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**Foreword**

*The report is the final product of the field visit to Tashkent, Fergana, Andijan and Namangan that began on 7 December, 2011, as well as of the work started at home base and completed, again at home base, upon comments received following the presentation of the draft report in Tashkent on 16 December, 2011. It strictly follows the Terms of Reference issued by UNDP/Uzbekistan.*

*Many people contributed to its preparation in Tashkent, Andijan, Fergana, and Namangan, whose names are listed in Annex B with my heartfelt thanks.*

*I am solely responsible for the content of the report and the opinions put forward therein. However, without the cooperation of all these persons, errors and omissions would have been more serious and grievous.*

*F.A*

***Executive Summary***

***Findings***

* *The project is* ***relevant*** *because it is in concordance with the strategic positioning and focus of UNDP on key outcomes. It is also in concordance with the national priorities, as well as with achieving the “Millennium Development Goals.****”*** *The project was very relevant to the needs of local citizens who participated into a number project activities (mostly, but not exclusively infrastructure building activities) by physical labor as well as financial support.*
* *Planned activities have been carried out and completed. Only a very few of them will be completed at the end of the calendar year. There are no arrears or financial overruns, and, given the maintenance of one office in Tashkent and three in the field, overhead is deemed reasonable. Hence the project was* ***efficiently*** *administered.*
* *Given the outputs and their qualities and the modest sums allocated to them, by and large the management was* ***effective****.*
* *The* ***ownership*** *is a delicate issue. It is assumed that national execution (NEX) assures the ownership. Although the project is executed under the title of NEX, due to a variety of issues the UNDP Country Office has a heavy hand in implementation.. Hence, the execution appears to be more of direct execution (DEX); at best it is a DEX-NEX mix. Therefore, full national ownership is questionable.*
* *The probabilities of* ***sustainability*** *of three major outputs are as follows: The sustainability of the improved capacity of local authorities to support delivery of basic services has a low probability, whereas the sustainability of the improved public service delivery and reinforced organizational capacity of 200 mahallas and of the increased equitable access by communities to rural development services and business is of high probability. .In the latter two outputs the high probability stems from the fact that the project succeeded in creating vested interest in the beneficiaries.*

***Conclusions***

* *The effectiveness of the ELS-supported community mobilization and development planning of the economic productivity of the target communities and the economic well-being of community residents, including notably women, is considerable.*
* *Capacity building of government institutions at district and provincial levels is only partially effective due to the low level of capacity of the local government personnel. ELS’s efforts of capacity building.was rather limited.*
* *. There is irrefutable evidence that ELS mobilized local resources (physical as well as financial) towards the attainment of the relevant MDG 1.*
* *Local stakeholders perceive that ELS and its financial resources coming from EU and UNDP partnership was a major instrument in achieving the MDG target 1.*
* *The effectiveness of ELS intervention in the target communities in terms of improved public services delivery for the resident populations,, notably women, was very high.*
* *The quality of the processes of participation in local governance in target communities and the effectiveness of ELS interventions in the development of communities’ institutions, notably local self-government institutions (i.e. mahalla committees), is very high. It is also very highly appreciated by mahalla leaders.*

***Best Practices***

* *. All outputs are either of good or very good quality. The report has a great deal difficulty of singling out only one as the best practice. However it wishes to assert that the creation of self-reliance in the communities and kindling the entrepreneurial spirit must be singled out as the best practice*.

***Recommendations***

* *The report puts forward two overreaching recommendations with the strong belief that they are the crux of the matter of having success of the forthcoming project(s) that will contribute to the realization of MDG 1.*

*1- The* ***first*** *one is related to training the officers of local government, and it has two components.*

* *Training that is necessary within the present legal-administrative set-up. As the report gathered from the activities, training local government employees were of course necessary but far from being sufficient. There are several areas where lacunae are evident. One of them refers to statistical information. It is the understanding of this report that the quality of statistical information leaves very much to be desired. They are not accurate, gathering such information is done rather haphazardly, there is no mechanism to assess the quality, and no mechanism is in place to determine whether such information is fideo digno. And yet such information is crucial for planning and management. Moreover local government employees are also orphans in tax administration, especially in assessment and collection methods. Therefore the report suggests the following: A longer term program that truly trains local government employees in the areas mentioned above. It should not be squeezed into a few weeks of seminars/lectures, but should be of longer duration and should incorporate into the training process the method of ‘learning by doing’.*
* *The second one is somewhat speculative and rests upon the assumption that the government of Uzbekistan will implement a certain degree of decentralization, an attempt that has been articulated by the President of the Republic. In this context decentralization will mean that people are allowed to influence their own destiny through increased local participation of citizens in decision making. This in turn can make the local government more immediately transparent and accountable. Decentralization can result in more efficient use of resources;it can provide a fertile setting for the emergence of local decision-making and it can improve economic participation by encouraging local entrepreneurship. Should that be the case in the near future, local government employees will be in dire need of additional training. Within this training fiscal management will occupy the front line, because by definition local authorities will have certain independent taxing power and additional revenues transferred from the central government will be according to an automatic formula and will not be subjected to yearly budget discussion. In that case fiscal management acquires primordial importance. And as the employees of local governments are not sufficiently prepared to deal with such responsibilities they will be in dire need of training.*

*2- The* ***second*** *overreaching recommendation**is preparing a group of trainers selected from the present project’s trainees (there is enough capacity built) to teach how to mobilize local participants for infrastructure work. Assuming that other regions will also have an ELS in the future, it would be a rational step to subject them to a brief training and then use them as trainers in other regions. This mode of operation will have several advantages: (i) it is cost saving, (ii) there will be no language barrier, and (iii) it will be the easiest way to convey trust, since essentially the trainer and trainee are of the same culture. This method may provide a platform for implementing a new poverty reduction program in other regions.*

*The report makes further specific recommendations. These are:*

* *The good results of the ELS in the Fergana Valley as a whole should be consolidated before exit. Its achievements should be consolidated in a report, and this report should be disseminated among the future candidate regions.*
* *The next poverty reduction program(s) can contribute to the clarification of standards for social service provision to communities and beyond, not only in the context of public utilities, but also in health and education.*
* *The future poverty reduction program should continue to help regional and district authorities, not only in developing a core set of indicators to measure the impact of state programs on poverty reduction, but also in developing functional activities and systems for sharing and verifying reliability of data.*
* *The public relations specialist of the current ELS should be trained in the development and dissemination of communication contents of UNDP/EU policies and programs and strategies for the selected additional regions.*

1. **Introduction**

**1.1 Background**

Uzbekistan gained its independence in 1991 after the dissolution of USSR and almost immediately was faced with a monumental task of nation building which entailed a series of economic and social transformation. Since independence the Uzbek Government’s economic policies were largely protectionist, and, in essence, relied on cotton as a major foreign exchange earner. The four basic economic policies the Uzbek Government followed can be summarized as (i) economic independence by way of curtailing imports through their substitution with domestic goods, and self-sufficiency with energy resources and food products; (ii) reorientation of the economy from raw materials production towards creation of a competitive industrial structure; (iii) expansion of the export potential and increasing the country’s gold and hard currency reserves to ensure stability of the national currency; and (iv) creation of new opportunities and improving living standards. With time the role of the state in the economy began the decline, as was the case in all ‘transition economies’.

To this day the role of the state in the economy is sizable although it continues to decline. The share of the non-state sector in the nation's GDP in 2001 was 74.1%; however this figure varies from sector to sector (e.g. 99% – in agriculture, 59.4% – in services rendered to the population). The state still exercises a fair degree of control on the non-state sector. For example, the major part of certain agricultural production still depends directly on the targets government establishes for cotton and grain.

During the transition period living standards declined, unemployment increased, and income distribution, measured by the Gini coefficient, worsened. The rectification of the declining conditions has been rather slow. In 2005 the human development index (HDI) stood at 0.611, in 2011 it inched up only to 0.641.[[1]](#footnote-1) Despite the slight improvement in HDI, disparities between regions and rural-urban areas have become more apparent. The painful process of transition had a drastic influence on the vulnerable strata of the population: young families, the unemployed, families with many children, female-headed households, pensioners, invalids and the youth. It resulted in the reduction of the consumer basket, availability of medical services, access to school and after school education, access to energy suppliers (gas, coal), to infrastructure services and transport. Even a relatively generous government welfare system was not able to stem the negative impact, nor was it able to mitigate appreciably regional disparities. One of the examples of regional disparities may be easily observed in Fergana Valley vis-à-vis other regions as well as the rest of the country.

Fergana Valley (comprising the three provinces of Andijan, Fergana and Namangan targeted by ELS) has a high population density population (445 persons per square kilometers), over 80% living in rural areas, which puts pressure on water and arable land resources. About 50% of arable land suffers from degradation in the form of salinization. Households in most vulnerable rural settlements rely on agriculture, mainly cotton, as the main source of family subsistence and cash income. Small rural enterprises outside agriculture, notably in food production, textile and machinery, are an emerging source of income for some families, but their productivity and profitability remain generally low. Social benefits and salaries of public servants account only for a small proportion of family incomes.

Within this setting one can easily appreciate the importance and the focus of the project entitled ‘Enhancement of Living Standards in Fergana Valley’ otherwise known as ELS. As stated in the Project Document, “the project seeks to improve the service delivery by the local authorities enhance the capacity of income generation by the local population.”

**Box 1**

**ELS in the past**

The experiences gained through the ELS projects are unique in the Uzbekistan context.

The projects’ approaches included: fomenting regional and local development strategies using improved data collection methods and techniques for mapping living standards; introducing civil society and self-help schemes to communities; generating and diversifying income through rural and urban micro-credits; and strengthening farmers and other types of rural enterprises. Three project evaluations have been undertaken. The first two, covering ELS interventions in Namangan and Karakalpakstan, were completed in 2006. The third, covering Fergana, was undertaken the following year and shows that even if poverty is increasingly concentrated in rural areas, it can be addressed primarily through strengthening local governance..

From: *ADR Uzbekistan*. 2009.

The Fergana Valley consists of three regions (Andijan, Fergana and Namangan) and has a population of 7 million (approximately 30% of the total population). The valley covers 22,000 sq. km (8,500 sq. miles) and is surrounded by the Pamir and the Tien Shan mountains. It is sufficiently endowed with water, which is largely used for irrigation. The valley is the region’s major agricultural producer of cotton, silk, grain, fruits and vegetables. It also has a significant industrial and agricultural potential (agricultural machinery, oil and oil refining, chemicals and fertilizers). The living standards of the rural population in Fergana Valley are largely dependent on irrigated agriculture and improvements of agricultural practices. Investments in appropriate irrigation infrastructures and drainage are required to support the promising sectors of rice and silk cocoon production. While cotton cultivation is predominant, fruits and vegetables are also grown by individual farmers on a smaller scale. Small scale private farming (dekhan) would benefit from improved distribution and marketing. Modern packaging and improved access to markets would support the potential of the local food processing industry. Improvements of existing practices in regulating labor migration and trade with bordering countries can contribute to raising employment levels and income generation while supporting social cohesion and stability.

ELS, in a setting described in the Project Document, has three distinct but interrelated objectives. These are: (i) Strengthening provincial and district level government institutions, therefore enabling them to support poverty reduction initiatives in Fergana Valley that are sustainable, effective and gender responsive; (ii) increasing the capacity of rural communities to participate in local development processes and undertake self-help initiatives to improve basic services in Fergana Valley; and (iii) increasing communities’ equitable access to rural development services and business opportunities. It is worth noting that UNDP has had some valuable experience in the past by implementing successfully ELS in other regions

The objectives stated above are to be realized should the project produce (4) outcomes, namely: (i) Improved capacity of local authorities to support delivery of basic public services; (ii) improved public service delivery; (iii) reinforced organizational capacity of 200 communities (*mahallas*); and (iv) business and agricultural advisory capacity of *mahallas* built and communities’ economic productivity improved.

The project is about to come to its completion at the end of this calendar year and it is the mandate of this evaluation to ascertain whether the objectives are at hand and the expected outcomes are realized as stated. The following section expounds the mandate of the evaluation.

