for future work. This evaluation is to be undertaken taking into consideration the evaluation policy of UNDP (<http://www.undp.org/eo/documents/Evaluation-Policy.pdf>) and the UNDP Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Results (<http://www.undp.org/gef/05/monitoring/policies.html>). The evaluation is linked to the corporate outcome “MDG-based national development strategies promote growth and employment, and reduce economic, gender and social inequalities”   1. **BACKGROUND INFORMATION**   Efforts at human development reporting in Uzbekistan began a few years after the first Global Human Development Report was launched in 1990. UNDP in cooperation with the Government of Uzbekistan pioneered the preparation of NHDRs and released the first Report in 1995. Over the past 15 years UNDP has applied different modalities of producing NHDRs, e.g.   * The NHDR 2005 was produced using an open tender procedure and was outsourced for production by the Center for Economic Research[[24]](#footnote-25). Since 2006 NHDRs have been produced by independent consultants, researchers and experts and coordinated by UNDP Country Office in Uzbekistan. The Human Development Coordinator post was established in the office in 2005 to facilitate preparation of NHDRs and provide oversight for other HD interventions generated by the office. * Given the increasing interest of national and international partners in issues related to human development, the concepts behind it and research and analysis based on it, an HD project on teaching this concept in educational establishments was launched in 2008, through which support is provided to academic educational entities in piloting HD as a teaching discipline. A number of other knowledge products, including UNDP CO Policy Briefs have also been generated under this project.   However during the first year of implementation of the project it became clear that in order to attract more attention to the merits of a people-centred approach, the HD project strategy needs to broaden its scope of activities in applying the Human Development concept into analysis and policy-making. It is important to raise awareness amongst academia, civil servants, the business community and young people at large of the significance of the HD concept and how it can translate into practical contributions to welfare strategies implementation. There is a need to provide timely and relevant policy advice to decision-makers, to develop national capacities for policy analysis, to strengthen the quality of the public debate on reforms leading to improvement of living standards and sustainable human development.  In order to diversify the target groups and move beyond teaching of human development towards mainstreaming the Human Development paradigm into daily life, the UNDP undertook a substantive revision of the existing project in 2009. In its new format the HD project aims to provide improved services for developing the capacity of educational and policy establishments in teaching and operationalizing the Human Development approach.  This is being achieved through the development of research, educational-methodological and curriculum bases to teach HD, training of lecturers, developing in-service training schemes, etc. In designing these activities, attempts have been made to draw on best practices from other UNDP programmes, producing National Human Development Reports and the UNDP CO flagship publication - Policy Briefs[[25]](#footnote-26) - and to strengthen national stakeholders’ capacities for MDG reporting, utilizing consolidated statistical data and analysis. A range of activities were carried out under the two phases of HD project and involved a range of partners - government representatives, research institutions, academia, journalists and members of NGOs/civil society organizations (Uzbekistan CO will identify the list of stakeholders and assist evaluation mission team in holding meetings for interview purposes).  With human development being mainstreamed in the UNDAF 2010-2015, and concrete targets and indicators and defined at UNDP CPAP for 2010-2015 in output 3.2.2, the evaluation of the project intervention will help assess partnership on human development between 2005-2010 and guide future strategies for HD initiatives.  **2.HD PROJECT OBJECTIVES & STRATEGY**  The Project aims to contribute to achieving the objectives of the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) for Uzbekistan and is implemented within the Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) for Uzbekistan for the period 2005-2009 and 2010-2015. In particular, the project aims to (i) introduce, and systematically increase awareness and advocate the policy relevance of the Human Development (HD) paradigm as well as the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) to undergraduates, teachers and tutors of the leading academic institutions, journalists and decision makers of the Republic of Uzbekistan; (ii) develop national capacities for policy analysis, enhance the public dialogue about reforms leading to poverty reduction and sustainable human development.  The project will contribute to the UNDP CPAP 2010-2015 Outcome “Enhanced capacity of the central and local authorities to develop and implement economic and social security policies aimed at welfare improvement of vulnerable groups” and the nationalized MDG goal 1[[26]](#footnote-27) .  **In order to achieve these aims, the Project undertakes the following tasks:**   1. Introduction of a “Human Development” Course to the University of World Economy and Diplomacy (UWED) and the Academy for State and Social Construction under the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan alongside with other educational institutions; Establishment of a “Human Development” Resource Centre in order to address the deficit in understanding and applying the concept of sustainable HD, and improving the level of scientific research in this dimension; reinforce collaboration among a wide range of higher educational centers and governmental structures on activities with an explicit policy focus; translation of obtained theoretical knowledge into policy practice in line with the HD concept and in support of MDG achievement. This includes conducting an e-course on national development strategies (National Poverty Reduction Strategy inclusive) for students and youth at large; 2. Publication of NHDR at least once every two years. Public fora promoted to enhance national policy dialogue and promote a participatory approach to policy making through workshops, conferences, round tables that are open to the representatives of the government, civil society and private sector with the aim of informing the public about on-going debates, building institutional capacities for assimilating policy advice; 3. Publication of Policy Briefs and other analytical research prepared in cooperation with national think tanks, government and NGOs, which contribute to the debate on specific development issues (e.g. laws being discussed in the parliament, socio-economic development, living standards, regional development, threats to human security, etc). Establishing/consolidating a system of information collection and analysis to serve the needs of UN agencies in statistical data. The latter is realized through storing all available disaggregated official statistical data both first-hand and processed, in DevInfo software, using data already available in previous UNDP publications.   **3. PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION**  UNDP in Uzbekistan plans to undertake a strategic, forward-looking assessment of its work on human development in Uzbekistan in all stages of implementation. More specifically the evaluation is expected to examine the following:  (a) The relevance and effectiveness of activities aimed at raising awareness and achieving greater integration of the human development approach into policy making and analysis, as well as into educational process for target audiences.  (b) Quality, usability of and sustainable follow-up on NHDRs, textbook and teaching materials as well as other analytical products, including UNDP Uzbekistan Policy Briefs, in promoting integrated human development approaches; and  (c) advice on how future interventions can improve the influence of HD interventions (including recommendations for possible design and implementation of the next HD project in Uzbekistan)  *Key reference materials:*  1/ NHDRs (2005 – 2010) - <http://www.undp.uz/en/publications/?publication_type=8>  2/ UNDP Uzbekistan Policy Briefs (2005-2010) - <http://www.undp.uz/en/publications/?publication_type=10>  3/ HD project “Increasing Capacities of Educational and Policy-making Establishments in Promoting and Applying the Human Development Concept” - <http://www.undp.uz/en/projects/project.php?id=135>  4/ List of publications produced by HD project between May 2008 – July 2010 (attached)  4/ Human Development in Uzbekistan website – [www.humandevelopment.uz](http://www.humandevelopment.uz)  5/ United Nations Development Assistance Framework 2010 – 2015 (UNDAF 2010 - 2015), M&E framework - <http://www.undp.uz/en/publications/publication.php?id=232>  6/ UNDP Country Programme Action Plan 2010 – 2015 (CPAP 2010 – 2015) - <http://www.undp.uz/en/publications/publication.php?id=237>  7/ Human Development in Uzbekistan website – [www.humandevelopment.uz](http://www.humandevelopment.uz)  **4. SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION**  In order to assess the influence of the UNDP strategy on HD and the extent to which the HD project has contributed to introducing Human Development concepts and approaches at central and sub-regional levels to various target audiences, it is necessary to review the series of interventions as they have evolved over time. This set of interventions includes the creation of networks/partnerships in the course of planning, implementation, monitoring of HD initiatives etc, capacity development and advocacy for human development approach.  **For the HD teaching component,** interviews will be held with HD Project counterparts (The University of World Economy and Diplomacy, the Academy of State and Social Construction and Tashkent Pediatric Medical Institute). A review of the HD literature produced under the project will be undertaken, with the purpose of assessing the quality and content, as well as how successfully it has been adapted to the Uzbek context. A meeting with the Ministry of Higher and Secondary Specialized Education will also be held to assess the strengths, limitations and potential of current and future partnerships.  The evaluation will also assess and make recommendations for future interventions for the [www.humandevelopment.uz](http://www.humandevelopment.uz) website, particularly in terms of introducing innovative methods for teaching Human Development, disseminating HD literature, strengthening networks of human development activists; raising awareness of human development approaches; influencing civil society thinking and capacity to advocate human development approaches;  **For the NHDR and Policy Brief component** of the project the evaluation will undertake an assessment of the processes used to select writing teams to prepare the reports, peer review mechanisms, consultations with civil society, relevant government line ministries and statistical bodies. The assessment will also cover the dissemination processes for NHDRs since 2005, and communication methods used to promote key messages.  The assessment will also cover the framework under which the human development reports are conceived and produced, and the ways in which key issues are mainstreamed, including the incentives, guidance and capacity to engender other human development interventions and products; and strengthen statistical capacity. The assessment will also look at the influence of the NHDRs on policies and programmes of the Government of Uzbekistan and those of UNDP.  **For the integration of human development approach,** the evaluation will look at the impact of recommendations made in NHDRs and Policy Briefs and make recommendations for future interventions regarding:  - the extent to which policy recommendations were taken up and/or integrated into UNDP Programming strategies  -the extent to which HD activities have contributed to the influence of UNDP on Government policies and programmes  **ROLE AND TASKS OF THE EXPERT/CONSULTANT**  **ON EFFECTIVENESS AND EFFICIENCY OF PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION MODALITIES**:  The expert/consultant will work under direct guidance of the Evaluation Team Leader and in collaboration with another team member. The evaluation mission team will consist of three members, and include (i) The Team Leader of the looking forward assessment mission, (ii) an expert/consultant with experience in process and advocacy of project implementation methodologies (effectiveness and efficiency component) and (iii) an expert/consultant with expertise in quality of human development analysis (quality of HD products component)  The expert/consultant on effectiveness and efficiency of project implementation modalities should, taking into account the existing political & working environment of Uzbekistan, contribute to the production of an evaluation by assessing:  Project concept and design: The expert/consultant will assess the project concept and design. He/she should review the problem addressed by the project and the project strategy, encompassing an assessment of the appropriateness of the objectives, planned outputs, activities and inputs as compared to cost-effective alternatives. The executing modality and managerial arrangements should also be judged. The expert/evaluator will assess the achievement of indicators and review the work plan, planned duration and budget of the project.  