**1.2 Mandate of the evaluation mission**

The mandate is clearly spelled out in the ToR issued by the Country Office. Accordingly the evaluation mission is not expected to start from day one, as it were, of the implementation of the project, but rather pick up from where it was left, for in March 2010 a mid-term evaluation of the project was carried out. Although the present evaluation, in a sense, becomes a natural extension of the mid-term evaluation, it is difficult to ignore all activities and outputs prior to the mid-term evaluation. Nor, in fact, is it expected, judging from the list of scope and objectives as these are expounded in Sec. IV of ToR. Due to their importance and pertinence, it is useful to repeat here each and every point. Moreover, the design of questionnaires will have to be in such a way that there should be at least one question (usually more than one) directed to obtain answers to the queries below.

1. To evaluate the effectiveness of the ELS-supported community mobilization and development planning for the economic productivity of the target communities and the economic well-being of community residents, and notably women.
2. To assess the effectiveness of the role played by the project’s established MIRCs in increasing community participation in the planning, implementation and monitoring of local development initiatives, as well as the prospects for their long-term sustainability.
3. To evaluate the nature of the conceptual and practical linkages between ELS pilot capacity building activities at community level and ELS pilot capacity building of government institutions at district and provincial levels.
4. To appraise the synergies between the ELS project intervention and other interventions and partners in the target areas, including notably the UN system, the World Bank, the Swiss Development Cooperation, by looking specifically at how ELS has leveraged EU and UNDP resources towards the attainment of the relevant MDG target 1.
5. To explore evidence of replication of the project’s pilot activities and investigate the possible instruments for ‘scaling-up’ the pilot interventions into national sector policies.
6. To assess the local stakeholders’ perception of the value added by the EU and UNDP partnership to the achievement of the relevant MDG target 1.
7. To evaluate the effectiveness of ELS intervention in the target communities in terms of improved public services delivery for the resident populations, and notably women; the analysis will include a tentative qualitative assessment of the likely impact of this project outcome on the UNDAF outcome 1, i.e., the improvement of the economic well-being of vulnerable groups.
8. To assess the quality of the processes of participation in local governance in target communities and the effectiveness of ELS intervention on the development of communities institutions, notably local self-government institutions (i.e. *mahalla* committees).

This report proposes to answer these questions and queries within the framework of the methodology, the basic tenets of which have been developed by UNDP as well as DAC.

* 1. **Methodology**

**Box: 2**

**UNDAF Outcomes and CPA**

Outcome 1**:** Economic well-being of vulnerable groups is improved (residents of economically underdeveloped, mainly rural areas; women, particularly home-based workers; labour migrants and their families; children, particularly most-at-risk adolescents; the elderly; HIV-positive people; and people with disabilities)

Outcome 2: Enhanced access to and utilization of relevant, quality essential social services (education, health, nutrition, STI/HIV/drug use prevention, social protection of children and Early Childhood Development).

Outcome 3: Integrate the principles of sustainable development into country policies and Programmes.

Outcome 4: Effectiveness, inclusiveness and accountability of governance at the central and local levels enhanced

**CPA2010-2015**

* Economic governance and welfare improvement;
* Environment and energy;
* Good governance.

In order to comply with its mandate, the evaluator will follow a methodology the major precepts of which will be in accordance with the norms set out by the Evaluation Office of UNDP for project/program assessment.[[2]](#footnote-2) In essence it consists of simultaneous use of **perception**, **validation** and **documentation**, otherwise known as triangulation, in order to assess why and how the outcomes have been achieved or are likely to be achieved, and to determine the contribution of UNDP, given the development parameters set out in the UNDAF (1) and Country Program (3) documents as shown in Box: 2.

Since the evaluation in question is an outcome evaluation, certain paradigms will be kept in mind. Namely its **focus,** that is to say how the outcomes have been achieved and what the contribution of UNDP has been in their achievement; its **scope,** that is to say broadly assessing the program’s contribution to outcomes specified in the program document, and **purpose.**

The evaluation will follow (6) concrete steps: The first step is the review of pertinent documents.[[3]](#footnote-3). These documents include, but are not limited to, the project documents, previous evaluations and assessments, annual work plans, progress reports, etc. Briefing and in-depth interviews with UNDP/CO and program’s personnel and related ministries, key stakeholders and partners, constitute the second step. These interviews were essentially structured[[4]](#footnote-4) and partially of open-ended nature.[[5]](#footnote-5) The third step is visits to selected project sites. The selection was not made haphazardly but rationally, adhering to the agreement reached with the program personnel in the Country Office. In these locations direct observation will be made and interviews with project personnel and, as much as possible, with the end users, in other words, the beneficiaries, will be carried out. Interviews with them will be conducted on the basis of a pre-prepared questionnaire.[[6]](#footnote-6)

The fourth step is to follow the result framework and relate outcomes to outputs and activities on the basis of all information received. Schematically it can be demonstrated as follows:

Activities Outputs Outcomes

Once this chain is analyzed, then the report can safely reach, as objectively as possible, the results of the program. In assessing activities, outputs and outcomes the critical information is the indicators related to each and every one of them. It is expected that each indicator adheres to SMART principles. If not, that deviation(s) will also be noted and conclusions for the corresponding outcome will vary accordingly.

Box: 3

SMART Principles

S pecific

M easurable

A ttainable

R elevant,

T ractable

The fifth step is the preparation of the draft report with special emphasis on relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, degree of change, and sustainability. Sustainability will be scrutinized especially to assess whether perceived positive changes/outcomes will be of enduring nature. The sixth step is the presentation of the major findings and conclusions/debriefing with UNDP, Government and other concerned entities and key stakeholders and finalization of the draft report based upon feedback received during the debriefing session.

The report adheres to (4) evaluation criteria set forth by DAC.[[7]](#footnote-7) These are:

* *Relevance* that examines whether the objectives of interventions are consistent with the priorities of GoU and UNDP’s UNDAF and CPAP focus areas.
* *Effectiveness* examines whether the outputs and outcomes are perceived as important.
* *Efficiency* looks into whether the budgeted outlays have been converted to outputs economically.
* *Sustainability* is the assessment of whether project outcomes will be sustained without further UNDP interventions.

The preliminary version of the report was prepared in Tashkent and was discussed at the steering committee. It was expanded and revised at the home base after receiving the comments of the project personnel, finalized, and became the final report.

1. **Project context**

2.1 Objective

The issues to be addressed by this project can be broken down into three main categories: (i) limited capacity of local authorities in local development planning; (ii) limited access to quality basic services by rural population coupled with limited capacity of community based organizations to support service delivery; and (iii) limited access by rural population and households to specialized rural extension services, knowledge and inputs, factors which reduce access to jobs and income. The combination of these issues contributes to slowing down local development and impacts negatively the living standards of the rural population.

In order to address these issues, the project seeks to create a venue, by consolidating them all with a project, the overall objective of which is *“****to contribute to the improvement of living standards of rural population in Fergana Valley.****”*  Within the overall objective, specific objectives can be summarized thus:

* Improved capacity of local authorities to support delivery of basic services.
* Improved public service delivery.
* Built business and advisory capacity of mahallas and improved community economic productivity.

**2.2 Activities, outputs and outcomes**

The report will analyze first whether the planned activities have in fact been carried out in order to achieve planned outputs. The next step will be to assess if the planned outputs are at hand. This will be done by verifying the stated indicators, which, in turn, will lead to the assessment of the outcomes.

* *Activities*. Detailed activities for the realization of expected outputs are given in Annex C. After an in-depth discussion with the management team in Tashkent, Andijan, Fergana and Namangan it appeared that all activities have been carried out as planned; there are no overruns nor activities yet to be completed at the conclusion of the project. This being the case, the report can now safely turn to the analysis of outputs.
* *Outputs*. The matrix below summarizes the realization of outputs.[[8]](#footnote-8)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Specific objective 1: Improved capacity of local authorities to support delivery of basic services.** | | |
| **Output** | **Indicators** | **Indicators verified** |
| Regional/local institutions are strengthened to support poverty reduction initiatives in Fergana Valley that are sustainable, effective and gender responsive | Number of local govt. officials trained to advocate gender sensitive policy formulation, implementation and service delivery in Fergana Valley. | 200 trained. Target has been met. |
|  | Number of communities have produced CDPs which incorporate needs statements and budget lines related to youth, women and low income priorities. | 255. Target has been met. |
|  | Number of consultations between Mahalla and local govt. to approve CDPs and their budgets. | 31 for 255 communities in 13 target districts. Target has been met. |
|  | Number of regional and district govt. officials trained to collect socioeconomic sex disaggregated data and use it for local planning, M&E. | 200. Target has been met. |
|  | Number of community projects established that require technical contribution from two or more local govt. Khokimiyats departments. | 201 projects. Target has been met. |
| **The report concludes that the capacity of provincial and district level government bodies in local development planning and managing the provision of basic public services has been built.** | | |
| **Specific objective 2: Improved public service delivery** | | |
| **Output** | **Indicators** | **Indicators verified** |
| Increased the capacity of rural communities to participate in local development processes and undertake self-help initiatives to improve basic services in Fergana Valley. | Number of facilities in project area that contribute directly to improved access to basic services. | 201. Target has been met. |
|  | % of participating communities produce an updated CDP in the year after the project is completed. | Should be evaluated at 2012 |
|  | Number of community infrastructure rehabilitation projects that are financed from outside the project budget and use a participatory methodology. | 189 projects. Target has been met. |
|  | Number of surveys showing good level of satisfaction of service delivery in 200 project communities. | 171 target communities participated in 2 surveys. Target has been met. |
|  | Number of projects supported through external resources for at least one priority identified in the CPDs by 200 Mahalla Committees and 12 Resource Centers. | 189 projects. Target has been met. |
|  | By the end of the Project, a survey of representatives of at least 200 Mahalla Committees shows that they acknowledge how to use rural participatory approaches for community development. | Will be evaluated at 2012 |
| **The report concludes that the output for their realization of objective 2 is at hand. The assessment of the last indicator which will be carried out later does not negate this conclusion** | | |
| **Specific objective 3: Business and advisory capacity of mahallas built and community economic productivity improved** | | |
| **Output** | **Indicators** | **Indicators verified** |
| Communities have increased equitable access to rural development services and business opportunities. | Number of targeted initiative groups have developed a successful business plan. | 79 business IGs. Target has been met. |
|  | Number of dekhans and households trained in marketing, business planning & administration. | 2280. Target has been met. |
|  | Number of pilot demonstrations and replications for appropriate technologies identified. | 102. Target has been met. |
|  | Number of people (of whom at least 30% women) trained in accounting skills, financial analysis & income generation. | 2280. Target has been met. |
|  | Number of beneficiaries participated in agro-demonstration activities. | 3002. Target has been met. |
|  | Number of people benefited from community based development centers. | 450. Target has been met. |
| **Verified indicators lead the report to state that the output for the realization of objective 3, as stated above, is at hand.** | | |

With the information expounded above the report now turns its attention to outcomes and impacts

**2.3 Outcomes and impacts**

Outcome evaluation, as this ~~one~~ report strives to ~~be~~ do, compares planned with actual achievements. It focuses on how and why outputs and strategies contributed to the achievement of intended results, by focusing on questions of relevance, effectiveness, sustainability and change. It also assesses achievements of outputs by comparing indicators before and after the intervention by relying on monitoring data on information from external sources. Outcomes, of course, can be positive or negative, enhancing the possibility of reaching the overall objective, or creating obstacles to it. The overall objective of this exercise, just to recapitulate, is “to contribute to the improvement of living standards of rural population in Fergana Valley” through a variety of targeted interventions. All indicators point to the direction of positive outcomes, keeping in mind that the majority of indicators are quantitative and verifiable and adhere to the SMART principles (see: Box 3). That being the case – subject to the verification of DAC principles – the report tends to propose that all outcomes are positive and no negative outcome is discernible.

While all outcomes are positive and germane to the objectives, some deserve special mention, such as rural participatory approach to local development fomented in 200 mahallas; increased access to public utilities realized by the efforts of communities themselves; managed ~~to~~ assistance a number of entrepreneurs to learn modern methods of business planning and management, thereby increasing their earnings; substantial increase in the provision of women’s needs; and appreciable reduction in the incidence of several diseases.

Impacts are usually measured after a reasonable time elapse following the conclusion of the projects.[[9]](#footnote-9) As the mid-term evaluation points out,[[10]](#footnote-10) measuring impact was difficult as project indicators were not always relevant and/or reliable. Nevertheless, the report states that,

“Indications were found that the program had improved the livelihoods of communities through its mobilization and a social infrastructure rehabilitation activity to bring access to clean water and a notable effect has been the drop in intestinal diseases such as typhoid, hepatitis, and diarrhea, as a result of availability of cleaner water. The project has had limited but potentially significant impacts on incomes and employment in the target areas. At community level, households have now the potential to achieve improved living standards through the acquisition of more productive and efficient technologies. In terms of increased capacity of local governments to respond to community needs, uses by the projects of MDGs as a starting point to support local development planning have in general helped fostering the dialogue with communities about addressing local development issues.”

The present report finds no evidence to dispute the above statement. However, it points out to its somewhat conjectural nature at this stage and states firmly that it requires further verification when sufficient time elapses and the project results are revisited.

3. Key Findings of the Projects

3.1 Relevance

Two basic concepts are the guiding pillars in deciding the relevance of the projects in question: namely, a) the strategic positioning and focus of UNDP on key outcomes; and b) the outcomes relevant to national priorities, as well as consistent with achieving *Millennium Development Goals (*See: Box 4).The Government of Uzbekistan signed the Millennium Declaration and its policies are oriented towards the achievement of the first seven MDGs. Subsequently published documents and decrees fortified adherence to the pronounced policy.[[11]](#footnote-11)

**Box: 4**

**MDG**

As a signatory to the Millennium Declaration, Uzbekistan is fulfilling its promises to address the challenges outlined in the MDGs. The Government recognizes the relevance and acuteness of these challenges in the national development context. The Government, in collaboration with donor community and the civil society, has embarked on the process of formulating its own national MDG targets and indicators. The national experts’ team made major steps in analyzing the development context for each goal by setting appropriate baselines and indicators. The set of seven national MDG goals are:

1 **-**[**Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger.**](http://endpoverty2015.org/goals/end-hunger)  **2-** [**Achieve universal primary education**](http://endpoverty2015.org/goals/universal-education)**.  
3 -** [**Promote gender equality and empower women.**](http://endpoverty2015.org/goals/gender-equity)  **4 -** [**Reduce child mortality.**](http://endpoverty2015.org/goals/child-health)  **5 -** [**Improve maternal health**](http://endpoverty2015.org/goals/maternal-health)  **6-** [**Combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases.**](http://endpoverty2015.org/goals/combat-hiv-aids)  **7 -** [**Ensure environmental sustainability.**](http://endpoverty2015.org/goals/environmental-sustainability)  **8 -** [**Develop a global partnership for development.**](http://endpoverty2015.org/goals/global-partnership)

**From:** *Achieving Millennium Development Goals in Uzbekistan.*

The project is also inconcordance with the UNDAF’s expected outcomes 1[[12]](#footnote-12) and 4 and Country Program Action Plan (see: Box 2). Also as the signatory of Millennium Declaration the Government of Uzbekistan adheres to its tenets. Hence, the report sustains that certainly the expected outcomes of the project do reflect the priorities of the Government and the overall mandate of UNDP. In short, the report wishes to assert that the project it reviews is relevant and pertinent to the expected outcomes in the realm of enhanced capacity of designated institutions as well as of contributors to the Millennium Development goals. The relevance of the strategic positioning of UNDP is attested by the support it received from the donor community. The report found that the intervention were timely and relevant and consistent with UNDP strategic goals.

One more, and perhaps most indicative, yardstick is that local citizens participated into a number project activities (mostly, but not exclusively infrastructure building activities) by physical labor as well as financial support. The project was very relevant to their needs.

3.2 Efficiency and effectiveness

Efficiency can be measured in a variety of ways. One method would be to estimate the proportion of the resources that UNDP allots to a set of outcomes to their administrative costs. Another method is to compare the extent of UNDP’s contribution to the outcome with that of its partners. Taking the latter first, UNDP succeeded in mobilizing funds from EU at the ratio of ten to one, its total cost being 3,850,000 euro. The administrative cost is 29%. Prima facie this percentage may appear to be excessive, if one were to consider that the overhead in most of the UNDP projects varies between 10% and 15%. However, the project, by its very nature, maintained, in addition to an office in Tashkent, additional three field offices. In view of this particular circumstance a high overhead of the project cannot be viewed as an indication of inefficiency. Hence the report concludes that it was efficient. A complementary way is to look into the activities and assess whether planned activities are carried out within the set time frame. It appears that all of the planned activities have been carried out and completed. There are no arrears or financial overruns.

Effectiveness poses the question whether, given the budget, the total outputs could have been achieved at a lower cost. The report does not have any comparative data to make a fair judgment. However given the outputs and their qualities and the modest sums allocated to them, one cannot help but tend to think that by and large the management was effective.

3.3 Resource Mobilization

Given UNDP’s limited resources, their mobilization by the Country Offices has acquired a great deal of importance during the last decade or so.[[13]](#footnote-13) As is pointed above, UNDP leveraged about 91% of the total cost. However in addition to the 9% of cost financing UNDP brought to the table its recognized neutrality and accumulated technical knowledge as intangible contributions to the project. In-kind contributions of the local governments are also an added resource.[[14]](#footnote-14) In projects dealing with infrastructure or income generation activities the project succeeded in having direct beneficiaries to participate into the projects either with their own or with the communities’ funds. The end result was, of course, to increase the financial capacity of the project.

3.4 Ownership and execution modality

Since the early 90’s UNDP adopted the National Execution Modality (NEX) as the norm. The underlying assumption was that NEX was much more conducive to national ownership of UNDP programs and projects.[[15]](#footnote-15) The project also succeeded in securing a high participation and involvement of local actors. Given the level of maturity in the public sector as well as participation of local actors, the report concludes that, NEX is, in fact, an appropriate modality for Uzbekistan,[[16]](#footnote-16) or so it seems at the first instance. A local steering committee, as the project had, is certainly the first step to the direction towards NEX. That is necessary but not sufficient, for a full-fledged NEX also requires that the project management, both financial and technical, be left to the national authorities, with UNDP assuming an overseer role. However, the financial regulations of the country did not permit a full transfer of financial and technical responsibilities. The result is, in fact, a compromise that can be best described as a DEX-NEX mix.

3.5 Sustainability

Sustainability refers to the durability of positive results after the termination of technical cooperation. It is important to assess whether the project results are institutionalized and internalized. With respect to outcome sustainability it is necessary to assess whether the positive change in the situation will endure and will also lead to other projects/programs pursued by the Government with or without any technical assistance. Sustainability within the project’s frame of reference rests on long-term capacity building. Based on interviews carried out locally and the documents reviewed, the report reaches the following conclusions with respect to the sustainability of the realized objectives and outputs.[[17]](#footnote-17)

Detailed discussions with the germinal entrepreneurs and with the mahalla leaders left no room for doubt that the project results will not be sustainable. In cases where entrepreneurs are involved (3d component) the overwhelming response was: “thanks to the project I doubled my income, now I know that I can double it again.” In the case of the 2d component the response was: “we put our money and our sweat, the project helped us technically and financially. The irrigation channel we built (or electricity wires we installed) is ours and we shall maintain it.” In short, all benefits were internalized and ownership was established.

**Probability of sustainability matrix**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Specific Objectives** | **Outputs**  **(Results)** | **High** | **Low** | **Comments** |
| **1.** Regional/local institutions are strengthened to support poverty reduction initiatives in Fergana Valley that are sustainable, effective and gender responsive. | 1.1Improved capacity of local authorities to support delivery of basic services. |  | **X** | This was the first attempt to strengthen local/regional authorities and capacity building. Further enhancement is needed. |
| **2.**Increase the capacity of rural communities to participate in local development processes and undertake self-help initiatives to improve basic services in Fergana Valley. | 2.1.1mproved public service delivery.  2.2 Organi-zational capacity of 200 mahallas reinforced. | **X** |  | High participation of local citizenry, internalization of project outputs. |
| **3**.Communities have increased equitable access to rural development services and business opportunities. | 3.1.Increased equitable access by communities to rural development services and business | **X** |  | Private entrepreneurial spirit awakened/fortified; local capital involved; productive use of business centers. |

3.6 Synergies

Two types of synergy are observable in this context. One is the synergy among the components of the program, and the other is the synergy between the project itself and other multilateral and or bilateral initiatives. Here the report mentions some of the important ones.

* EC Central Asia Poverty Reduction Scheme goes beyond poverty reduction to embrace conflict prevention and cross-border co-operation. The objectives of ELS are coherent with the poverty reduction objectives of the EC scheme and the choice of the Fergana Valley region and focus on bordering districts are security motivated and aim to support the conflict prevention objective of the EC scheme.
* The objectives of ELS are also relevant in the context of the UNDP-ABD program objectives in Uzbekistan. ABD is an integrated concept to the solution of the multi-dimensional aspects of poverty: monetary income deprivation, lack of job opportunities, underemployment, poor access to healthcare and education, etc. The rationale for an ABD approach in Uzbekistan is the concentration of the multi-dimensional issues of poverty in specific localities, and notably in rural communities. The declared ABD program objectives are welfare improvement and increased living standards of the population in disadvantaged rural areas. The objectives and approach of ELS are fully coherent with the objectives and approach of the UNDP-ABD programme.
* The World Bank has been operating in the Fergana Valley with the health and irrigation, drainage and improvement of wetlands projects. The health projects have aimed to improve the quality and overall cost-effectiveness of healthcare services. The irrigation, drainage and wetland improvement projects have aimed to increase productivity of irrigated agriculture and to improve water management.
* UNICEF has had two projects in the Fergana Valley: the family planning and education project and the child and mother care project.
* A major new World Bank program is the Fergana Water Resource Management Program (FWRMP), which is implemented from mid-2010 to mid-2016; it aims to promote sustainable irrigated agriculture production, increase employment and generate farm incomes by improving drainage and irrigation systems.

The synergy between these programs/projects is likely to fortify the outcomes of ELS project and vice versa[[18]](#footnote-18)

3.7 Best Practices

. As can be deduced from the analysis in Section 2, almost all outputs are either of good or very good quality. The report had a great deal difficulty of singling out only one as the best practice. However it wishes to assert that the creation of self- reliance in the communities and kindling the entrepreneurial spirit, thanks to “Business Development Centers,” must be singled out as the best practices.

**3.8 Perceptions**

Perception is a fairly recently introduced concept in evaluation. UNDP, through its Country-Level Impact Assessment (CLIA) methodology developed in 1999, underlined the benefit of this approach to record the differences of views and opinions of partners on a specific program or institution. If a program/project is to be improved, it is important to know how the outsiders perceive its image, so that when the image is negative the missing or correct explanation can be introduced, or the elements that create this negative image can be modified. The report would like to make clear that the perceptions cited here are those of the interviewed and do not necessarily reflect the views already expressed in this report.

With respect to participants, the overwhelming majority perceives the project as an excellent one in creating opportunities in the advancement of their career or in their endeavors. As one participant put it “everything was very good in this project, the only bad thing is that it now ended,” a view that was shared by the overwhelming majority who benefited from the project. Several surveys conducted by the project also indicate a high level of satisfaction of those who were involved with the project, mostly as trainees, which, in turn, attests that it was very positively perceived.

The opinion of the Government, as expressed by the local as well as national authorities, was very positive; it is hoped that the project will be extended. The representative of EU also expressed the same opinion.

**3.9 Conclusions recapitulated**

Now that all the observations and the review of all the documents have been summarized, this recapitulation also strives to answer the evaluation questions posed and articulated in Section 1 of the report.

* The effectiveness of the ELS supported community mobilization and development planning on the economic productivity of the target communities and the economic well-being of community residents, notably women, is considerable. Also the effectiveness of the role played by the project in increasing community participation in the planning, implementation and monitoring of local development initiatives is also considerable and the long-term sustainability is high.

**Box: 5**

**What the beneficiaries told the evaluator**

“*It was an excellent project…The only bad thing about it is that it is ended. We need training in so many areas.*” **A trainee in local government.**

*“I have increased my production 50% in a year and the number of my employees doubled, thanks to the management courses and training I received. The business center was a great help.”* **A lady manager/owner of a furniture factory**.