Implementation: The evaluation will assess the implementation of the project in terms of quality and timeliness of inputs and efficiency and effectiveness of activities carried out. Also, the effectiveness of management as well as the quality and timeliness of monitoring and backstopping by all parties to the project should be evaluated. In particular, the evaluation is to assess the Project team’s use of adaptive management in project implementation.  Project outputs, outcomes and impact: The evaluation will assess the outputs, outcomes and impact achieved by the project as well as the likely sustainability of project results. This should encompass an assessment of the achievement of the immediate objectives and the contribution to attaining the overall objective of the project. The evaluation should also assess the extent to which the implementation of the project has been inclusive of relevant stakeholders and to which it has been able to create collaboration between different partners. The evaluation will also examine if the project has had significant unexpected effects, whether of beneficial or detrimental character.  Changes in development conditions*.* Address the following questions, with a focus on the perception of change among stakeholders:   * What are the results (outcomes and impacts) of the project? * Have awareness on Human Development in general and personal capacity of national stakeholders to continue project activities in particular are built? * Have the project contributed in the establishment of efficient national institutional frameworks for promotion of human development?   Measurement of change*:* Progress towards results should be based on a comparison of indicators before and after the project intervention.  Project strategy: How and why outputs contribute to the achievement of the expected results. Examine their relevance and whether they provide the most effective route towards results.  Sustainability: Extent to which the benefits of the project will continue, within or outside the project domain, after it has come to an end. Relevant factors include for example: development of a sustainability strategy, establishment of financial and economic instruments and mechanisms, mainstreaming project objectives into the local economy, etc.  Partnership Strategy   * Cementing of partnerships with educational establishments through MOUs was appropriate and the approach was strategic and sound. * Identification of stakeholders, target audience and beneficiary partners was done appropriately; * The approach adopted for preparation of NHDRs, Policy Briefs, other relevant analytical studies and mainstreaming HD in teaching (incl. having government ownership) was sound;   In particular, the evaluation team should review the following:   * The quality and timeliness of project management’s response to the changing development environment and of the monitoring/ backstopping by all concerned parties; * whether the project and implementation design allowed for flexibility in responding to changes in the environment;   Assess the appropriateness and effectiveness of the project implementation mechanism in meeting objectives and the extent to which they have contributed towards strengthening the capacities of stakeholders for human development oriented teaching, analysis, planning, implementation and monitoring and make recommendations for future work.  **Additional Recommendations for project sustainability and future interventions:** The expert/consultant should provide the Team Leader with recommendations regarding specific actions that might be taken to improve effectiveness and efficiency of project implementation modalities (under scope of evaluation) for possible formulation of similar project(s) in the future. Recommendation for possible project(s) in the future should also include the management architecture of the project staff and the role of Human Development Coordinator. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **III. EVALUATION REQUIREMENTS AND METHODOLOGY** | |
| **EVALUATION METHODOLOY**  The incumbent under the guide of the Mission Team Leader and in collaboration with another team member will be responsible for producing an evaluation report which is based on inputs from other team members, and which draws on the findings and factual statements identified from review of relevant documents which were submitted according to UNDP rules and procedures, including the annual project planning documents, annual project reports, in addition to the technical reports produced by the project and the different promotional materials. A list of the above materials will be shared with the consultants before the beginning of the mission. The mission will also undertake field visits and interview the stakeholders including the target beneficiaries, government officials (both at the national and regional levels). Participation of stakeholders in the evaluation should be maintained at all the times, reflecting opinions, expectations and vision about the contribution of the HD interventions towards the achievement of its objectives.  **PRODUCTS EXPECTED FROM THE EVALUATION**  The team leader will be responsible for coordinating the team’s work on:   1. **a desk review** of existing documents. 2. conducting fieldwork and interview stakeholders. 3. Writing and compiling report. 4. Making a presentation of the entire findings highlighting achievements, constraints and realistic recommendations to decision makers and stakeholders. 5. Finalizing the evaluation report (**desk job**)   **Evaluation report:**  The outline and main findings of the evaluation should be completed and handed to UNDP during the final de-briefing session. The draft report should be produced according to the structure outlined in the UNDP Guidelines for Evaluation.  The team leader will submit the draft evaluation report to UNDP not later than 15 days after completion of the fieldwork. Based on the comments of the stakeholders, the team leader will be responsible for finalizing and submitting the final version of the report to UNDP, Tashkent, within 15 days of receipt of comments.  While the experts/consultants are free to use any detailed method of reporting, the Evaluation Report should contain at least the following:   * Title Page * List of acronyms and abbreviations * Table of contents, including list of annexes * Executive Summary (Gender issues are to be noted in the executive summary) * Introduction: background and context of the program * Description of the program – its logic theory, results framework and external factors likely to affect success * Purpose of the evaluation * Key questions and scope of the evaluation with information on limitations and de-limitations * Approach and methodology * Findings * Summary and explanation of findings and interpretations * Conclusions * Recommendations (including additional recommendations for future project interventions) * Lessons, generalizations, alternatives   In addition, the final report should contain the following annexes:   * Terms of Reference for the evaluation * List of meetings attended * List of persons interviewed * List of documents reviewed * Any other relevant material   Throughout the period of the evaluation, the team leader and the team members will liaise closely with UNDP senior management, Human Development Coordinator and personnel of on-going HD project. The experts/consultant(s) can raise or discuss any issue or topic they deem necessary to fulfill the tasks. The experts/consultant(s), however, are not authorized to make any commitments to any party on behalf of UNDP.  The Experts/consultant should provide details in respect of:   * Documents reviewed; * Interviews; * Field visits; * Questionnaires, if any; and * Participation of stakeholders and/or partners. | |
| **IV. MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS** | |
| The evaluation is initiated by the UNDP Uzbekistan Country Office under overall supervision of the Deputy Resident Representative and direct supervision of the Assistant Resident Representative of UNDP in Uzbekistan. As such, UNDP Country Office will, through support from the Human Development Project, recommend about the schedule of the mission, provide copies of the project documentation for review and arrange meetings. The Project will also arrange for transportation and if and whenever necessary for interpretation during the mission. The Project shall provide an overall briefing to the evaluator upon arrival. UNDP will provide the evaluator with logistical support such as an issue of visa, hotel reservation, working space in the project premises with access to internet. The members of the evaluation team are requested to travel with their own laptops. | |
| **IV. Deliverables and timeframe** | |
| The total duration of the assignment is 5 weeks[[27]](#footnote-28). Tentative schedule of deliverables is as follows:  Within a week after signing the contract, the team leader will present an inception report covering:  (a) preliminary approach of the study  (b) study tools to be utilized and,  (c) broad outline of the final report.  The incumbent will undertake a 2 week mission to Tashkent, the exact timing of which will be agreed with the Country Office, mission Team Leader and another team member. At the end of the mission, the team leader will present a summary of key findings.  The Team Leader will be responsible for ensuring timely delivery of reports from other team members, and will deliver a draft report, following the outline provided above, within 15 days of the end of the mission.  The Team Leader will deliver the final evaluation report within 15 days of receiving comments on the draft report from Uzbekistan CO and other members of the evaluation team. | |
| **VI. PAYMENT CONDITIONS** | |
| The payment will be based on UN rates for international consultants. 10% of the payment will be made on signing of the contract agreement, 10% on receipt of consultant’s part of inception report and 30% on submission and acceptance of the consultant’s part of draft evaluation report. The remaining 50% of the contract amount will be made after delivery of the products. Each payment installment will be supported by the performance evaluation as per standard format for SSA holders. | |
| **VII. RECRUITMENT QUALIFICATIONS** | |
| Education: | * strong professional background in dealing with policy issues/programmes in the area of human development/direct experience with HDRs as well as evaluation experience with a minimum of 10 years of relevant experience; the expert/consultant must travel to the sites identified and hold discussions with project stakeholders. |
| Experience: | * Demonstrated ability to assess complex situations, succinctly, distil critical issues, and draw forward-looking conclusions and recommendations; * Ability and experience to deliver quality reports within the given time. * Extensive experience in monitoring and evaluation of development projects supported by donors; * Gender expertise on the evaluation team is required. Evaluators have the capacity to identify and collect gender related information using various methods and analyze the data. * Familiarity with UNDP rules, regulations and results-based project evaluations; |
| Language Requirements: | * Proficiency in English, knowledge of Russian is an asset. * Excellent writing and communication skills in English. |
| Others: | Awareness of gender issues (preferably in the CIS region) and knowledge of gender mainstreaming techniques |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Wednesday, 24 November 2010** | | | |
| **14.00-15.30**  **SM** | Meeting with HD Project | |  |
| Thursday, 25 November 2010 | | | |
| **14:00-14:30**  **SM/ ThO** | Meeting with HD Summer school 2010 participants ( confirmed)  At UWED in the meeting room next to resource centre | |  |
| **15:00-16:00**  **SM / ThO** | Meeting with NatoAlhazishvili, Deputy Resident Representative and Sitara Syed, Assistant Resident Representative ( confirmed) | |  |