“*We put up our limited financial sources and our labor. ELS gave us technical advice and some financial hel. and we brought water to our mahalla for the enjoyment of 1800 households*” **Head of a mahalla committee.**

**“***We did dig the channel and brought water for irrigation of our fields thanks to the project. The channel now is ours and we will maintain it.”* **Head of a mahalla committee***.*

*“I quickly doubled my income thanks to the project, which taught me business planning and marketing. Now I know how to double it again”* **A young farmer.**

*“Business Development Centers are great. I would say go there and learn how to double your income.”* **An agricultural entrepreneur**

*“I am ready to share my knowledge with other districts and teach them how to mobilize and do good for their own benefits/”* **A mahalla chairman**

*“ELS was a catalyzer to teach the communities to learn how to work together, and how to solve their problems together for their own good.”* **A Community mobilization officer.**

* Business Development Centers, created by the project, have played a pivotal role in providing an array of assistance to entrepreneurs to enter into new ventures or expand their businesses. The assistance was particularly effective in business planning.
* The conceptual and practical linkages between the ELS pilot capacity building activities at the community level and ELS pilot capacity building in government institutions at district and provincial levels is partially effective due to low level of capacity in the local government personnel and ELS’s efforts of capacity building was rather limited.
* The report had limited time to appraise the synergies between the intervention of ELS and interventions by other in the target areas, including notably the UN system, the World Bank, and the Swiss Development Cooperation. Therefore no conclusions can be advanced at this stage. There is, however, irrefutable evidence that ELS mobilized local resources (physical as well as financial) towards the attainment of the relevant MDG target 1.
* Local stakeholders perceive that ELS and its financial resources provided by EU and UNDP partnership was a major instrument in achieving MDG target 1.
* The effectiveness of the intervention of ELS in the target communities to improve the delivery of public services to the resident populations notably women, was very high; it stands to reason that the likely impact of this project outcome on the UNDAF outcome 1 is high as well.
* The quality of the processes of participation in local governance in target communities and the effectiveness of the intervention of ELS on the development of communities’ institutions, notably local self-government institutions (i.e. *mahalla* committees), is very high, which is very highly appreciated by mahalla leaders. In most of the mahallas the results of infrastructure projects, now totally internalized, and their sustainability has been assured by the mahalla committees that assumed the responsibility of their maintenance.
* ELS also succeeded in enlisting the assistance and good will of the district governments that in turn cooperated with the mahallas in various ways in their infrastructure projects.

**5 Lessons learned and Recommendations**

**5.1 Lessons Learned**

**Box: 6**

**Capacity development**

Capacity is defined as the ability to perform functions, solve problems and set and achieve objectives. [However] as countries transform themselves…they must do more than expand human skills. They must also create the opportunities and the incentives for people to use and expand those skills. Capacity development thus takes place not just in individuals, but also among them, in the institutions and the networks they create through what has been termed the “social capital” that holds societies together and sets the terms of these relationships.

For individuals capacity development involves enabling individuals to embark on a continuous process of learning, and building upon on existing knowledge and skills. For institutions it involves building on existing capacities, encouraging these institutions to grow. For societies it involves capacities in the society as a whole.

**From:** Sakiko Fukuda-Parr et al. **(**eds***),*** *Capacity for Development***.** UNDP, New York, 2002.

In this section the report wishes to point out some important lessons learned during the implementation of the present project which might be of importance, should there be a second phase of the project, and/or a similar project to be implemented elsewhere in Uzbekistan.

* The complexity and multi-dimensional character of poverty in the target area shows that area-based development approach yields the best results.
* At the design level, sufficient attention must be paid to public utilities and to infrastructural bottlenecks which, in turn, have affected the quality of the services. ELS gave due attention to this issue, hence very good results have been achieved. A similar project in the future would also do well by giving attention to the issue of public utilities and underlying infrastructures.
* The area-based development approach cannot neglect capacity building in local government, since policies must incorporate public policy issues within which policies directed to poverty reduction will have to navigate. Proper training of the local governments’ cadre is *sine qua non*.
* Indicators to measure the impact of poverty reduction are systematically used by local authorities, but the quality of the statistics is not always reliable and accurate. Hence, underestimations and/or overestimations are serious issues that surround poverty reduction efforts. Capacity building, as the present project strived in preparing accurate statistics, must be one of the first priorities.
* Identifying women and female-led households as specific target groups, and assisting them in the income generation activities must be an important priority, since at the present time they are the disadvantaged segment of the society.

**5.2 Recommendations**

The report puts forward two major recommendations with the strong belief that they are the crux of the matter forthcoming project(s) to succeed in contributing to the realization of MDG 1.

The **first** one is related to training the officers of local governments. And in that there are two sub-sets.

1. Training that is necessary within the present legal-administrative set-up. The report gathered from the activities directed to training local government employees that they were of course necessary but far from being sufficient. There are several areas where lacunae are evident. One of them refers to statistical information. It is the understanding of this report that the quality of statistical information leaves very much to be desired. They are not accurate; gathering such information is done rather haphazardly; there is no mechanism to assess their quality, nor is any mechanism in place to determine whether such information is *fideo digno*. And yet such information is crucial for planning and management. Moreover, local government employees are orphans in tax administration, especially in assessment and collection methods. Therefore the report suggests that there be a longer term program that truly trains local government employees in the areas mentioned above. It should not be squeezed into a few weeks of seminars/lectures, but should be of longer duration and should incorporate into the training process the method of ‘learning by doing’.
2. The second sub-set suggested is somewhat speculative and rests upon the assumption that the Government of Uzbekistan will implement a certain degree of decentralization, an attempt that has been articulated by the President of the Republic. In this context decentralization will mean that people are allowed to influence their own destiny by increasing local participation of citizens in decision making. This in turn can make the government immediately more transparent and accountable. Decentralization can result in more efficient use of resources; it can provide a fertile setting for the emergence of local decision-making and it can improve economic participation by encouraging local entrepreneurship. Should that be the case in the near future, local government employees will be in dire need of additional training. Within this training fiscal management will occupy the front line, because by definition local authorities will have certain independent taxing power and additional revenues transferred from the central government will be according to an automatic formula and will not be subjected to yearly budget discussion. In that case fiscal management acquires primordial importance. As the employees of local governments are not sufficiently prepared to deal with such responsibilities, they will be in dire need of training.[[19]](#footnote-19)

The **second** one is the preparation of a group of trainers selected from the present project’s trainees and beneficiaries. Assuming that other regions will also have ELS projects in the future, it would be a rational step to subject them to a brief training and then use them as trainers in other regions. In fact there are several trainees or local leaders involved especially in infrastructure projects and eager to help other communities. This mode of operation will have several advantages: (i) it is cost saving, (ii) there will be no language barrier, and (iii) it will be the easiest way to project trust, since essentially the trainer and trainee are of the same culture.[[20]](#footnote-20) This method may provide a platform for implementing a new poverty reduction program in other regions.

The report makes further specific recommendations.[[21]](#footnote-21) These are:

* The good results of ELS in the Fergana Valley as a whole should be consolidated before exit. Its achievements should also be combined in a report and this report should be disseminated among the future candidate region(s).
* The next poverty reduction program(s) can contribute to the clarification of standards for the provision of social services to communities and beyond, not only in the context of public utilities, but also in health and education.
* The future poverty reduction program should continue to help regional and district authorities, not only in developing a core set of indicators to measure the impact of state programs on poverty reduction, but also in developing functional activities and systems for sharing and verifying the reliability of data.
* The public relations specialist of the current ELS should be trained in the development and dissemination of communication contents of UNDP/EU policies, programs and strategies for the selected additional regions.

**Annex: A**

**Terms of Reference**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME**  **TERMS OF REFERENCE / INDIVIDUAL CONTRACT** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **I. Job Information** | |
| Job Title:  Project Title/Department:  Type of contract:  Duration of the assignment:  Duty station:  Expected places of travel:  Reports to: | International Evaluation Expert  “Enhancement of Living Standards in Fergana  Valley”  International Contractor  15 working days till 9 December 2011  Home based (maximum 4 days) with 1 mission to Uzbekistan (no less than 11 days, including international travel days)  Tashkent , Andijan, Fergana, Namangan  Head of Economic Governance Unit and Project Coordinator |

|  |
| --- |
| II. Background and context |
| *II.1 Objectives of the project being evaluated*  The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Office in Uzbekistan plans to evaluate the project Enhancement of Living Standards (ELS) in Fergana Valley (ID: 00063911), financed by the European Union, and implemented and co-financed by UNDP.  The purpose of ELS is to improve living standards in Fergana Valley. The specific objectives of the project are the followings:   * Strengthening provincial and district level government institutions therefore enabling them to support poverty reduction initiatives in Fergana Valley that are sustainable, effective and gender responsive; * Increasing the capacity of rural communities to participate in local development processes and undertake self-help initiatives to improve basic services in Fergana Valley; * Increasing communities’ equitable access to rural development services and business opportunities.   The project implementation phase commenced on 11 December 2008 and is scheduled to end on 31 December 2011. The project activities target the population and community institutions of 200 most economically vulnerable rural *Mahallas* in 12 districts of the provinces of Andijan, Fergana and Namangan, as well as the respective provincial and district level government administrations.  The expected outcomes of the project are:   * Improved capacity of local authorities to support delivery of basic public services. * Improved public service delivery. * Organizational capacity of 200 communities (*Mahallas*), reinforced. * Business and agricultural advisory capacity of *Mahallas* built and communities’ economic productivity improved.   *II.2 Main project activities*  The project implements three main activities:   1. Capacity building of provincial and district level government bodies in local development planning and managing the provision of basic public services. 2. Building rural communities’ capacity to participate in local development processes and undertaking self-help initiatives to improve basic public services. 3. Building the capacity of community level business and agricultural advisory services and improving communities’ economic productivity.   Within the first activity, the project’s trainings were implemented in co-operation with the Academy for State and Social Construction (ASSC) and have mainly targeted middle-level civil servants from both provincial and district government institutions. As part of the second activity, a selection of most economically vulnerable rural communities were targeted for participatory decentralized planning and rehabilitation of essential public services. Through the third activity, the project has promoted increases in agricultural productivity and incomes, through ‘field farm schools’ and a network of Rural Development Centres (RDCs), and supported the start-up of small rural businesses through equipment grants and trainings.  *II.3 Geographic, demographic and social-economic context*  The Uzbek territory of the Fergana Valley (comprising the three provinces of Andijan, Fergana and Namangan targeted by the ELS project) has a high density population (445 persons per square kilometers), over 80% living in rural areas, which puts pressure on water and arable land resources. About 50% of arable land suffers from degradation in the form of salinization. Households in most vulnerable rural settlements rely on agriculture as the main source of family subsistence and cash income. Small rural enterprises outside agriculture, notably in food production, textile, machinery, are an emerging source of income for some families, but their productivity and profitability remain generally low. Social benefits and salaries of public servants account only for a small proportion of family incomes.  *II.4 Project’s resources*  The total financial resources allocated to the project by the EU and UNDP are EUR 3,850,000. The EU share (in the form of technical assistance grant) is EUR 3,500,000 or 91% of the total.  *II.5 Key project’s partners*  The National Implementing Agency is the Ministry of Economy of Uzbekistan. The beneficiaries of the project are the 3 provincial governments of Andijan, Fergana and Namangan. The project’s client is the European Commission.  *II.6 Observed changes since the beginning of implementation and contributing factors*  The government of Uzbekistan is a signatory of the Millennium Declaration and the ELS project is an integral part of the UNDP’s strategy of achieving the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). In particular, the project design aims to directly contribute towards the achievement of the nationalized MDG target 1: reduce poverty by half by 2015; and to the related UNDAF[[22]](#footnote-22) Outcome 1: economic well-being of vulnerable groups is improved, including notably for residents of economically underdeveloped rural communities. Within this outcome area, UNDP Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP)[[23]](#footnote-23) has focused on supporting the government strategy through interventions in the spheres of economic governance and initiatives that lead to welfare improvement. Poverty reduction is also a primary objective of the EC Regional Strategy for Assistance to Central Asia 2007-2013 which, with relevance to the ELS project, has been implemented under the TACIS Financial Regulation. |

|  |
| --- |
| III. Evaluation purpose |
| The current evaluation aims at generating lessons learnt and recommendations to guide decision-making for future actions in an area, poverty reduction, which both UNDP and the EC will continue to support.  The evaluation will complement the evaluation information of the previous EC external mid-term evaluation of the ELS programme and its four individual ELS projects, carried out in March 2010. The purpose of the EC evaluation was to assess the continued relevance, efficiency, and preliminary indications of effectiveness and sustainability of the ELS programme and to provide recommendations for future actions on the part of the EC in the field of poverty reduction/rural development – notably in light of the preparation of a new poverty reduction/rural development programme in Uzbekistan, under the DCI financial instrument.  The current evaluation is being conducted to generate information on lessons learnt and recommendations to help guide future activities in the area of poverty reduction/rural development in Uzbekistan.  In particular, the results of the current evaluation will enable UNDP Office in Uzbekistan and the EC Europe Aid H/2 Unit in Brussels, as well as the National Implementing Agency in Tashkent, to take stock of the effectiveness of the ELS project in achieving its planned outcomes and whether the partnership strategy crafted for implementing the ELS project has been effective. |

|  |
| --- |
| IV. Evaluation scope and objectives |
| The evaluation covers the period of the project implementation from 1 April 2010 to 31 October 2011, not covered by the preceding Mid-term Evaluation. The geographical scope of the current evaluation extends to the three target provinces of Andijan, Fergana, and Namangan. Within each province, one district is to be covered. Within the target communities, the evaluation should focus on women, as a particularly vulnerable target group of the project activity. In terms of outputs, the evaluation will focus on the quality of public service delivery to communities and on the quality of community participation in local governance, as a result of the project activity.  The objectives of the evaluation aim to address the issues of impact, effectiveness and sustainability of the project intervention. The specific objectives of the evaluation are:   * To evaluate the effectiveness of the ELS project intervention in the target communities in terms of improved public services delivery for the resident populations, and notably women; the analysis will include a tentative qualitative assessment of the likely impact of this project outcome on the UNDAF outcome 1-i.e.economic well-being of vulnerable groups is improved. * To assess the quality of the processes of participation in local governance in target communities and the effectiveness of the ELS project intervention on the development of communities institutions, notably local self-government institutions (i.e. *Mahallas* committees). * To evaluate the effectiveness of the ELS supported community mobilization and development planning on the economic productivity of the target communities and the economic well-being of community residents, including notably women. * To assess the effectiveness of the role played by the project’s established MIRCs in increasing community participation in the planning, implementation and monitoring of local development initiatives; as well as the prospects for their long-term sustainability. * To evaluate the nature of the conceptual and practical linkages between ELS pilot capacity building activities at community level and ELS pilot capacity building of government institutions at district and provincial levels. * To appraise the synergies between the ELS project intervention and other interventions and partners in the target areas, including notably the UN system, the World Bank, the Swiss Development Cooperation by looking specifically at how the ELS project has leveraged EU and UNDP resources towards the attainment of the relevant MDG target 1. * To explore evidence of replication of the project’s pilot activities and investigate the possible instruments for ‘scaling-up’ the pilot interventions into national sector policies. * To assess the local stakeholders perception of the value added by the EU and UNDP partnership to the achievement of the relevant MDG target 1. |

|  |
| --- |
| V. Evaluation questions |
| The following evaluation questions define the information that the evaluation is expected to generate:   * Where the ELS planned outcomes achieved? * When not achieved, what progress towards the outcomes has been made? * What are the likely factors that have contributed to achieving or not achieving the planned outcomes? * To what extent the ELS outputs have contributed to achieving or not achieving the planned outcomes? * Has the project partnership strategy been effective? * What factors contributed to the effectiveness and ineffectiveness? * What has been the likely contribution, if any, of the ELS project’s outcomes to poverty reduction (improved living standards) in the target areas? * What are the prospects for the sustainability of the project’s outputs or outcomes after the end of the implementation phase? |

|  |
| --- |
| **VI. Evaluation deliverables** |
| Payment will be made in lump sum in three installments upon completion and submission of Performance Evaluation From (PEF) on the works performed below:   * **Evaluation inception report** – the report should demonstrate with logical and structured arguments the evaluator’s understanding of what is being evaluated and why, showing how each evaluation question will be answered by outlining the proposed **methodology** for data collection and analysis. The report should include a detailed time **schedule** of activities and an **evaluation framework** in the form of a table outlining for each evaluation question, the correspondent sub-questions, indicators, sources of information and information collection methods. (within - 3 working days, 40% of lump-sum). * **Draft evaluation report-** to be reviewed by UNDP to ensure that the required quality criteria are met. (within - 10 working days, 20% of lump-sum). * **Final evaluation report-** the report should include clear **lessons learnt** and **recommendations.** The latter should identify areas and instruments which have better prospects to ‘scale-up’ the pilot benefits of the project. (within - 2 working days, 40% of lump-sum). |

**Annex: B**

**Persons interviewed**

**In Tashkent**

Jaco Cillers Deputy resident representative, UNDP

Emilio Valli ELS, Project coordinator

Sherzod Akbarov Head, Economic Governance Unit, UNDP

Bakhodur Eshenov Director, Center for Economic Research

Ondrej Simek EU delegation, Chargé d’affairs

Shukhart Shukurov Deputy Hakim, Namangan Region

**In Andijan**

Sardor Alimjanov Area manager, ELS

Alisher Sattarhanov Task manager, ELS

Alisher Pulatov Task manager, ELS

Muzaffer Tuhtasinov Administrative assistant

Shurat Kamalov Trainee, local government

Galibbek Ravshanbekov Trainee, local government

Nadirbek Saydanov Trainee, local government

Durdona Azimova Trainee, local government

Oybek Kuchkarov Trainee, bee keeper

Namuna Kurbanova Director/Owner, furniture producer

Saadethan Kadirova Palvantosh, town chairperson

Hosanboy Madumarov Rahimov mahalla chairman

Tasanno Rahimova Markeziy mahalla Chairperson

Tursunali Boltaboev Chairman, Polvantos Water Department

Abdulhary Mirzajonov Chairman, Dulan Mahalla

Habib Kerimjan Veterinarian

**In Fergana**

Adilahon Tadjibaeva a.i.Area manager, ELS

Bahtiyorjon Tashdemirov Task manager, ELS

Shermurod Tolipov Assistant, ELS

Akramjon Azizov Community mobilization officer, ELS

Baburjon Holikov Engineer, ELS

Rahmatjon Isameddinov Director, Regional Business Development Center (BDC)

Muzaffar Rahmatov Director, Yazyavan district branch of BDC.