| **16:00-16:30**  **SM / ThO** | Meeting with N. Mirkurbanov, Author of policy brief on education( confirmed) | |  |
| **Friday, 26 November 2010** | | | |
| **9:30-10:30**  **SM / ThO** | Meeting with BakhodurEshonov, Director of the Centre of Economic research ( confirmed)  (150-02-02 RimaMukhtarova) | |  |
| **14:00-14:30**  **SM / ThO** | Meeting with UsmonRakhimdjanov, Task Manager, UNDP, Innovation project, author of policy brief on microfinance( confirmed) | |  |
| **15:00-15:40**  **SM / ThO** | Meeting with Aziza Umarova, Head of Good Governance Unit ( confirmed) | |  |
| **16:30 – 17.30**  **SM / ThO** | Meeting with YakovAsminkin, Director of the Centre for social studies ( confirmed)  (mob:158 66 57) | |  |
| **Saturday, 27 November 2010** | | | |
| **10:00-10:30**  **SM / ThO** | Meeting with TOT participant from Tashkent State Institute of oriental studies – ShonazarErmamaov, teacher of “Foreign relations and economy” department | |  |
| **12:00-13.00**  **SM / ThO** | Meeting with BakhodirGaniev, chairman of youth movement “ Kamolot” ( confirmed)  (mob: 494 51 40) | |  |
| **13:30-14:00**  **SM / ThO** | Meeting with TOT participants from Tashkent State economic university - DilyaromKasimova, Professor of “Management” faculty ( mob: 575-11-55) and NilyufarIsmailova (mob: 104 03 14), teacher of “World economy and foreign economic relations” department | |  |
| **Monday, 29 November 2010** | | | |
| **10:30-11:00**  **ThO** | Meeting with MA students from UWED participated in HD course |  | |
| **11:00 – 12.30**  **ThO** | Meeting with BakhodirKhodjaev, Deputy Rector of the University of World Economy and Diplomacy (UWED), ShavkatKhusainov, Dean of international economic relations faculty and TOT participants from UWED  ***This meeting was canceled (the deputy rector was not available) but I had a group meeting with HD teachers from UWED, including the dean)*** |  | |
| **14:00-14:30**  **ThO** | Meeting with KiyomNazarov, Rector of the Academy of State and Social Construction of under the President of the RUz***(la señorapesadatambienestabapresente)*** |  | |
| **Tuesday, 30 November 2010** | | | |
| **11:00 – 12:00**  **ThO** | Meeting with CEU Summer school on HD alumni ( Elena Danilova – Cross, LayloZakirova, NaziraDadakhanova, NargizaAbdukadirova, NilyufarKamalova, ZiyodulloParpiev, LayloTashpulatova, NodiraKurbanbaeva,) |  | |
| **14:30 – 15:00**  **ThO** | Meeting with TOT participant from the Institute of Culture - AnvarNorbekov, Dean of social activity faculty |  | |
| **10:00 – 10:30**  **ThO** | Meeting with TOT participant from State Academy, Prof. IrgashevIbodulla, Head of Chair |  | |
| **Wednesday, 1 December 2010** | | | |
| **11:30 – 12:30**  **ThO** | Meeting with GuzalAdilova, Assistant of HD Resource Centre |  | |
| **16:00 16:30**  **ThO** | Meeting with co-authors of PB on livestock |  | |
| **16:30-17:30**  **ThO** | Meeting with authors of PBs CER |  | |
| **Thursday, 2 December 2010** | | | |
| **11:00-11:40**  **ThO** | Meeting with Mr. Kamilov ,Deputy Minister of the Ministry of Public Health of the Republic of Uzbekistan  (contact person-Dilshod,mob: 775 09 40) |  | |
| **15:00-16:00**  **ThO** | Meeting with B. Daminov, Rector of Tashkent pediatric medical institute |  | |
| **Friday, 3 December 2010** | | | |
| **15:00-16:00**  **ThO** | Meeting with the representative from the Ministry of Higher and special secondary education of the Republic of Uzbekistan |  | |
| **16:15-17:00**  **ThO** | Meeting with mass media representatives - NafisaAbdukhalikova -mob: 407 19 22 (“Uzbekistan Today”, UzA, |  | |
| **Monday, 6 December 2010** | | | |
| **10:00-10:30**  **SM, ThO** | Meeting with U.Alimov, UNDP project manager, author of policy brief on statistics  ( confirmed) | UNDP Conference Room  4, Taras Shevchenko str.  Tel: 120 34 50 | |
| **11:00 – 11:30**  **SM, ThO** | Meeting with mr. Jan Sorensen, UNFPA Representative and FuadAliev, Assistant Representative ( tel: 281 58 81) ( confirmed) | 14, M. Tarobiy Str.,  Tel. (+99871)28158-81/83 ; (+99871)1206899 .  Fax: (+99871)1206897 | |
| **12:00-13.00**  **SM, ThO** | Meeting with Sh. Salikhov, the President of the Academy of science of the Republic of Uzbekistan ( confirmed) +translator  (VasilyaAgzamovna,mob: 444 23 90) | 70, YakhyoGulomov str.,  Phones: +998 (71) 233 59 67  236 76 29 ВасиляАгзамовна | |
| **14:00-14:40**  **SM, ThO** | Meeting with Akhmedov B, Director of theInstitute for social studies  under the Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Uzbekistan  (Ruslan 233 26 54) ( confirmed)+translator |  | |
| **15.00:15:30**  **SM, ThO** | Meeting with AbduvakkosAbdurakhmanov, Head of Env.EnergyUnit,UNDP  ( confirmed) | UNDP Conference Room  4, Taras Shevchenko str.  Tel: 120 34 50 | |
| **Tuesday, 7 December 2010** | | | |
| **10:00-10:40**  **SM, ThO** | Meeting with authors of National Human Development Report 2009 ( confirmed) | UNDP Conference Room  4, Taras Shevchenko str.  Tel: 120 34 50 | |
| **11:00-11:30**  **SM, ThO** | Meeting with Pugach, author of policy brief ( confirmed) | UNDP Conference Room  4, Taras Shevchenko str.  Tel: 120 34 50 | |
| **15:00-16:00**  **SM, ThO** | Meeting with SodikSafaev, Senate of OliyMajlis of the Republic of Uzbekistan  ( confirmed) + Translator | Mustaqillikmaydoni, 6.  Tel: +998 (71) 238-26-96  e-mail: [info@senat.uz](mailto:info@senat.uz) | |
| **16.30:17:30**  **SM, ThO** | Meeting with ZiyodulloParpiev, Advisor Economist, UNDP ( confirmed) | UNDP  Small meeting room 2nd floor  4, Taras Shevchenko str.  Tel: 120 34 50 | |
| **Wednesday, 8 December 2010 - NO MEETINGS, TIME FOR WRITING** | | | |
| **Thursday, 9 December 2010** | | | |
| **10:00-10:45**  **SM, ThO** | Meeting with KamolaSafaeva UNICEF ( confirmed | 43, Istiklol Street Phone: (998-71) 2339512, 2339735 Fax: (998-71) 1206508 | |
| **11:00 – 11:45**  **SM, ThO** | Meeting with SherzodAkbarov, Head of Economic Governance ,UNDP  ( confirmed) | UNDP Conference Room  4, Taras Shevchenko str.  Tel: 120 34 50 | |
| **12:00-12:40**  **SM, ThO** | Meeting with the Chairman of the State Committee on Statistics of the Republic of Uzbekistan( confirmed)  (contact person: Erkin: 440 97 91) | 63 BuyukIpakYuli, 700077, TashkentTelephone: (998) +230 80 12 приемная,  230 81 52/53 канцелярия  230 80 69/70 ШариповДжамшидEmail: [gks@stat.uz](mailto:gks@stat.uz)Website: [www.stat.uz](http://www.stat.uz) | |