Abdulaziz Haydarov Director, Altiarik district branch of BDC

Muzaffar Hayrullah Chairman, irrigation initiative group

Hasan Kamalov Member, irrigation initiative group

Abdurrahim Tursunbutov Extension agent, demonstration plot

**In Namangan**

Dilshod Resulov Project manager, ELS

Maksuda Muhsinbaeva Community Mobilization Officer, ELS

Abror Khodjaev Task manager, ELS

Lochin Buriev Income generation ass’t, ELS

Sherzad Muradov Rural specialist, ELS

Kamil Shemsiev Engineer, ELS

Adham Azimov Owner/Manager Bakery

Mamuna Artikulova Chair, Bog Kucha Mahalla

Turdikhan Usmanova Advisor, Bog Kucha Mahalla

Kazim Tuhtabaev Director, Deaf and Dumb School

Abdulvahab Mamasoliev Chairman, Baht village

Mamurjon Begbaev Adviser, Baht village

**Annex: C**

Activity Matrix

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1.Activities** | **Activity mapping Scope of work** | | **When started and when completed** | | **Comments (if any)-deliverables** |
| **Specific objective 1 Regional/local institutions are strengthened to support poverty reduction initiatives in Fergana Valley that are sustainable, effective and gender responsive** |  | |  | |  |
| **Expected result 1.1** Improved capacity of local authorities to support delivery of basic services |  | | **April 2009-December 2011** | |  |
| 1.1: Conduct a capacity assessment of local authorities to deliver local services and validate local needs. | 1.Discuss the assessment with the regional government (Khokimiyat) and non-government authorities: Preparation of ToR for CA; Background reading of training materials; Check on experience of CA in Kazakhstan; Draw up revised timetable for all work on CA; Prepare ground with MoE and other local stakeholders; Organize 2 w-shops (one on the objectives of the assessment and one to adapt questions related the specifics of the local context)  2. Develop a questionnaire with RBEC and disseminate it to the key stakeholders for completion: Start collecting suggestions on the structure of the questionnaire and on what information is needed to get from the CA; Organize a retreat to draft a questionnaire, and decide on sample group; Translate a questionnaire into Russian and Uzbek and print copies; Pilot a questionnaire in the field (in Fergana, Namangan, Andijan, Karshi, KKP)  3. Analyze the questionnaires: Form focus groups; Follow-up interviews as well as focus group discussions on the preliminary findings; consult with Bratislava chaps, how to enter data and use results;  4.Disseminate the results in the form of a report for feedback and agreement from stakeholders  5.Present the results/report agreed with stakeholder  6.Develop recommendations to address capacity needs and shape future interventions  7. Review literature and training material by UNICEF and UNDP, including the material prepared under previous ELS project.  8. Disseminate the results in the form of a report for feedback and agreement from stakeholders and present it at a w-shop.  9.Develop recommendations to address capacity needs and shape future interventions  10. Organization w-shop to agree recommendations with all stakeholders.  11.Inclusion all agreed with stakeholders recommendations to the assessment report | | April 2009  April-June 2009  July 2009  July 2009  July 2009  July 2009  January 2010  January 2010  January 2010  February –March 2010  April 2010 | | 1.TORs for assessment  2. Workshop to present TOR to stakeholders  3. Questionnaire and focus group guidelines  4. Field work carried out, results of interviews and focus groups discussions analyzed  5. Draft analytical report with recommendations circulated among stakeholders for comments and feedback  6. Workshop - recommendations agreed with all stakeholders  7. Final assessment report and recommendation for capacity response |
| 1.2: Prepare training materials and train local trainers in local development planning. | 1.Development of training plan and training of trainers with Academy  2. Finalization module and training materials  3.Submission developed module and training materials to the national and local govt reps for their review  4. Organization mini w-shop with national and local govt reps for their to approve developed module and training materials  5. Translation finalized/approved by national and local govt reps into Russian, Uzbek, English languages  6. To provide within ASSC trainings based on developed modules and training materials to 15 trainers for further conducting training activities  7. Evaluation of training activities and award certificates to 15 trainers based on the results of the training  8.Development of a practical guide for local government officials on issues of effective public governance at the regional level | | July-September 2009  January-February 2010  January-February 2010  January-February 2010  January-February 2010  February –March 2010  February –March 2010  March-September 2010 | | 1.Draft training module and training materials (Academy in consultation with ELS programme staff and others)  2.Training module approved by national and local govt reps (mini-workshops)  3.Final training module and materials in Russian, Uzbek, English  4.15 trainers trained (by Academy )  5. Evaluation of training of trainers (forms, compiled and summarized). |
| 1.3: Train local authorities in local development planning. | 1.Selection of 20 middle level regional and district government officials and representatives of the Mahalla Fund in each region as trainees for training program  2. Implement training plan and train government officials in the regions  3. Select of trainees among the representatives of local authorities  4. Development schedule and train on regional development planning based on modules and training materials developed under the ASSC  5. Development and agree with national and local govt reps a special training modules in responsiveness and accountability in community participatory development  6. Carrying out presentation of the study tour conducted by the December 2009  7. Preparation report on carried out trainings  8. Evaluation of training results and impacts | | September 2009  October 2009- March 2010  February-March 2010  March -October 2010  February -April 2010  January –February 2010  April-June 2010 | | 1.Selection guidelines for government officials/trainees  2.120 govt officials trained (40 in each region + additional 5-10)  3.Special training modules in responsiveness and accountability in community participatory development  4. [2] study tours and presentations  5. evaluation of training (forms, compiled and summarized) |
| 1.4: Support the preparation of MDG advocacy materials. | 1.Review of data gaps for MDG advocacy and monitoring;  2. Review of the capacity assessment results and policy suggestions and key recommendations in line with the priorities of community development plans.  3. Organization w-shop and focus group discussions with local stakeholders, five national thematic experts and one international expert | | April- October 2010  April- October 2010  April- October 2010 | | 1.Analysis of CDPs in each region, comment on extent to which match regional and national priorities  2.Review of data gaps and shortcomings (availability, quality and use) for MDG advocacy and monitoring at community, district and regional level  3. Review of capacity assessment results, and suggestions for implementation of key recommendations at regional/district levels  4. [2] Advocacy papers  5. [3] Workshops  6. [1] Roundtables |
| 1.5: Support local authorities to collect and analyze socioeconomic data and set up/maintain a database for local planning and MDG monitoring. | 1. Collection the socio-economic data (including: gender relations; division of labour; income distribution; disparities; private sector’s role and other) and organize them in electronic maps (Fergana and Namangan).  2. Prepare guidelines for the collection and monitoring of MDG socioeconomic data (baseline and indicators of the WIS)  3. Review availability and quality of data for monitoring outcomes of socio-economic policies at community, district, regional level including recommendations for restructuring the current system of data collection  4. Regularly update and improve capacity of the local authorities to monitor the poverty reduction impact of policy measures  5. Organization workshop for local authorities to set up and learn how to use and maintain an electronic database | | January-March 2010  January -October 2010  January -October 2010  January -October 2010  May-June 2010 | | 1. Database in excel  2. Maps (Completed in Andijan)  3. District and regional level flow of regular reporting data done electronically and access to public users improved  4. Two Workshops (one done by 2009 year) |
| 1.6: Prepare a summary of experience and disseminate lessons learned and training material. | 1. Monitoring and evaluation of project results and preparation a lessons learned report  2. Organization w-shop with representatives of  the 3 Khokimiyats and Ministry of Economy for presentation a summary of experience  3. Preparation the list of donors and international organizations, which interested in the ELS project results. Agree the list with the regional local government | | June-July 2010  July-August 2010  September –December 2010 | | 1. A summary of experience  2. One Workshop  3. Distribution list |
| 1.7: Evaluate and exit. | 1. Preparation of the evaluation TOR for external evaluation | | August 2010 | | 1. TOR |
| **Specific objective 2 Increase the capacity of rural communities to participate in local development processes and undertake self-help initiatives to improve basic services in Fergana Valley** |  | |  | |  |
| **Expected result 2.1** Improved public service delivery |  | | April 2009-December 2011 | |  |
| 2.1.1: Visit existing ELS community projects. | 1. Agree and get support from local authorities to conduct the assessment of existing 59 ELS community projects in ELS Phase I target districts.  2. Field visits and distribution of the questionnaire among ELS Phase I communities and Mahalla Fund Resource Centers.  3. Collect the questionnaire, compile and analyze data provided by communities.  4. Field visits to ELS AP 2003 communities.  5. Finalize and present report on assessment. | | April -June, 2009  May 2009  May 2009  May 2009  June 2009 | | 1. [4] meetings with local authorities conducted.  2. [59] copies of the questionnaire distributed among ELS AP 2003 communities Mahalla Fund Resource Centers.  3. [59] questionnaires collected  4. [53] communities visited  5. [1] report prepared and 4 presentations conducted in 4 target districts. |
| 2.1.2: Select 200 communities based on ELS criteria | 1. Assist in developing criteria and selection of target districts  2. Develop an application form and criteria for selection of target communities.  3. Meetings with Hokims, Deputy Hokims and Heads of districts' Makhalla Funds in 5 target districts to introduce Component 2 tasks and objectives.  4. Conduct 5 workshops for local authorities, potential partner organizations, counterparts and communities to introduce the ELS project.  5. Organize selection process with 5 selection committees of target districts  6. Recruitment of International consultant on community development.  7. Field visits to the pre-selected communities.  8. Complete a rapid assessment of the socio-economic situation in the selected communities and compare the data with that obtained from the local authorities.  9.Based on the information collected together with regional and local authorities and the Mahalla Fund agree and finalize choice of selected target communities for project intervention based on information received and field visits.  10. Prepare and submit final list of selected communities to regional and district local authorities. | | April 2009  April 2009  April 2009  April 2009  May 2009  September 2009  May 2009  May 2009  May 2009 –March 2010  May- March 2011 | | 1. [2] criteria for selection  2. selected socioeconomic data for 200 communities  3.rapid assessment of the socioeconomic situation in the selected communities |
| 2.1.3: Mobilize and train communities in strategic planning. | 1. Organize and conduct 5 MDG localization and CDP development workshops to local government (khokimyat, district government structures, MCC chairmen of the target communities)  2. Organize and conduct community information meetings with Component III and select volunteer groups (IG) (infrastructure and economic  3. Organize and conduct MDG localization workshops in the selected target communities where the MDGs will be used to identify and prioritize problems, set socioeconomic baseline and targets for local development (community needs mapping) with Component III  4. Recruit 4 local consultants  5. Organize trainings on Family Education (UNICEF) for target communities.  6. Digitizing resource maps of each communities  7. Completion of a specific social mobilization package which consists from documentations (guidelines, manuals and etc.) on community development mechanisms and approaches  8. Provide consultation to the IG members how to use community development mechanisms and approaches during the implementation of community development plans  9. Organization community mobilization events in 66 target communities to ensure active participation of local population in the community development activities | | May 2009  June 2009 – March 2011  June 2009 – March 2011  June 2009  November 2009  April –June 2010  January –April 2010  April-October 2010  August 2009 – December 2011 | | **1.** [50] w-shops on MDGs  2. w-shops handouts  3. [200] community resource maps (digitized)  4. A specific social mobilization packages  5. [66] mobilization events |
| 2.1.4: Support the communities in the design of 200 development plans and 200 priority community projects (basic service infrastructure or income generation activities). | 1. Agree on the socioeconomic needs prioritized during the MDG w-shops with the target district authorities (Khokimiyat and Mahalla Fund) and seek their consensus.  2. Organize community mobilization events, trainings for communities on social mobilization, project design, fundraising, monitoring and strategic planning.  3. Assist initiative groups to present plans to the authorities and Mahalla Fund for their endorsement and inclusion in the district and regional annual budget plans  4. Assist the initiative groups to choose and design priority projects, agree on the stakeholders’ contributions and sign project agreements with communities, authorities and other partners (triple agreements)  5. Conduct presentation of the priorities to community at the community meeting (project defense meetings)  6. Presentation projects by initiative groups to ELS for funding  7. Assist initiative groups to develop sustainability plans  8. Provide consultation to the IG member to ensure active participation of women of mahalla in community development activities  9. Tender announcement and contracting with construction organizations  10. Monitoring and evaluation of community projects implementation processes and results  11. Preparation an information document on pilot mahallas, where socio-economic dates (# of poor families, unemployed, direct and indirect beneficiaries, etc.) will be identified  12. Monitoring and evaluation the socio-economic impacts of the community projects | | June 2009  June –December 2009  December 2009, January 2011, January 2011  August 2009 – December 2011  August 2009 – December 2011  August 2009 – December 2011  August 2009 – December 2011  August 2009 – December 2011  September 2009 – October 2011  September 2009 – October 2011  August 2009 – November 2011  August –December 2010, May- August 2011 | | 1. [72] project proposals with equitable  women's participation (not less than 30 per cent women as beneficiaries and partners) and at least 20 per cent co-financing from community pledged  2. [72] Priority projects  3. [66] list of poor families  4. [72] sustainable plans  5. [72] project design w-shops  6. [72] Final presentation meetings  7. [66] training events of 2 days each)  8. [66] Community development plans  9. [72] Presentations (defense meetings) |
| 2.1.5: Provide seed grant funding to 200 priorities community projects. | 1. Preparation a procurement plans for implementation of 72 community projects  2. Creation a Local Tender Commission (LTC) of ELS (staff members of ELS and target district khomiyat representatives) for selection of community projects.  3. Conducting meetings of LTC for review project proposals  4. Contracting the construction organizations  5. Identifying via special assessment what specific technical assistance required for speeding up community development processes. | | July 2009–November 2011  July 2009–November 2011  July 2009–November 2011  July 2009–November 2011  July 2009–November 2011 | | 1. Procurement plans  2. [72] Contracts  3. report assessments for technical assistance |
| 2.1.6: Implement and monitor 200 community projects. | 1. Render consultative, expert, and in case of need financial assistance for realization selected priority projects.  2. Develop project monitoring matrix  3. Assurance regular contact with mahalla leaders for ensuring timely reporting during project realization (minimum 1 report per month).  4. Visit territory of each implementing project (minimum one time per week) for ensuring timely achievement of results.  5. Monitoring and evaluation results, impact and sustainability community projects. | | July 2009- December 2011 | | 1. Monthly visit and report plan  2. Works monitoring/impact plan  3. Weekly meeting records  4. Monthly logbooks |
| 2.1.7: Establish management, operation and maintenance mechanisms. | 1. Establish and organize work of a local management committee (LMC) in each target districts to accept the community project infrastructures and facilitate  2. Assist LMC in preparation of community project infrastructures management plans.  3. Support IG and community leaders in elaboration Exit Strategies.  4. Assist the 200 mahallas to update activities of existing and/or to create new community based structures which will be responsible for provision of sustainability of the community infrastructure projects results | | July 2009- November 2011  July 2009- November 2011  July 2009- November 2011  January 2010-December 2010 | | 1.Local management committee in each target community  2.Exit Strategy 3.Management, operation and maintenance mechanisms for each project |
| **Expected result 2.2. Organizational capacity of 200 Mahallas reinforced** |  | |  | |  |
| 2.2.1: Assess capacity of existing 11 ELS resource centres. | 1. Prepare and organize a satisfaction survey among the 53 communities in the four districts of ELS AP 2003.  2. Finalize report on assessment of the capacity and needs of existing of ELS AP 2003 Mahalla Resource Centers.  3. Conduct a workshop in each district to present the results of the survey to the local authorities, the Mahalla Fund and representatives of the communities that implemented projects in 2006-2007.  4. Share report with the district authorities of ELS AP 2006. | | May 2009 | | 1. [1] satisfaction survey among 53 communities conducted.  2. [1]  report on assessment of the capacity and needs of existing AP2003 Mahalla Information & Resource Centers prepared and shared with local authorities  3. [4]  workshops conducted.  4. [1]  meeting on regional level for sharing report on assessment of existing Mahalla Information and Resource Centers. |
| 2.2.2: Set up 12 (4 per region) new Mahalla Information & Resource Centres and identify 24 facilitators (8 per region) under Mahalla Fund. | 1. Meeting with Regional Khokimiyat and Mahalla Fund representatives and demonstration them MRC vision and seek their support.  2. Develop a ToR for MRCs and criteria for the selection of facilitators and identify 10 facilitators under Mahalla Fund  3. Procurement of the equipment for new 5 Mahalla Information and Resource Centers.  4. Organization training for new established MIRCs facilitators training on Business planning  5. Development the business plans of MIRCs | | May 2009  June 2009  October –December 2009  January –May 2010  January –May 2010 | | 1. [5] meetings  2. TOR and budgets for centers  3.Centers business plans |
| 2.2.3: Train and coach centre facilitators. | 1. Prepare a training plan, obtain and review training modules and conduct trainings for 20 facilitators. (10 ELS AP 2003 and 10 ELS AP 2006)  2. Trainings for facilitators and Local consultants on MDG, CDP, overall RC goal and objectives, strategic planning, project design, monitorinfg and evaluation, fundraising, human resourses management, sustainable communities, community mobilization.  3. Assist facilitators to develop work plans for the provision of community services and for expanding the community development approach to other communities and districts.  4. Prepare and hand out to the facilitators training material for dissemination to more communities.  5. Organization training on “How to create a Successful Marketing Plan, Business Planning and Accounting and Basic Communication Skills for Business Development" for MIRCs facilitators  6. Organization trainings on “Human Resources Management” and on “Creation of Rural Income Generation”, including support of rural service and producer enterprises for MIRCs facilitators | | July 2009  July-September 2009  July-August 2009  July-September 2009  January –March 2010  January –March 2010 | | 1. [4] presentations by trainers  2. [1] 6-days ToT  3. [6] two-day workshops |
| 2.2.4.: Assist the Mahalla Information & Resource Centres to provide information, support and services to communities. | 1. Assist MRCs in organization relevant information exchanges, meetings and workshops.  2. Assist MRCs in creation date bases (one in each center), information about projects UNDP and other relevant projects, analysis and assessments.  3. Provide Mahalla Information & Resource Centers with training materials. | | September 2009-November 2011  September 2009-December 2011  September 2009-November 2011 | | 1. [66] information exchange, meetings and workshops (one in each community where the programme operates)  2. [8] workshops (2 per each centre) |
| 2.2.5.: Organize network meetings and study tours between communities. | 1. Develop best practices dissemination plan  2. Preparation a visit concept papers for organization study tours to the territory of ABD project to exchange experiences on community development planning and MIRCs development  4. Organization study tours between ELS target mahallas | | June –September 2010  January-February 2010  January 2010-May 2011 | | 1. [1] visit concept papers and individual knowledge dissemination plans  3. [10] study tours organized between ELS target communities |
| 2.2.6: Facilitate inclusion of community development plans into district plans and follow up. | 1. Assist the IG members in preparation CDP presentations  2. Organization and conducting CDP presentation meetings in district centers for possible inclusion of planned within the CDP community initiatives to the annual social development plans  3. Organization a round table/presentation in regional level to discuss:  recommendations of the regional authorities concerning the inclusion of priority plans of the mahallas to the social development plans for 2010-2011 years (one in each region);updating of activities/results achieved during the previous phases of the ELS project (implementation of CDPs and established MIRCs sustainability (in Fergana and Namangan) | | December 2009-December 2011 | | 1. [10] district structured and moderated meetings with the district authorities  2. Recommendations/resolutions by regional authorities to include plan in the district’s annual budget |
| 2.2.7: Facilitate dissemination of community development approaches to more communities. | 1. Preparation plan/concept for dissemination of tested community development approaches to more communities  2. Facilitate MRCs to disseminate community development approaches to more communities | | August 2009 –November 2011 | | 1. [50] CDP developed by non target mahallas  2. [4] dissemination plans of MIRCs developed |
| 2.2.8: Record good practice and lessons learned.  May 2010- August 2011 | 1. Monitoring and evaluation of project results and preparation a lessons learned report  2. To post the summary of experience in the internet  3. Preparation the list of donors and international organizations, who interested in the ELS project results  4. Distribution the summary of experience among the donors and international organizations  5. Development of the Visibility Strategy | | May –September 2010  August –December 2010, May- August 2011 | | 1. A summary of experience posted in the internet  2. Distribution list  3. Visibility strategy |
| 2.2.9: Evaluate and exit. | 1. Preparation of the evaluation TOR for external evaluation  2. Conducting a final evaluation of 72 community projects  3. Translation the evaluation report into Uzbek, Russian languages  4. Preparation the list of participants of round table/presentation, including the local authorities, the IG members and the community leaders  5.Organization the round table/presentation of the ELS project results | | November 2011  August 2010-November 2011  November 2011  December 2011 | | 1. evaluation TOR  2. English, Uzbek and Russian evaluation, including recommendations and lessons of experience  3. One roundtable/presentation |
| **Specific objective 3 Communities have increased equitable access to rural development services and business opportunities.** | |  | |  |  |
| **Expected Result 3.1 Business and advisory capacity of mahallas built and community economic productivity improved.** | |  | |  |  |
| 3.1.1: Analyse the economic potential in 200 communities in agriculture and other business sectors. | | Organize Initial contacts and meetings in each selected community (synergy with the component II). | | May-June, 2009 | Information about the project is delivered |
| Organize workshops (one in each community) on analyzing economic potential of communities. | | June-July, 2009 | 67 workshops are conducted |
| Prepare brief analysis on the economic potential in each community (synergy with the component II). | | June-July, 2009 | A brief analysis report |
| Conduct feasibility study on the potential for Food Processing in the region. | | April-July, 2009 | A feasibility study on the potential of food processing in the region |
| Conduct an Assessment of the existing institutional capacity in terms of provision of extension services in agriculture sector. | | May-June, 2009 | An assessment of the existing institutional capacity |
| 3.1.2: Mobilize communities and agree on community economic priorities. | | Organize Informational Meetings in the selected communities and discuss communities economic and livelihood issues, collect baseline information (synergy with the component II). | | May-June, 2009 | Baseline information on the 67 communities are collected |
| Prepare brief outline of the main means by which communities members sustain a livelihood. | | June, 2009 | One final report (brief outline) prepared |
| Organize workshops in each community on mapping of the communities economic priorities (identify topics for demonstration and sectors/business for proposal) (synergy with the component II). | | June-July, 2009 | Communities economic priorities in 67 communities are identified |
| Develop criteria for selection of Economic Initiative Groups (EIG’s). | | June, 2009 | - ToR for EIG's; - Criteria for selection of EIG's |
| Form Initiative Groups on possible enterprise/cooperative initiatives (synergy with the component II). | | June-August, 2009 | At least 67 EIG's in the target communities are formed |
| 3.1.3: Establish demonstrations. | | Identify topics of the demonstrations (approximately 30). | | August, 2009 | At least 30 topics identified |
| Develop criteria for selection of Extension Agents (EA’s). | | August, 2009 | - A ToR for EA's; - Criteria for selection of EA's |
| Select the Extension Agent (approximately 30). | | August-November, 2009 | - A report of the selection process in target communities; - A list of selected EA's |
| Make Agreement (MOU) with Extension Agents. | | August-November, 2009 | - At least 30 signed Agreements with EA's |
| Design training plan for all extension agents. | | August-November, 2009 | - A training plan for EA's |
| Recruit training specialists; obtain, review and agree on training modules. | | August-November, 2009 | - A list of recruited training specialists; - Reviewed and agreed final version of training modules |
| Conduct trainings to the extension agents. | | September, 2009 -September, 2010 | - Training report; - List of participants |
| Establish about 30 demonstrations and procurement of inputs. | | September, 2009 – March, 2010 | - Final reports of establishment of about 30 demonstration plots; - Reports of input delivery to end users |
| Conduct experimental works on demonstration plots. | | October, 2009 – October, 2010 | - One experimental work on each demonstration plot is conducted |
| Conduct practical trainings and demonstrations. | | October, 2009 – October, 2010 | - At least 30 practical trainings and/or demonstrations on the demonstration plots are conducted |
| Organize exchange and study tours. | | December, 2009 – October, 2010 | - At least 5-6 exchanges and study tours are conducted; - At least 25-30 EA's and gardeners have participated in exchange and study tours |
| Monitor results. | | January, 2010 – November, 2010 | - One monitoring for each established demonstration plot |
| 3.1.4: Mobilize and train economic initiative groups. | | Design a training program for Economic Initiative Groups. | | June, 2009 | Developed training program for EIG's |
| Recruit training specialists; obtain, review and agree on training modules. | | June-July, 2009 | - Training specialists are recruited according to the training program; - Reviewed and agreed final version of training modules |
| Conduct training program for Economic Initiative Groups (synergy with the component II). | | September, 2009 – September, 2010 | - 6 different trainings for EIG are conducted |
| Set up a committee in each community to screen and select the winning proposals. | | August, 2009 | Members of the committee are identified |
| Develop criteria’s for selection of the best economic proposals (business plans). | | August, 2009 | A list of criteria for selection of the best economic proposals |
| Assist EIG’s in developing economic proposals. | | December, 2009 – February, 2010 | At least 12 proposals are developed |
| Select the best economic proposals/business plans for further support (at least 4 proposals). | | March-April, 2010 | At least 4 proposals are selected and approved |
|  | |  |  |
| 3.1.5: Support successful economic initiative groups in implementation of their proposal. | | Assist selected EIG’s/businesses in registration if they are not registered. | | April-June, 2010 | - At least 4 businesses are registered (if they were not registered) |
| Support in development of work plans for the selected EIG’s/businesses. | | April-May, 2010 | - At least 4 work plans are developed |
| Make Agreement (MOU) between UNDP and selected EIG’s/businesses (beneficiaries). | | April-June, 2011 | - At least 4 MOU's developed and signed |
| Procure and supply inputs for the selected businesses/proposals (at least 4 proposals). | | April, 2010 – May, 2011 | - Necessary equipment were made available to business entities according to the business proposals |
| Monitor performance of the supported proposals/businesses. | | December, 2010 – November, 2011 | - Periodical reports of monitoring |
| 3.1.6: Set up at least 6 nongovernmental rural development centres as rural enterprises. | | Based on the conducted assessments and baseline information identify how many RDC’s will be organized. | | November, 2009 | - Report on identification of the number of RDC's to be established |
| Conduct meetings to discuss organization and registration of the RDC’s with the Hokimiyat, the Mahalla Fund, the Chamber of Commerce, the Farmers Association and others where the ELS programme works. | | December, 2009 – January, 2010 | - Organization and registration issues of RDC's are agreed and documented |
| Prepare business plans for RDC’s. | | January-March, 2010 | - business plans for RDC's are prepared |
| Establish and register RDC’s. | | March-May, 2010 | - RDC's are registered |
| Identify list of initial full time staff of the RDC’s. | | March, 2010 | - A list of identified and agreed initial full time staff of the RDC's |
| Assist RDC’s in recruitment of the staff. | | April-June, 2010 | - A list of recruited staff of the RDC's |
|  | |  |  |
| Prepare a MOU between UNDP and the RDC’s. | | April-August, 2011 | Signed MOU between RDC's and UNDP |
|  | |  |  |
| 3.1.7: Equip and train centres. | | Identify and prepare a list of equipment for RDC’s. | | February-March, 2010 | - A list of identified equipment for RDC's |
| Procure and deliver equipment for RDC’s. | | May, 2010 – May, 2011 | - Equipment delivery documents for RDC's |
| Identify topics and prepare training plan for the RDC’s staff. | | April, 2010 | - Developed topics and training plan for the RDC staff |
| Recruit training specialists; obtain, review and agree on training modules. | | May-July, 2010 | - Agreement (contracts) with the trainers; - Agreed training modules |
| Conduct trainings for the RDC staff. | | May-September, 2010 | - At least 4 trainings for the RDC staff conducted |
| Assist the centres to develop an exit strategy. | | September-October, 2010 | - Developed exit strategies for RDC's |
| Organize Monitoring of RDC’s activities. | | August-November, 2011 | Periodical Monitoring reports |
| 3.1.8: Support existing institutions in the provision of rural extension services. | | Identify list of existing institutions in the provision of rural extension services (extension service providers – ESP’s) in each district. | | June, 2009 | - A list of existing institutions in the provision of rural extension services per a target district |
| Conduct initial meetings/interviews with all existing ESP’s in the target districts. | | June, 2009 | - Reports of meetings and interviews in all 5 target districts |
| Identify list of institutions that are willing to collaborate with the programme. | | June, 2009 | - A list of identified ESP's per a region |
| Prepare an assessment of capacity of existing ESP’s. | | July, 2009 | - An assessment report of ESP's per a target district |
| Selection of proposals for further support | | 04.2010-06.2011 |  |
| Provision of trainings and inputs to ESP | | 08.2010- 12.2011 |  |
| 3.1.9: Produce and distribute written guidelines and extension material. | | Identify list of topics that the extension materials and simple guidelines will address. | | August-September, 2009 | - A list of identified topics |
| Develop extension materials and simple guidelines. | | November, 2009 – November, 2010 | - Examples of developed extension materials |
| Distribute extension materials and simple guidelines. | | April, 2010 – November, 2011 | - A list of beneficiaries to whom extension materials are distributed |
| 3.1.10. Evaluate and exit. | | Develop methodology, questionnaire and indicators for the final assessments. | | August-September, 2011 | - Methodology, questionnaire and indicators for the final assessments |
|  | |  |  |
| Conduct final assessment of businesses supported. | | July-November, 2011 | - A final assessment report |
| Conduct final assessment of RDC’s. | | November, 2011 | - A final assessment report |
| End user survey. | | November-December, 2011 | - End user survey conducted |
| Prepare final evaluation report. | | December, 2011 | - Final evaluation report |
| Final hand over of equipment to end users. | | N/A | - Set of equipment transfer documents |
| Conduct final workshop and disseminate results. | | December, 2011 | - One regional workshop for about 30 participants |