| **14:00-14:30**  **SM, ThO** | Meeting with SirojiddinovN , Deputy of Director, Centre for Economic Research not confirmed | CER | |
| **15:30-16:30**  **SM, ThO** | Wrap-up meeting with Anita Nirody, Resident Representative UNDP and Sitara Syed, Assistant Resident Representative, UNDP ( confirmed) | UNDP  4, Taras Shevchenko str.  Tel: 120 34 50 | |
| **NN**  **SM, ThO** | Meeting with World Bank Representative not confirmed |  | |

**III. Results and Resources Framework**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Expected Outcome as stated in the Country Program Results and Resource Framework:**  Outcome I: Application of the HD concept in the development policies to improve the standards of living of the Uzbek population. | | | | |
| **Outcome indicators as stated in the Country Program Results and Resources Framework, including baseline and targets:**  **Indicator:** Human Development indicators recognized and introduced to measure living standards  **Baseline(s):**1/ Welfare Improvement Strategy of the Government for 2008-2010 recognizes the need for economic and institutional reforms to reduce poverty, generate employment and improve the welfare of people.  2/ Lack of statistical data and coherent monitoring and reporting system is hampering efforts to track the progress towards reducing multidimensional poverty and achieving national MDGs  **Target(s):**1/ # of HD-oriented regional development strategies implemented  2/ HD/MDG monitoring and reporting system established. | | | | |
| **Applicable Key Result Area (2008-2011 Strategic Plan):**  1.1 Promoting inclusive growth, gender equality and MDG achievement | | | | |
| **Partnership Strategy:**University of World Economy and Diplomacy (UWED), Academy of State and Social Construction under the President of the RUz (ASSC) and other educational establishments– cooperation partners. The Senate and CCI  UNDP – implementing agency. A wide range of partnerships is required and envisaged at all levels (The Senate, CCI, regional state authorities, think tanks and research institutions, mass media, line-ministries ). | | | | |
| **Short Project title – “Human Development”,**  Atlas Award ID: Project ID: **00061558,** Proposal ID: **00049246** | | | | |
| **INTENDED OUTPUTS** | **OUTPUT TARGETS FOR YEARS** | **INDICATIVE ACTIVITIES** | **RESPONSIBLE PARTNERS** |
| **Capacities of Educational and Policy-making Establishments in Promoting and Applying the Human Development Concept Increased**  **Baseline# 1:**No precedents of teaching HD concept in educational establishments of Uzbekistan: Methodological base for teaching HD concept is non-existent  **Success indicator # 1:**the teaching of HD by educational establishments Introduced and advanced  **Target# 1:** HD curriculum and HD teaching kit adopted by # of higher educational institutions  **Baseline# 2:** The baseline for the penetration of HD concept at central and regional levels unknown/not established  **Success indicator # 2:**awareness level and quality of HD awareness, visibility materials available for public , HD literacy increased  **Target# 2**: 1/3 of target group respondents (random sampling, national representation) are aware of HD concept, satisfied with HD visibility materials and are able to describe what HD is about in simple words  **Baseline# 3:**The baseline for the impact of NHDRs and Policy Briefs on policy making is not established/not known  **Success indicator # 3:** at least 1externalindependent assessment with findings and recommendations) of policy recommendations at central and regional level conducted  **Target# 3:** # of produced NHDRs and Policy Briefs provide in-depth analysis, practical policy recommendations leading to improvement of welfare and sustainability of human development | **2008 (entry strategy):**  **Output target # 1.Methodological base for teaching HD created, curriculum for MA level students developed;**  **2009:**  **Output target # 1**. **HD course curricula piloted in at least 1 educational institution under MoU with UNDP;**  **Output target # 2:The baseline for the penetration of HD concept at central and regional levels established**  **Output target # 3:Analytical papers are formulated/produced in a participatory manner with main stakeholders;**  **2010:**  **Output target # 1: Enabling conditions for HD teaching at sub-regional level created**  **Output target # 2**: **Visibility of HD interventions enhanced, level of HD literacy improved**  **Output target #3: NHDRs and Policy Briefs address most challenging development topics in its research, analysis and recommendation dimensions** | **Activity 1**:**Introducing and advancing the teaching potential of educational establishments for teaching HD.**  **2008 (entry strategy):**  **Indicator# 1.1:** Advanced copy of HD textbook produced and disseminated to target groups in # of copies  **Indicator # 1.2**.: # of Training for trainers (beginning and intermediate level) conducted, # of people trained (at least 30% women)  **Indicator # 1.3**: # of graduate students trained (at least 30% women) and % certified as a result of 1 semester long HD course  **Indicator # 1.4:** # of study tours abroad to familiarize representatives of target groups with best in class international practices of HD conducted. Upon return # of Intensive follow up actions secured by the participants.  **2009:**  **Indicator # 1.1**. # of MA level students trained (at least 30% women) and % certified as a result of 1 semester long HD course  **Indicator # 1.2**.: # of Training for trainers (intermediate & advanced level) conducted ( 30% women trained), # of people certified  **Indicator # 1.3.:** HD teaching kit comprising of lecture texts, presentations, sample exam questions and case studies developed  **Indicator # 1.4:** Video laboratory for introducing innovative teaching methods established  **Indicator # 2.1:** Survey at the sub regional level conducted (establishing the baseline for HD/MDG literacy by public)  **Indicator # 2.2:** HD Resource Center is up and running;  **Indicator # 2.3:** HD website launched and registered in # of search engines worldwide  **Indicator # 2.4:** # of learning seminars/HD workshops conducted at subregional level and covered by both national& local media  **Indicator 2.5:** # of study tours abroad to familiarize representatives of target groups with best in class international practices of HD conducted. Upon return # of Intensive follow up actions secured by the participants.  **Output target 2.6 #** of HD events by topic organized under the auspices of HDRC  **2010:**  **Indicator # 1.1.:** hard and electronic HD teaching kit and 1st edition of HD textbook in Uzbek, English, Russian produced and # of copies disseminated  **Indicator # 1.2:** At least 1 summer school at sub-regional level (on-line and off-line teaching Modules) conducted. (at least 30% women participated)  **Indicator # 1.3:** # of HD articles and abstracts published in HDRC bulletin  **Indicator # 1.4**.: # of training for Trainers (beginning, intermediate and advanced level) conducted (at least 30% women trained), % of people certified  **Indicator # 1.5**.: # graduate students trained (at least 30% women) and % certified  **Indicator # 1.6:**HD course curricula pilotedin # of educational institution under MoU with UNDP;  **Indicator # 1.7**: Association of teachers and students established (disaggregated by gender)  **Indicator # 1.8.**: # of teaching courses developed by the means of Video laboratory  **Indicator # 1.9.** The HD textbook for the Academy of State and Social construction developed in Russian and Uzbek  **Indicator # 2.1.** HD PR kit developed in Uzbek and disseminated regionally  **Indicator # 2.2.** # of downloads from HD website at [www.humandevelopment.uz](http://www.humandevelopment.uz) by topic, by # of unique visitors at regional level  **Indicator # 2.3.** # of extensive mass media mentions  **Indicator # 2.4.** % of active HDRC clients out of total registered disaggregated by gender (level of activity is measured by # of borrowed/used materials)  **Indicator # 2.5** # of learning trips abroad to seek best HD experiences conducted. Upon return # of Intensive follow up actions secured by the participants.  **Indicator # 2.6** # of HD events by topic organized under the auspices of HD Resource Center  **Indicator # 2.7.** The HD guidelines for parliamentarians produced in Russian and Uzbek and widely disseminated | UNDP, UWED, HD support group at BRC and HDRO, project team, Ministry of Education, HD teaching institutions of the RBEC region (Kazakhstan, Russia, Slovakia), HD Association of teachers, HD network, project team, UN RC MDG youth network, UNDP project “MDG Statistics” |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **2011(exit strategy and sustainability assurance):**  **Output target # 1:HD concept is continuously promoted through the self-sustained HD courses by educational establishments for various targeted audiences**  **Output target # 2:General public is aware of HD concept, satisfied with HD visibility materials and able to describe what HD is about in simple words**  **Output target # 3:NHDRs and Policy Briefs provide in-depth analysis, adequate policy recommendations addressing issues of improvement of welfare and sustainability of human development** | **2011 (exit strategy and sustainability assurance):**  **Indicator # 1.1.:** # of educational establishments in the regions of Uzbekistan teaching HD  **Indicator # 1.2:** At least 1 summer school at sub-regional level (on-line and off-line teaching Modules) conducted (at least 30% women participated)  **Indicator # 1.3:** # of HD articles and abstracts from Uzbekistan published in international academic papers  **Indicator # 1.4**.: # of training for Trainers (beginning, intermediate and advanced level) conducted (at least 30% women trained), % of people certified  **Indicator # 1.5**.: # of graduate and undergraduate students and ASCC listeners trained (at least 30% women) and % certified  **Indicator # 1.6:** the MHSSE supported the HD course by official recommendation t o include it into the HE curricula  **Indicator # 1.7**: Network of teachers and students promoted throughout the HD website (measured by regular exchange of information and feedback across & between students and teachers)  **Indicator # 1.8.**: # of teaching courses developed by the means of Video laboratory  **Indicator # 1.9.** Information on HD teaching transferred to the third parties  **Indicator # 2.1.** # of downloads from HD website by topic, by # of unique visitors at regional level  **Indicator # 2.2.** # of extensive mass media mentions on HD  **Indicator # 2.3.** % of active HDRC clients out of total registered disaggregated by gender (level of activity is measured by # of borrowed/used/copied materials)  **Indicator # 2.4**# of study tours abroad to familiarize representatives of target groups with best in class international practices of HD conducted. Upon return # of Intensive follow up actions secured by the participants.  **Indicator # 2.5** # of HD events by topic organized under the auspices of HD Resource Center  **Indicator # 2.6.** A nationwide survey to assess HD literacy among target groups conducted  **Activity 2**:**Producing NHDRs to provide in-depth analysis of issues of a particular relevance for Uzbekistan development priorities**  **2008:**  **Indicator # 3.1.** The writing team for NHDR 2009/2010 on regional disparities fully staffed  **Indicator # 3.2.** NHDR 2009/2010 outline produced upon consultations with national counterparts  **2009:**  **Indicator # 3.1.:** At least 500 people of subregional HD workshops attended regional round tables (at least 30% women)  # of round tables and in-depth interviews conducted  **Indicator # 3.2.:** The report writing team for the Country Report on Social Inclusion is fully stuffed  **Indicator # 3.2.** The sociological survey on social inclusion conducted (3000 respondents, national representation)  **2010:**  **Indicator # 3.1**The baseline for the impact of NHDRs and Policy Briefs on policy making established through the HD assessment mission  **Indicator # 3.2** NHDR 2009/2010 on regional disparities launched centrally and # of sub-regional launchings  **Indicator # 3.3** The Country Report on social inclusion produced  **Indicator # 3.4**. A DevIfo disaggregated data storage system applied in connection to at least 2 major UNDP/UN publications (NHDR and MDG Reports)  **Activity 3:Producing Policy Briefs and other publications for development aimed at providing adequate and relevant policy services to decision-makers of Uzbekistan, develop national capacities for policy analysis and enhance the public dialogue about reforms leading to improvement of welfare and sustainability of human development.**  **2009:**  **Indicator # 3.3**: At least 2 Policy Brief round tables conducted and 2 consultations with the stakeholders held to ensure active participation and ownership by local partners, # of Policy Briefs produced  **2010:**  **Indicator # 3.5.** At least 2 Policy Brief round tables conducted and 2 consultations with the stakeholders held to ensure active participation and ownership by local partners, # of Policy Briefs produced  **2011: Indicator # 3.5.** At least 2 Policy Brief round tables conducted and 2 consultations with the stakeholders held to ensure active participation and ownership by local partners, # of Policy Briefs produced | UNDP, UWED, HD support group at BRC and HDRO, project team, HD teaching institutions, HD Association of teachers, UNDP “MDG Statistics”, “Migrant workers”, “Gender”, “ACCESS” projects and UNDP/EC ELS programme  UNDP and respective PB PRG group |