**Legend**

SO: specific objective

OVI: objective verifiable indicator

R: Result

Baseline=current situation before the project start on which the project will build and which is the starting point for result monitoring.

Annex: D

Questionnaire

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Q. 1. Were to Planned outcomes achieved?** | | | | |
| **Sub questions** | **Project adm’n- Nat’l project Director** | **Local govt. Reps** | **Partners** | **Target communities** |
| 1.1 What are the most important outcomes? |  |  |  |  |
| 1.2 Are all the outcomes achieved? (yes/no) |  |  |  |  |
| 1.3 (if no) what is not achieved and why |  |  |  |  |
| 1.4 What was the missing element (if not achieved) |  |  |  |  |
| 1.5 |  |  |  |  |
| 1.6 |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Q.2 If not fully achieved what are the progress towards has been made?** | | | | |
| **Sub questions** | **Project am’n- Nat’l project Director** | **Local govt. Reps** | **Partners** | **Target communities** |
| 2.1 What is the degree of achievement if not fully achieved? |  |  |  |  |
| 2.2 What is missing? |  |  |  |  |
| 2.3 What should be done? |  |  |  |  |
| 2.4 How could be achieved after the end of Pro. |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Q.3. What are the factors that contributed for achievement/non-achievement** | | | | |
| **Sub questions** | **Project adm’n- Nat’l project Director** | **Local govt. Reps** | **Partners** | **Target communities** |
| 3.1 Two most important factors for achiev. |  |  |  |  |
| 3.2 Two most important factors for non- achiev. |  |  |  |  |
| 3.3 How could be achieved after the end of Proj. |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Q. 4. How would you appraise the synergies between the ELS project intervention and other interventions and partners in the target areas**, | | | | |
| **Sub questions** | **Project adm’n- Nat’l project Director** | **Local govt. Reps** | **Partners** | **Target communities** |
| 4.1 Two most important outputs for achiev. |  |  |  |  |
| 4.2 Two most important missing outputs for non- achiev. |  |  |  |  |
| 4..3 How could the missing outputs remedied afer the end of Proj. |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Q.5 Was the project partnership effective?** | | | | |
| **Sub questions** | **Project adm’n- Nat’l project Director** | **Local govt. Reps** | **Partners** | **Target communities** |
| 5.1 was it effective?. |  |  |  |  |
| 5.2 What were the reasons? |  |  |  |  |
| 5.3 Was it ineffective? |  |  |  |  |
| 5.4 What were the reasons? |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Q. 6 Has the project contributed to poverty reduction?** | | | | |
| **Sub questions** | **Project adm’n- Nat’l project Director** | **Local govt. Reps** | **Partners** | **Target communi/NGOs** |
| 6.1 Yes/ no |  |  |  |  |
| 6.2 (if yes) Can you indicate some concrete proof? |  |  |  |  |
| 6.3 (if no) Can you indicate some concrete proof? | |  |  |  |
| 6.4 What were the reasons? (for yes/no) |  |  |  |  |
| 6.5 (if no) What is left to be done? |  |  |  |  |
| 6.6 Who should do it? |  |  |  |  |
| **Q.7 Once the project is over are the results sustainable?** | | | | |
| **Sub questions** | **Project adm’n- Nat’l project Director** | **Local govt. Reps** | **Partners** | **Target communities** |
| 7.1 Yes/ no |  |  |  |  |
| 7.2 (if yes) Can you indicate some concrete proof? |  |  |  |  |
| 7.3 (if no) Can you indicate some concrete proof? |  |  |  |  |
| 7.4 What are the reasons? (for yes/no) |  |  |  |  |
| 6.5 (if no) What is left to be done for sustainability? |  |  |  |  |
| 6.6 Who should do it? |  |  |  |  |
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**Annex F**

**Itinerary of the Mission**

| **Day** | **Region** | **Timeframe** | **Activity** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1st Day** | | | |
| December 06, 2011 (Tuesday) | *Tashkent* |  | Arrival to Tashkent |
|  |  | |  | | --- | | Meeting with ELS Project Coordinator | | Travel to Andijan by road | |
|  |  | Check-in in the Hotel “Vella Elegant” and dinner |
| **2nd Day** | | | |
| December 07, 2011 (Wednesday) | *Andijan* | 09:00-10:00 | Briefing meeting with ELS project staff in Andijan region |
| 10:00-12:00 | Meeting with the representatives of regional/local authorities (participants of trainings under the 1st Component of ELS project) |
| 12:00-14:00 | Lunch and travel to Marhamat district |
| 14:00-17:00 | Visit the ELS project sites:  MCC “Khujaarik”. Demonstration plot on beekeeping  MCC “Guliston”. Business project on furniture production  MCC “Markaziy”. Community infrastructure project on drinking water supply |
| 17:00-18:00 | Travel to Andijan city |
| 18:00-19:30 | Dinner |
| **3rd Day** | | | |
| December 08, 2011 (Thursday) | *Andijan* |  | Day off – Constitution Day (official Holiday) |
| **4th Day** | | | |
| December 09, 2011 (Friday) | *Andijan* | 9:00-10:00 | Travel to Shahrikhan district |
| 10:00-12:00 | Visit the ELS project sites:  MCC “Dulan”. Community Rural Medical Point reconstruction and installation of solar water heating collector’s installation  MCC “Markaz”. Extension service provider on expanding of veterinarian services |
| 12:00-13:00 | Lunch |
| 13:00-14:00 | Travel to Izboskan district |
| 14:00-17:00 | Visit the ELS project sites:  MCC E“Urta Kishlok”. Business project on clothing production  MCC “Chek”. Demonstration plot on mushroom production |
|  |  | 17:00-18:00 | Travel to Fergana region |
|  |  | 18:00-19:30 | Check-in in the Hotel “Asia” and dinner |
| **5th Day** | | | |  | 09:00-10:00 | Travel to **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_** district |
| December 10, 2011 (Saturday) | *Fergana* | 09:00-18:00 | Desk-work in ELS project office in Fergana |
| **6th Day** | | | |  | 10:30-11:30 | Briefing meeting with ELS staff in Andijan region |
| December 11, 2011 (Sunday) | *Fergana* |  | Desk-work in ELS project office in Fergana |
| **7th Day** | | | |  |  | Debriefing meeting with ELS project staff |
| December 12, 2011 (Monday) | *Fergana* | 09:00-10:30 | Briefing meeting with ELS project staff in Fergana region |
|  | 10:30-11:30 | Meeting with representatives of Regional Business Development Centre |
|  | 11:30-12:30 | Travel to Yazyavan district |
|  |  | 12:30-14:00 | Lunch |
|  |  | 14:00-17:00 | Visit the ELS project sites:  MCC “Chuliguliston”. Community infrastructure project on Rural Medical Point reconstruction and installation of solar water heating collector  MCC “Qum”. Community infrastructure project on construction of irrigational system  MCC “Navruz”. Demonstration plot on cattle breading |
|  |  | 17:00-18:00 | Travel to Fergana city |
|  |  | 18:00-19:30 | Dinner |
| **8th Day** | | | |  |  | Debriefing meeting with ELS project staff |
| December 13, 2011 (Tuesday) | *Fergana* | 09:30-11:30 | Travel to Uzbekistan district |
| 11:30-12:30 | Visit to MCC “Karimdevona”. Community infrastructure project on electricity supply |
| 12:30-14:00 | Lunch |
| 14:00-16:00 | Visit the ELS project sites:  MCC “Shursuv”. Business project on sewing production  MCC “Pastki Quriq”. Demonstration plot on Beekeeping |
| 16:00-18:00 | Travel to Fergana city |
| 18:00-19:30 | Dinner |
| **9th Day** | | | |  |  | Debriefing meeting with ELS project staff |
| December 14, 2011 (Wednesday) | *Namangan* | 09:00-10:00 | Travel to Namangan region |
| 10:00-11:00 | Briefing meeting with ELS project staff in Namangan region |
| 11:00-12:00 | Travel to Uchkurgan district |
| 12:00-13:00 | Visit to MCC “Yangiobod”. Business project on bakery production |
| 13:00-14:00 | Lunch |
| 14:00-17:00 | Visit the ELS project sites:  MCC “Oktovlik”. Demonstration plot on lemon production and drip irrigation  MCC “Bog kucha”. Project on drinking water supply and installation of solar water heating collectors in boarding school  VCC “Baht”. Community infrastructure project on installation of gas supply line |
| 17:00-18:00 | Travel to Namangan city |
| 18:00-19:30 | Check-in in “Namangan” Hotel and dinner |
| **10th Day** | | | |  |  | Debriefing meeting with ELS project staff |
| December 15, 2011 (Thursday) | *Namangan*  *Tashkent* | 09:00-10:30 | Travel to Pap district |
| 10:30-11:00 | Visit to MCC “Temir Yol Usti”. Demonstration plot on poultry |
| 11:00-12:30 | Meeting with representatives of Pap district water supply organization and visit water pumping station “Akcha”. Project on improving drinking water supply system of Pap town. |
|  |  | 13:00-18:00 | Travel to Tashkent city |
| **11th Day** | | | |  |  | Debriefing meeting with ELS project staff |
| December 16, 2011 (Friday) | *Tashkent* | 10:00-14:30 | Participation in ELS project Steering Committee meeting |
| 14:30-15:30 | Meeting with Center for Economic Researches |
| 15:30-16:30 | Meeting with representatives of EU UzBuroKES (TACIS NCU) |
| 16:30-17:30 | Meeting with Ministry of Economy |
| 17:30-18:30 | Meeting with UNDP CO |
| **12th Day** | | | |
| December 17, 2011 (Saturday) | *Tashkent* |  | Departure |

1. See UNDP, *Human Development Report*. New York 2011. Tables 1 and 2. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. This report follows the principles of evaluation elaborated in two major publications of UNDP/EO. See: *Handbook on Monitoring and Evaluating for Results*. New York, 2003, and UNDP, *Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results*. New York, 2009. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Among the documents one stands out as most useful: *Mid-Term Evaluation of the Living Standards Program in Uzbekistan. 2005-2010*. Prepared by Emilio Valli. The present report has benefited from it (subsequent pages will refer to it as “Mid-term Report). A similarity between that report and the present one is not coincidental, due to the fact that the time elapsed between the two is barely 16 months. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. For the structured questionnaire see Annex D. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Annex B of the report will list the persons interviewed. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Socio-economic setting differed from locale to locale and so did the emphasis of specific projects; hence variations will be introduced to the prepared questionnaire for more accurate answers. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. OECD*, DAC Criteria for Evaluating Development Assistance*. Paris 1991. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. In many documents of the project the terms of output and result are used interchangeably. The report fallows UNDP terminology and uses ‘output’ consistently. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. See: UNDP, *Results Oriented Monitoring and Evaluation*. NY 1997. p. 113. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. See, p. 7. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. These are among many others: Welfare Improvement Strategy Paper (WISP), Presidential decrees allocating funds for the rehabilitation of public services and infrastructure in rural towns and villages, for private housing development in rural communities, and for improving rural populations’ access to quality primary health care services; decentralization of public administration; and regional social policy. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. UNDAF’s’ expected outcome 1 reads as follows: “Economic well-being of vulnerable groups is improved (residents of economically underdeveloped, mainly rural, areas; women, particularly home-based workers; labor migrants and their families; children, particularly most-at-risk adolescents; the elderly; HIV-positive people; and people with disabilities);” and outcome 4 reads as: “Effectiveness, inclusiveness and accountability of governance at the central and local levels enhanced.” Country Program articulates “economic and good governance and welfare improvement.” [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. See: Haven North and Fuat Andic, *Building Development Partnerships through Co-financing.* UNDP/EO,

    New York, 1996. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. The report does not attempt to monetize in-kind contributions. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. An evaluation carried out by UNDP/EO showed that NEX is conducive to create a sense of national ownership provided that minimum human and institutional capacities are in place. See: Fuat Andic and Richard Huntington, *National Execution: Challenges and Promises.* UNDP/EO, New York, 1995. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. Similar conclusion was reached by the mid-term evaluation report. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. For details see: Annex C. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. More details can be found in *Mid-term Evaluation Report,*  p. 23 ff. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. For the details of fiscal management see: Fuat Andic*, “Local Governance and Participatory Development:*

    *A Conceptual Guide to Practitioners.”* **SocialScience Research Network**, 2008. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. One example among many successful activities was to bring the mahalla leaders together with local government employees in a district in Fergana to decide what community projects could be financed jointly. The success has been overwhelming. Those community leaders who have been involved in this endeavor are perfect candidates to be trainers [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. Similarities between these recommendations and recommendations put forward in *Mid-Term Evaluation* are not coincidental. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. UNDAF 2009. [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
23. UNDP Country Programme Action Plan 2010-2015 [↑](#footnote-ref-23)