1. Output 3.2.2 Citizens are better informed about development challenges, policymaking and empowered to better participate in decision-making. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. UNDP Central Asian Economist, Almaty [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Independent HD consultant [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. See Appendix 1 for interview questions [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. Before 2005, production of the NHDR was outsourced, through a tender process, and in practice a local research institute hired local consultants, including government authors. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. http://www.undp.org/evaluation/handbook/ [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. Only aspects, which are not covered by the general evaluation criteria, are included in the specific evaluation questions. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. “Adaptive management (AM), also known as adaptive resource management (ARM), is a structured, iterative process of optimal decision making in the face of uncertainty, with an aim to reducing uncertainty over time via system monitoring.” <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Adaptive_management> [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
9. PRODOC RRF for LPAC as of September 25th, 2009. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
10. www.cer.uz [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
11. Policy brief is a publication of UNDP in Uzbekistan, which outlines the rationale for choosing a particular policy alternative or course of action in a current policy debate. Its target audience includes policymakers, the donor community, independent analysts and other development stakeholders. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
12. <http://www.undp.uz/en/publications/?type=10> [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
13. Given the character of provision of qualitative analysis and policy input that can mainly be delivered by policy briefs and NHDRs the evaluation considers that it is reasonable to not having a baseline established for this target. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
14. Expressed officially in President Karimov’s speech in the UN MDG summit in September 2010 in New York. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
15. For example, a criticism came from a representative of the Ministry of Economy, and then only for one Policy Brief. But even this official did not question the usefulness of the briefs (it is actually a positive sign that he read them), but rather complained that government had not been sufficiently involved in the production. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
16. An outline of the WIS II document has been provided, which would give a “menu” to start from. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
17. Evaluation ratings are not a general evaluation policy in UN agencies in general. Nevertheless they are frequently used in some of them, such as UNDP and UNICEF, as well as in many other agencies and institutions for international cooperation. Most of the rating systems commonly used are based on the OECD/DAC evaluation criteria for development cooperation. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
18. Rating established in accordance with “Review of DACPrinciples for Evaluation of Development Assistance”, OECD 1998. <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/63/50/2065863.pdf>; the rating is not established in the sense of a value scale commonly used by public opinion surveys, which include a “neutral” point (for instance a value zero in a five step scale from -2 to +2); rather the rating used in this report has more in common with the logic of evaluations given to pupils in an education system. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
19. it is this strategic bottom-up approach which is not formulated in the project document [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
20. Implemented as of December 2010. A positive response in this column only indicates if the activity has been implemented and not necessarily if it has been implemented in the precise moment for which it had been planned. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
21. Not fully implemented. The first edition of the HD textbook is not available in English. [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
22. Implemented as of December 2010. A positive response in this column only indicates if the activity has been implemented and not necesarrily if it has been implemented in the precise moment for which it had been planned. [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
23. Implemented as of December 2010. A positive response in this column only indicates if the activity has been implemented and not necessarily if it has been implemented in the precise moment for which it had been planned. [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
24. www.cer.uz [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
25. Policy brief is a publication of UNDP in Uzbekistan, which outlines the rationale for choosing a particular policy alternative or course of action in a current policy debate. Its target audience is policymakers, the donor community, independent analysts and other development stakeholders. [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
26. Nationalized MDG 1: Improve living standards and reduce malnutrition [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
27. Weeks do not have to be continuous. For example, completion of the final report will depend on how quickly comments are received from UNDP CO [↑](#footnote-ref-28)